

ODC Division Five Year Report for 2009

Frank J. Barrett, Division Chair

Gavin Schwartz, Secretary-Treasurer

In early February 2009, the ODC executive board met for two days during which we worked on the five year review. The board shared and discussed the implications of the survey results, discussed the “health and governance checklist” and made recommendations for ways the division could better serve its members. This document represents those discussions

Part I. Analysis of survey results

In fall 2008, ODC division members were asked to complete an on line survey. Out of 2, 862 members of ODC, 327 responded, for a response rate of 11.4%

Profile of membership

The first section of the survey addressed the profile of our members – years as members of the division, type of membership, gender, age, and reasons for belonging to the division. The ODC membership has grown by 389 since the last report in 2004, for an overall growth of 15.7%. We noted that 44% (n = 151) have joined the division in the last 3 years and 69% (n = 238) of those who responded to the survey have joined ODC in the last 7 years. The majority of the members are male (59%) and between the ages of 36 – 65 (79%). ODC continues to draw veterans (18% have been members of the division for 12 or more years). A majority of our members are North American (65%). Most of the members are academics (53%); twenty one percent identify as executive / practitioner (a point we will explore below). Of the total membership, 26 % of our members are students, (approximately the same rate as the overall AOM membership).

When asked what is most significant to them, 66% of the respondents value gaining and sharing information relevant to research, rating it first or second in terms of importance. Less significant is teaching (9% report that it is most important). However,

55% rated “gain and share information relevant to training and management practice” as most or second most important. Slightly less than half of the respondents identify with ODC as a primary division. Thirty-four percent report that they identify with another division almost as much as ODC and 18% report that that identify mostly with another division.

The ODC Division’s membership continues to increase, in keeping with AOM’s membership growth and matching the trend identified in the previous five year report. As of August 2008, the division had 2,862 members. During the five-year time period, however, this growth has slowed down, indicating a loss of momentum. Between 2004 and 2008, there has been a 15.73% increase in membership count, with an annual average of 3.15%. This growth is lower than the AOM count, being 26.55% and 5.3% respectively. More significantly, new member growth is now in negative territory, with a five year percentage change of -3.79% (for an annual average change of -0.76%). In other words, while the division continues to expand its membership, and although the division remains one of the larger entities in the AOM, this growth is slowing. This trend does replicate the AOM’s own slowing (but positive) annual percentage increase. Membership data indicates that 2007 and 2008 were especially poor years for growth with a net increase of only 8 (+0.29%) and 53 (+1.89%) in member count.

In keeping with ODC’s traditional constituency, the division is made up of a good mix of domestic and international members. Between 2004 and 2008, both types of members increased significantly, with domestic membership growing 14.3% and international members increasing by 18.6%. This domestic growth matches the AOM trend, while it is in keeping with positive movement in AOM international growth. The

ODC division has always had a strong international flavor and as a result, our ability to match the 44.3% AOM growth pattern is not likely – the AOM is catching up to the standard that the division set for many years prior to 2004. Member type also reflects the division’s disciplinary interests with a healthy distribution between academic and practitioner members. In 2008 the division had 1,429 academic and 625 practitioner members. Both counts reflect positive growth, with an increase of 11.3% and 15.3% respectively over the five year review period. Raw numbers for emeritus members remained constant over this period (between 46 and 55 members). Much like the increase in the division’s academic membership, student membership has grown steadily and significantly since 2004 – up 25.3%, indicating a potentially healthy future core membership and potential for continued growth. The division continues to offer doctoral students a home for mentorship and training and spends its time and resources well in this regard.

In summary, the ODC division’s member count represents a relatively healthy balance sheet. Nonetheless, there is cause for concern about the noticeably slowing growth pattern since 2007. This slowdown, however, represents an opportunity for new growth and development initiatives, just as much as it does highlight significant issues.

Annual Meeting

Questions 9 – 12 concern the annual meeting. Thirty-two percent of the members attend the meeting whether they are on the program or not; another 15 % (n=52) attend when they are on the program; 22% attend “once in a while.” We noted that 41 % (n = 105) rarely or never attend. The major reason for not attending is lack of funding (53%).

