To: The Board of Governors, Academy of Management
From: Jeffrey Ford, Chair, Organization Development and Change Division, for the ODC Division 5-Year Review Committee on behalf of the ODC Executive Committee

ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT
ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE
DIVISION REVIEW REPORT: 5-YEAR REVIEW

FEBRUARY 2014

Lead Author: Jeffrey Ford, Chair ODC Division
With:
Inger Stensaker (Past Chair); Jim Ludema (Past Chair); Sonya Sackmann (Chair-Elect); John Amis (PDW Chair-Elect)

This report represents the work of the ODC 5-Year Review Committee in cooperation with the ODC executive board. The information contained in this report is derived from the 2009 ODC 5-Year Review, the Feedback on ODC's 5-Year Report from DIGR, the 2008 and 2013 membership surveys, the ODC Division Review Metrics from AOM, Comparative survey results by size 1000-2499 from AOM, and assorted ODC division documents.

1.   Summary of Member Survey

In the fall of 2013, ODC division members were asked to complete an online member survey conducted from the offices of the AOM in liaison with the ODC Division Chair and members of the Review Committee. Based on suggestions from the ODC Review Committee, additional questions were added to the standard survey form. The AOM office sent emails to all members of the ODC Division to invite them to participate in the member survey. In addition to two prompts from the AOM offices, the Division also prompted members to respond through our newsletter.

We received 414 complete responses from 2181 members representing a response rate of 19%. This compares favourably with the historical response rate for the five year review survey among AOM Divisions of 18% and is significantly higher than the 11.4% response rate we had for our 2009 report. It also compares favourably with the average response rate of 16.9% reported for other divisions of similar size for their most recent five year review.

1.1.   Membership Demographics

1.1.a.   Membership Numbers
The total membership of ODC had declined from 2,826 in 2009 to 2,156 as of Feb 15, 2014 for a reduction of almost one-quarter of our membership (23.7%).[1] During this same period, AOM has grown 2.5% overall. A closer examination reveals that we have lost both domestic (-22.08%) and international (-6.3%) members as well as members from every membership type except emeritus (+11.7%). What is particularly of concern, however, is that the greatest percentage losses have occurred in academic (-13.6%) and student (-27.4%) membership while AOM has increased in academic members (+5%) and remained the same with student memberships. Also of concern is that there has been a substantial reduction in the number of student members, from 741 in 2009 to 538 currently, a decline of over 27%. Since students represent future academic members, this decline is worrisome, especially in light of the fact that the rate at which we are adding new members has declined by 22% over the last five years.

Since 2009, we have added 2368 new members for an average of 474 new members each year. Yet, during that same time period, the division has lost of 645 members per year for an average net loss of 129 members per year. If the division seeks to grow, or at least not decline further, it will need to find ways to retain existing members in addition to attracting new ones. Unfortunately, because the five year review does not collect data from members

---

[1] This number is different from the 2181 reported from AOM for the number of members surveyed for this report in October/November 2013. http://apps.aomonline.org/divdownload/comparison_rpt.asp?code=D11

who have left the division, we have no direct data on their views of the division or their reasons for leaving.

The DIGR indicated in their 2009 Feedback report that the membership growth rate would be a challenge to the division. At that time, ODC membership had increased 16% which was below the overall 27% for the AOM. Declining membership has also been a concern to the ODC executive committee, since the implementation of some of the ideas for stemming the decline proposed in the 2009 ODC report has not had the intended impact. For example, we added a doctoral consortium that each year has been well attended and gets very high evaluations from attendees, but student membership has still declined substantially.

To get a better handle on the reason for the membership decline we asked members in this survey why they thought membership was declining. We got a total of 165 comments that tend to fall into three general categories: reputation, communication, and competition.

Reputation, as used here, is broadly defined as how people think of the division and the body of work it represents. In this regard, members proposed that ODC is "old, dusty, and non-prestigious". As one member put it, "the name evokes the past". Based on a "fad" that is now over, it is not clear what ODC stands for and what the focus of its research is; it does not have a strong identity like BPS, ENT, or OB. Some members note that the AOM is mostly an academic culture and that ODC is seen as too practice-oriented and that "with pressures to publish as high as ever, newer faculty may be looking elsewhere content-wise as they build their careers." Other members, however, feel that there is too much emphasis on research, and that what research is done is not sufficiently practice-oriented. Others point to the perception that the work in ODC is not cutting edge or exciting and that there is a need for new areas of research, particularly for younger scholars, which some respondents say is being done in other divisions.