Question eleven concerns members' engagement with activities related to the annual meeting; question twelve asks about level of satisfaction with the meeting program. For question 11, we were quite surprised to discover the high percentage of respondents who reported never serving as a reviewer (44%); never presented at PDW (40%); never presented a scholarly session (51%); never served as chair or discussant (69%). Twenty-six percent (n=87) serve as reviewers every year. Twenty-nine percent have served once or a few times. Twenty three percent have volunteered in some capacity.

For question twelve, a majority of members reported that they are satisfied, very satisfied or extremely satisfied with the division activities. The pattern is consistent for PDW's (85%); paper sessions (77%); poster or visual sessions (64%); interactive sessions (81%); symposia (88%); social and networking opportunities (86%). Eighty-eight percent feel satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied that they have access to participation on the program.

The average submission and acceptance rate of ODC division papers (73% in 2008) is comparable to the Academy average (70% in 2008), while the acceptance rate for symposia (91% in 2008) is higher than the AOM average (72% in 2008). The closeness in these trend results is generally followed throughout the five-year review period. The symposia figure supports both the division's disciplinary background and membership survey analysis that members in division are highly interested in applied scholarly activities. In general, scholarly submissions show a basic upward trend, in keeping with AOM trends, although 2008 saw some declines, again in keeping with overall Academy figures. Following the ODC division's leadership in the development of

PDW's many years before they became an Academy staple, the division shows an enviable and notable growth in this part of our scholarly program. In 2008 PDW sessions grew by 92.9% when AOM PDW session shrunk by -7.4%. This aspect of our program represents a strength for the division as it continues to develop its niche in this area.

The reviewer participation rate since 2006, however, raises a red flag. The reviewer participation for ODC has decreased in 2008 (293 or -18.6% for domestic reviewers and 167 or -16.5% for international reviewers) from 2006 (325 domestic and 192 international reviewers). At the same time the Academy has increased its reviewers from 4,704 to 5,182 (+10.1%). This unexpected drop may be attributed to reviewers learning about the operation of the Centralized Reviewer System, which was introduced in 2006, and becoming more selective in the division they review for. This drop needs to be monitored over the next few years, and rectifying actions set in motion should it continue.

Program / Services and Leadership

Question thirteen asks respondents to voice their satisfaction with the programs, services, and leadership of the division. The vast majority was satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with the following programs and services: sense of community within the division (74%); activities that address the division's domain (79%); efforts to reach out to international members (76%); efforts to foster good relations and work collaboratively with other divisions / interest groups (77%); opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network and collaborate (61%); level of communication received from

the division (77%); quality of newsletter (74%); usefulness of website (74%); value of listserves (67%); responsiveness of division officers to member concerns (83%); ability of interested members to become leaders in the division (80%); opportunities to influence the division (74%); fair and open elections (89%); selection process for awards and recognition (84%). While we were pleased with the overall level of satisfaction, we will discuss below how we seek to improve ODC services.

Overall satisfaction

Members expressed overall satisfaction with the division. Ninety percent reported that they were satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with their membership in the division. Only two percent expressed dissatisfaction.

Part II: Analysis of the Health and Governance of the ODC Division

ODC has grown an average of 3.15% over the last 5 years and represents approximately 15.4% of the overall academy membership. The acceptance rate of ODC papers (73%) is comparable to the overall academy average (70%). One concern is the number of academic papers submitted to ODC relative to the rest of AOM. The overall academy saw an increase of 51% since 2004 while ODC saw an increase of only 11%.

One of the central issues of ODC concerns our identity as a division in regard to scholarship vs. practice. While most members have academic interests, we have a critical mass interested in management practice. Twenty-one percent of our members identify as executives/practitioners. For the overall academy, only 9% identify as executives/practitioners. This suggests that we serve a more diverse membership than many other divisions. The survey (and anecdotal evidence) suggests the delicate balance in serving our membership. The board feels strongly that the inclusion of academics, practitioners, and students makes us a creative and exciting division that refuses to separate scholarship and practice. In light of this, the Executive Board decided to expand membership from one to two executive / practitioners. In the past five years we have had senior executives from GE, Hewlett-Packard, CNN, and Lockheed on our board. Their contributions have been indispensable. ODC needs to remain committed to rigorous research and managerial relevance. \

There's somewhat of a bi-modal distribution submission of papers to the annual meeting. One thread is practitioner oriented – consistent with the founding humanistic values of the field of Organizational Development. Several applied programs have evolved in the last several years, including executive doctoral programs and

organizational development programs. There is another thread of papers that focuses on the dynamics of change. These papers tend to be more empirically rigorous, yet less focused on implications for managers and leaders of change.