Communication, as used here, refers to the extent to which the division engages with its members and provides opportunities for them to engage with each other. A consistent comment throughout the responses is that the division is not as interactive or communicative as other divisions. This is well conveyed in the comment by one member: "I am a member of other divisions and subscribe to their mailing lists and they are vibrant and active on a daily basis which gives a member tons of opportunity to get useful info that we do not see as much of in ODC."

Competition, as defined here, has to do with the availability and attractiveness of alternatives as well as the demand for the subject matter of ODC. Comments in this area propose that OD is a dying, declining field with a lack of academic interest in it as a subfield. Others propose that OD and C are not in demand in the external environment, that the existing material has become a commodity, and that people are moving toward other fields where new and interesting work on change is being done. In this respect, several members point out that other divisions within AOM do work on organization change and they are better at marketing what they are doing.

Together, these responses indicate that membership decline is the product of different factors, some of which appear to be external to what the division does, e.g., change in demand for ODC in the external market. The division could, however, utilize the practitioner members to facilitate staying up to date on market changes regarding ODC. However, there is no question that some of the decline is the result of "division neglect" in that we simply have not done a sufficient job in communicating with members or giving them opportunities to be involved and participate either with the division leadership or with each other.

1.1.b. Membership Type
Of the members responding to the 2013 survey, 56% were academic, 21% student, and 19% executive/practitioners. This compares to 53%, 23%, and 21% respectively in the 2009 report and represents a slight shift in the focus of the Division away from executive/practitioners toward a more scholarly profile. It is also very consistent with the distribution of our members which is 52% academic, 22% student, and 22% executive/practitioner, indicating that the responses are representative of our membership.

However, in comparison to other Divisions of similar size, our membership is much lower on academic members (53% vs 70% avg.) and much higher on executive/practitioner members (21% vs 10% avg.) based on the responses received. Only the Management Consulting Division reported a lower percentage of academic members (41%) and a higher percentage of executive/practitioner members (34%) in their most recent five-year report.

Given the history and tradition of ODC as having a sizable executive/practitioner presence, this shift, although slight, indicates an increased scholarly interest in the division. This is underscored by the increase in the percentage of respondents who reported that "gaining and sharing information relevant to research" was the most important reason for belonging to ODC, 46% this year as compared to 42% in 2009.

1.1.c. Membership Tenure
78% of respondents have been members of the Division for seven or fewer years, which is higher than the average of 67% for divisions of similar size but is virtually the same as the 79% reported in our 2009 report. However, 43% of responding members have been members for three years or less, which is higher than the average of 40% for divisions of comparable size.

1.1.d. Membership Age and Gender
16.7% of respondents are under the age of 40, which is comparable to the 33% of respondents who were under the age of 45 in our 2009 report (the scaling has changed), but is much lower than the average of 69% of respondents under the age of 45 for similar sized divisions. However, the 30% of respondents who are over 60 years of age is much higher than the average 24% of respondents above the age of 55 for other divisions.

The respondents to the survey were 61.7% male and 38.3% female, which compares to 59% and 41% respectively in our 2009 report and to 60% and 40% for other comparable sized Divisions. Gender equality and inclusivity in the Division's membership composition, research orientation, ethos and activities is a Divisional goal. This priority is reflected in Executive Committee elections in which we have followed a policy of nominating women only and men only every other year to ensure gender diversity. As a result, the current

Executive Committee is composed of four men and three women (next year it will be four women and three men). Similarly, this Review Committee is composed of three men and two women.

1.1.e. Membership Geography

As indicated in Table 1, the overwhelming majority of survey respondents come from North America (64%) and Europe (23%), meaning that only 13% of respondents represent "the rest of the world". However, relative to our 2009 report, there has been a significant decrease in North American respondents (from 74 to 64%) combined with increases in respondents from Europe (from 18 to 23.2%), Asia (from 4 to 6.2%), and Africa (from 0 to 1.2%). This distribution compares very favourably to the averages for similar size divisions.

Although this survey is still dominated by Eurocentric respondents, these changes do reflect that we are becoming more international. The internationalization of the Division has been a focus of the Executive Committee as reflected in its policy of intentionally selecting 5-year and representative-at-large candidates who are not from North America. In this regard, the current Executive Committee has two members from North America, three from Europe, and two from Oceania.

We have also attempted to expand outside of North America by the invitations we have made for our Distinguished Speaker at the annual AOM Meetings. Prior to 2012, every Distinguished Speaker was from North America. In 2012, 2013, and 2014, the Distinguished Speakers are from Europe. Though by no means sufficiently international, this does reflect our continued commitment to being a more internationally diverse Division.

Table 1 - Location of respondents (%)

	2009	2014	Similar Divisions
Africa	0	1.2	1
Asia	4	6.2	7
Europe	18	23.2	18
North America	74	64	71
Oceania	4	3.8	3
South America	1	1.4	1

1.1.f. Membership Identification and Motivations

The results of the survey indicate that members continue to have a strong identification with the division. This is evident in the 47% of respondents who said that ODC was their primary division and 30% who said they identified with another division almost as much. These results are almost the same as the 48% and 34% respectively obtained in our 2009 report. However, in comparison to other Divisions, a higher percentage of ODC members identify ODC as their primary or joint division (78%) than do members in similar size Divisions (56%). This suggests that our members have a stronger identity with ODC than other members of similar size divisions do with their division.

Member satisfaction is also high (82.8% satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied). Although this percentage is lower than in our 2009 report (90%), is is consistent with the

80% average satisfaction reported for similar size divisions. However, to the extent that member satisfaction is a predictor of continued membership, this decrease is a red flag to be addressed by the executive committee. This is particularly significant given that even with a high member satisfaction level in 2009, there was still a substantial decline in membership during the past five years.

There has been a significant shift in the reasons members give for belonging to the division. The percent of members who say they are members in order to "gain and share research information" has increased from 42% who ranked this as the number one reason in 2009 to 60.5% currently. This result is consistent with the 59% of members in similar sized divisions who rank this reason as their primary reason.

1.2   Membership Participation and Satisfaction

1.2.a   Membership Participation in Elections
One measure of member participation in the division is the percent of members who vote in the annual elections for nominees to the executive committee. Since 2009, an average of 16.4% have voted in these elections with the high in 2009 (18.5%) and the low in 2011 (13.8%). This percentage is approximately half of the AOM voting average of 26.9%.

1.2.b   Annual Meeting Scholarly Submissions
Since 2009, there has been a 19.4% decline in the number of papers submitted to the Annual Meeting. In examining the data, it is of interest to note that the number of submissions increased through the 2010 Montreal meeting and then fell sharply (-28%) with the 2011 San Antonio meeting and has not recovered significantly since then. Over the same time period, paper submissions to the AOM Annual Meeting increased 8.6% overall. Of the papers submitted, an average of 49% are accepted which is consistent with the overall acceptance rate for the Annual Meeting of 52%.

Since the 2009 report, there has been a 33% decline in the number of symposia submitted as compared to an 8.5% increase in symposia submissions for AOM overall. In looking at the submissions for each Annual Meeting, the number of submissions appears to be a function of where the Annual Meeting is held. Submissions were down 22% in San Antonio (11.6% for AOM) and 45% in Orlando (12.3% for AOM), and were up 38% in Boston (21% for AOM). Of the symposia submitted, an average of 62% are accepted which is consistent with the AOM acceptance rate of 61%

Not surprisingly, these declines in scholarly submissions parallel the decline in academic and student members reported above in section 1.1.a. If the division is to increase its scholarly presence at the Annual Meeting, it will have to increase the number of academic members and increase the number of submissions from all members.

1.2.c   Annual Meeting Attendance
A total of 35.2% of respondents indicate they attend the Annual Meeting every year, which is up from the 32% reported in 2009 but still substantially below the average 49% reported by other divisions of similar size. 16.2% said they attend only if they are on the program, which is up slightly from the 15% reported in 2009 but still well below the average 21% reported from divisions of similar size.

Surprisingly, almost half (49.2%) of respondents said they are not very keen on attending the Academy's Annual Meeting (including the options once in a while; rarely; never). This is down from the 53% in our 2009 report, but is substantially higher than the 31% average for similar sized divisions. A deeper investigation of the current data indicates that 62% of responding executive/practitioner members are not keen on attending the Annual Meeting, whereas, only 37% of academics are not keen on attending.