We noted that ODC has grown internationally, with an annual average of 3.15% since 2004. However, this growth rate is lower than the overall academy (5.3%) and we can do more. We have taken several steps to expand internationally. For the last 5 years ODC has co-sponsored an annual conference with the University of Lyon in France. Since 2003 the Executive Board has included an international representative. The board has included representatives from universities in Australia, France, England, and Norway. This has reaped success that is evident in a number of areas. The last several years several of our top rated papers and symposia include international scholars. In 2007, of the top ten rated papers, seven were from Europe or Asia. One of our regular current five-year division representatives is from the Norwegian School of Economics.

Governance and Finance

In 2008, participation in the ODC division election by its members has continued previous trends. In 2006, 22.15% of members participated in the election, while 24.06% participated in 2008. The three year period of data collected on this metric show a basic constancy, albeit with a slight upward inflection. This participation rate represents a challenge (no doubt for the AOM too) in attempting to significantly increase interest in getting members to vote in elections.

An overview of the division's financials shows a stable set of accounts with nothing alarming or significant to note. Like many other divisions, ODC's main expenses are now primarily related to the annual meeting, and particularly food and beverage (an

average of 66% of annual allocation and 47% of total operating funds). Other expenses are inconsequential in comparison (in raw dollar terms anyway). The division has worked diligently on maintaining its operating budget expense percentages, supplemented occasionally by endowments or contributions. Given the closeness of the division to business and business interests, this latter source of additional funding has been a constant source of income over the five year period. The current national and global economic outlook represents a challenge in maintaining external and independent funding. The executive committee is in continual discussion about this aspect of the division's finances.

Part III: Goals and Initiatives for Future of ODC

Based on this data, the ODC board discussed a number of activities we can take.

1. Communicate more frequently with membership. Improve the website to include interviews with leading scholars, notify members of relevant articles in top rated journals.
2. Improve the ODC list serve and seed discussions about change research.
3. Join with the Journal of Action Research to increase interest in action research submissions.
4. Since it appears from Q 11 that a small group of people are volunteering for activities, the division can do more to encourage volunteer activity at several levels. We have already begun to address this and are involving several additional people in roles as discussants and session chairs for the next meeting. We are inviting several members to attend our business meeting in Chicago and intend to use this as a way to share some of these findings and to encourage membership involvement.
5. Expand our pool of reviewers. Twenty six percent (n=87) report that they review each year. Forty-four percent (n=144) report that they have never served as a reviewer. Given the considerable percentage of practitioners and students in ODC, we need to continue to be deliberate in selection of reviewers, however.

ODC currently seeks four reviewers for each paper. ODC will continue to ensure at least two of the reviewers for each paper are academics.

6. Reach out to collaborate with other divisions that have similar research interests, especially MOC, BPS and OMT.
7. Focus on young scholars and encourage them to join ODC. Beginning in 2008, we experimented in creating an ODC doctoral consortium, inviting high quality academic institutions to send doctoral students. This was a success and we plan to continue this tradition.
8. Co-sponsor international conferences. ODC is planning to co-sponsor a conference in 2010 at Insead University on strategic change.
9. Organize symposia that include leading scholars in the field of change management.
10. Since 20% of ODC attends PDW's each year, this is an opportunity to reach out to members. We had several thoughts about organizing a regular PDW that focuses on publishing scholarly research in academic journals. Specifically offer sessions on designing and publishing qualitative studies in organizational change in order to encourage practitioners to write about change projects.

Health and Governance Checklist

The purpose of this checklist is to monitor basic division/interest group health and governance. It is intended to stimulate conversation among the officers and prompt reflection. Copies of documents referenced in the checklist are **NOT** being requested. For each item please share an example that illustrates your answer or a quick idea for improvement, where applicable. Officers should expand on items calling for improvement in their report.