This split in membership attendance at the Annual Meeting is a significant factor given the relatively large percentage of executive/practitioner members in ODC and that program space and division visibility at the Annual Meeting is a function of paper and symposia submissions (see 1.2.a above). Since people who do not intend to attend the Annual Meeting are unlikely to submit papers and symposia, this high percentage means that the available pool for submissions is substantially reduced. Were ODC members to attend the Annual Meeting at the same level as similar size divisions (i.e., 31%), the decline in submissions would be less.

When asked why members do not attend the Annual Meeting, the primary reasons given were a lack of funding (58%) or no time (39%), which are comparable to the 53% and 38% respectively in our 2009 report and the 60% and 30% respectively for similar sized divisions. However, almost a quarter of respondents (22.4%) say they don't attend the meeting because they belong to the Academy for benefits other than the annual meeting. This compares to the 18% in our 2009 report and the 17% average for similar sized divisions.

There is a significant difference in why our members don't attend the Annual Meeting depending on the types of membership (Table 2). Academic members don't attend primarily because they don't have the money (60.2%) and secondarily because they don't have the time (36.3%). Executive/practitioner members, on the other hand, do not attend primarily because they do not have the time (57.8%) and secondarily because they don't have the money (39.1%). Executive/practitioner members are also members of the AOM for reasons other than the annual meeting, such as professional affiliation, than are academic members.

Table 2 – Reasons for Not Attending Annual Meeting by Member Type

Reason	Academic	Executive
I do not have access to funding	60.2	39.1
I do not have time to attend	36.3	57.8
I'm not interested in attending	6.4	1.6
I belong to the Academy for benefits other than the Annual Meeting	19.3	28.1

1.2.d Annual Meeting Participation

As evidenced in Table 3, there has been an increase in member participation in the Annual Meeting since 2009 as evidenced by the decline in the percentage of members who responded "Never" to reviewing, presenting, chairing, or volunteering in some capacity. These percentages compare favourably to divisions of similar size except with regard to serving as a reviewer. One explanation for this difference is that although we get a good response from members to serve as reviewers, we don't end up using all the reviewers due to the manner in which reviewers are assigned. Further, we have used feedback from submitters regarding the

quality of reviewers as well as our own evaluation of the reviews in an attempt to improve the overall quality of reviews. As a result, we may have limited some opportunities to review.

Table 3 – Percentage of Members Responding "Never"
to Forms of Participation

Form of Participation	2009	2014	Similar Divisions
Served as reviewer	44%	36.8%	29%
Presented PDW	66%	56.3%	58%
Presented at scholarly session	51%	43%	33%
Served as chair or discussant	69%	61.8%	58%
Volunteered in some capacity	77%	65.8%	65%

1.2.e   Satisfaction with ODC Annual Meeting Program

Bearing in mind that 50% of respondents to this survey are not regular attendees at the Annual Meeting (19.4% never; 8.6% rarely; 20.3% once in a while), the responses suggest that members are satisfied with the various components of the annual program, but not as satisfied as they were in 2009. Table 3 shows member satisfaction (extremely, very, and satisfied) with four areas of the Annual Program: PDWs, scholarly sessions, social opportunities, and access to participation. As can be seen, there has been a substantial reduction in the level of satisfaction with the ODC Program since the 2009 report. In 2009, overall satisfaction averaged 85.3%, which is considerably higher than the overall satisfaction of 59.5% reported here.

Table 3 – % Member Satisfaction with ODC Program

Area	2009	2014
PDWs	85%	56%
Scholarly*	82%	53%
Social	86%	60%
Access	88%	63%

* Paper sessions, Roundtables, Interactive Sessions, Symposia

One implication of these statistics is that there has been a substantial reduction in the attractiveness and value of the sessions presented by ODC at the Annual Meeting. The fact that the program is overwhelmingly determined by member submissions, this reduction suggests that the quality of our submissions has gone down in terms of the degree to which members find them satisfying. Clearly there is a need for the division to find ways to increase both the number and quality of submissions as well as finding innovative and interesting ways of packaging/presenting the sessions particularly in combination with other divisions.

Aside from program content, the decline in satisfaction with social opportunities and networking at the Annual Meeting indicates that members do not feel the division affords sufficient mechanisms and occasions for members to interact with each other outside of paper or symposia sessions. In this regard, members are "on their own" to meet with colleagues.