Bylaws and Domain

1. The division/interest group's bylaws are up to date and periodically reviewed and revised, if necessary.

Yes
X

Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea: The mission statement has been revised and is included in the appendix

2. The division/interest group's domain statement is current and activities reflect its full scope.

Yes
X

Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : The domain statement is included as an appendix.

3. The division/interest group conforms to all official Academy policies as detailed in the Division and Interest Group Chair's Guidebook.

Yes
X

Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We conform to AoM policies and are mindful of appropriate associations with other organizations and conferences.

Membership

4. Membership statistics are periodically reviewed to understand trends (growth, decline) and who the division/interest group is serving (students, academics, practitioners, emeritus, international, etc.)

Yes
X

Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We discuss these issues at our annual mid-year meeting.

5. The division/interest group delivers programs/services for all member constituencies

Yes

Yes, but needs improvement
X

Example/quick idea : We try to serve both academics and practitioners. We are co sponsoring a conference in June at Case Western Reserve University on Design and Sustainability that we hope draws all our stakeholders.

Finance

6. At least one person has responsibility for reviewing and understanding the division/interest group's financial reports.

Yes
X

Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We have appointed a treasurer-secretary who is very mindful of finances.

7. The division/interest group follows the Academy's financial policies, and routinely operates in the black. Yes
X Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We operate in the black each year and carry a small balance each year.

8. If feasible, the division encourages outside sponsorship to extend its resources Yes
 Yes, but needs improvement
X

Example/quick idea : We have received support from private sector organizations to support out social gatherings, but need to improve efforts in this area.

Governance

9. Periodic planning takes place to consider how the division/interest group might meet new challenges and opportunities. Yes
X Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We meet in February of each year to discuss challenges and opportunities.

10. There is a climate of mutual trust and respect among the officers. Yes
X Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We explicitly discussed this at our meeting in February 2009 and there is unanimous agreement that there is high trust among officers.

11. The respective roles of officers and key volunteers are understood and some level of orientation/guidance takes place. Yes
X Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : Each officer documents "lessons learned" from his / her activities and mentors his / her successors.

12. The division/interest group actively attempts to involve members in volunteer and leadership positions, including international members and other underrepresented populations. Yes
 Yes, but needs improvement
X

Example/quick idea : One of our five year reps is from Norwegian business school. We have two international reps who rotate. We co-sponsor a conference in Lyon France each year.

13. The current governance and committee structure serves the division/interest group well. Yes
X Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : _____

14. The division/interest group has a fair and open process for nominations and elections. Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We need to encourage more members to volunteer to serve ODC.

Programs/Activities

15. The officers periodically consider adopting new programs and modifying or discontinuing others. They know the strengths and weaknesses of their programs. Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We need to continue to encourage rigorous research and managerial relevance and discount the myth that these are contrary goals.

16. Scholarships, travel stipends, or other funding programs are transparent and open to all who are eligible. Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : _____

17. The division/interest group has well publicized recognition programs (for service, scholarly contributions, etc) and the criteria for awards are transparent. Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea: We announce these each year at the business meeting. These are posted on our website. But our website needs continuous improvement.

18. The division/interest group strives to serve members with research as well as teaching and practice interests. Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea: Our PDW's tend to serve teaching and practice. Our top rated papers have seen an improvement in scholarship over the last 5 years.

19. Services to members extend beyond those provided at the annual meeting. Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : We need to upgrade our website to provide more resources to members.

20. The division/interest group carries out regular communication with members (minimally including a newsletter and up-to-date website). Yes Yes, but needs improvement

Example/quick idea : _See above. Also we need to create a listserv for the ODC community.

	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement
21. The division/interest group actively works to build community (communities of practice, listservs, collaboration activities, social and special events) etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Example/quick idea : See above. We reach out to other communities, especially practitioner communities, by co sponsoring conferences (discussed above).

	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement
22. The division/interest group actively strives to improve the annual meeting program by periodically reviewing program statistics to monitor meeting trends.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Example/quick idea : _____

	Yes	Yes, but needs improvement
23. Collaboration exists with other division/interest groups in the Academy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Example/quick idea : We co sponsor activities with Management and Education division and Management Consulting
We need to reach out to other divisions including BPS, OMT, and MOC.