Finally, members are dissatisfied with their overall access to participation on the program. This is an interesting statistic given that there appears to be more members participating in the program than in 2009 (see 1.2.d). This finding suggests one reason for the decline in submissions to the scholarly program is that members do not believe they will be accepted and get an opportunity to present. Similarly, they may feel that being a session chair or discussant is reserved for better known and established scholars and that they are closed out of such opportunities. Clearly is this something that can be changed going forward.

1.2.e   Satisfaction with Division Operations
Members were asked a total of 14 questions pertaining to their satisfaction with the conduct of the division. These questions cover three general areas: Engagement, Communication, and Contribution.

1.2.e.1 Engagement pertains to those activities that seek to engage our members in creating a sense of community (sense of community, address division's domain, reach out to international members) and collaboration (work collaboratively with other divisions, collaborate with peers). In 2009, 73.4% of responding members were satisfied (satisfied, very satisfied, extremely satisfied) with community, relationships, and outreach in the division. In this survey, however, the level of satisfaction for engagement averaged 53.2%, which is substantially below the average (73.4%) reported for similar size divisions in their five year review reports.

1.2.e.2 Communication pertains to satisfaction with the level, form, and value of communication from the division (level of communication, quality of newsletter, usefulness of website, value of listservs, and responsiveness of division officers). In 2009, 76.8% of responding members were satisfied with communication from the division, with the high point being the quality of the newsletter (83%) and the low point being the value of the listservs (63%). In this survey, the average level of satisfaction for communication averaged 52.4% with the high point being the level of communication received from the division (67.7%) and the low point being the value of the listservs (36.9%). The average levels of satisfaction (52.4%) is also substantially below the average (78.4%) reported for similar size divisions.

Of particular concern here is the dramatic change in member satisfaction with the responsiveness of division officers to member concerns which fell from 83% in 2009 to 38.4% in this survey. This is of particular concern because it indicates that members feel division officers are out of touch with and isolated from the members, pursuing their own agendas without input from members. Clearly division officers have failed in staying in communication with members and explaining the actions they are taking.

1.2.e.3 Contribution refers to member satisfaction with their access to influencing the division (ability to become leaders, opportunity to influence division, fair and open elections, selection process for rewards). In the 2009 report, an average of 81.8% of members were satisfied with their ability to contribute to the division. However, in this survey, the average was 47.6% which is substantially below the 82.8% reported for similar size divisions. Clearly the membership feels estranged from the division leadership.

Overall, these results are extremely discouraging and indicate that division leadership has drifted away from the members they serve. If current members are this dissatisfied, then we

can only conclude that members who have left the division were even more dissatisfied. As a result, there is a need on behalf of division officers to re-examine their current assumptions and practices so as to expand member satisfaction with participation, communication, and contribution. In the absence of such a shift, it is likely the division will continue to experience declining membership.

1.2.f   Member Assessment of Division Strengths and Weaknesses
In establishing the division's strengths and weaknesses, we considered responses to the questions that dealt directly with strengths and weaknesses as well as what members liked best and least.

1.2.f.1 Like Best. In reviewing the open-ended responses to the question "What do you like best about membership in the ODC Division?", two dominant responses emerged: collegiality and professional value. Collegiality pertains to all forms of social value and personal interaction as evidenced in the comments "The sense of collegiality and community", "Great colleagues!", and "Conviviality and helpfulness of members." One respondent suggested that s/he really appreciates the Division because "I find myself with academics whose work I appreciate and often cite. I also find the division to be more collegial and supportive than other divisions." Of the 171 responses to this question, approximately 35% of them dealt with some form of collegiality.

The second "like best" category dealt with professional value, both academic and practitioner and is evidenced in such comments as "Association with others of shared professional interest", "Sharing of ideas for research," and "Picking up good ideas that can be used in consulting and teaching." Respondents felt that the division produces high quality scholarship that is accessible thus allowing members to stay up to date with the latest trends in research and that the ways in which theory and research were connected was also a strong point. Several respondents reported that input from Division members/events had really assisted in the development of their doctoral dissertations. Professional value was the dominant "like best" category with approximately 55% of the responses addressing some aspect of professional value.

1.2.f.2. Strengths. We received 121 responses to the question "What are the ODC division's strengths?" Of these, 23 did not provide usable information with such responses as "don't know", "NA", or "too new to say". The remaining 98 comments, which represent less than 25% of the respondents, tended to cluster into three categories: members, climate, and research. Overwhelmingly, members point to the quality of members as one of the major strengths of the division, mentioned as a strength in one form or another in approximately 40% of the responses.

Closely related to this first strength is what might be called the climate of ODC in which members refer to the openness, collegiality, inclusiveness, and helpfulness of members in relation to both scholarly research and practice. One respondent stated that the strength of the Division is "Its consistency, organizing committee, interest in gaining feedback, friendliness and professionalism." Indeed, this particular strength is mentioned almost as frequently as members.

The third strength is related to the research and scholarship of members and is evidenced in such comments as "Variety and depth of academics", "The mix of scholars", and "Strong researchers' community." Members also commented positively about the links between

scholarship and practice and the ways in which division-sponsored sessions at the Annual Meeting helped members with their scholarship and consulting. What is particularly interesting is that this category is mentioned much less frequently than either of the other two strengths, indicating that of those who responded, ODC's strength is to be found more in its social affinity than in its research prowess.

1.2.f.3 Like Least. There were a total of 133 responses to the question "What do you like least about membership in the ODC division?" of which 98 provided useable information. Of those 98, we identified three primary areas of "like least": scholarly research, inclusiveness, and member involvement.

The issue of scholarly focus is by far the dominant are of "like least" as is evident in two different set of responses. The first set of responses contends that ODC is not as scholarly or research oriented as other divisions as reflected in such comments as "less scholarly than other divisions", "too much emphasis on practice", "not aspiring to very high impact research", "the marginalization of organizational change research", and "weak quality of research". According to one member, "It seems like our scholarship, in general, is of a much poorer quality than other divisions. I think that this is attributable to the high number of practitioners in our division -- whom I welcome. However, we can do better about conducting rigorous work." The second set of responses strikes a contrary point of view, focusing on "the low appreciation of the contributions from practitioner", "not enough focus on practice", "people who do not value practice", and "not enough focus on practice." These responses reflect a tension in the respective orientations of our scholarly and practitioner members, indicating that this tension has not yet found an acceptable expression in the division, the annual program, and other activities.

Inclusiveness is the second most mentioned "like least" and pertains to two related issues. The first issue is the extent to which members feel welcome and included in the division. In this case, comments such as "new members don't feel welcome by more established members", "no outreach to new members", and "not inclusive or welcoming", indicates that the division has been unsuccessful in making new members welcome. This lack of inclusion is particular striking given that members see the collegiality within the division as one of its strengths and "like best"".

The second issue of inclusiveness is reflected in the extent to which members in general feel included in the operations of the division. In this case, comments such as "there is a leadership clique that runs things", "lack of frequent access to members", "total disconnect", "detached/remote executive committee members", and "exclusiveness of leadership" all indicate a feeling that members are not really part of the division.

The third most frequently mentioned "like least" is the level of member involvement. Interestingly, in these responses members identified their own lack of involvement as something they didn't like as in the comment "that I'm not more involved."

1.2.f.3 Weaknesses. There were a total of 112 responses to the question "What are the ODC division's weaknesses?", of which only 77 provided usable information. Based on the usable responses, we identified two primary weaknesses, both of which parallel the "like least" responses.

The most frequently identified weakness is the lack of strong, rigorous scholarship. As discussed above, members felt that ODC has a weak image within the AOM for scholarship. Among the comments supporting this view are "Need more high-impact researchers on change involved in the division", "poor scholarship", and "weak scholarship". However, as noted above, there are some members who feel that there is an insufficient emphasis on practice.

The second most mentioned weakness is the lack of member engagement. In this case, members point to the perception that there is a lack of engagement between practitioners and scholars, officers do not seem accessible and available or in communication, the leaders are too dependent on what has been done in the past, and that the division is too inward looking.

Conclusion: These comments indicate that ODC is a division with strong member affinity where members enjoy each other and get professional value from their membership. These comments also indicate a division with a split personality regarding scholarship in that some members consider the scholarship to be a strength, whereas, others see it as a weakness that hurts the division's image within the AOM, potentially alienating practitioners who seek more practice-oriented opportunities. Finally, these comments suggest a division with weak member involvement and participation that is lead by officers who are not in communication with their members.

2. Member Recommendations

2.1 Better Member Service

When asked how the ODC division could better serve its members, respondents focused particularly on the need to create more opportunities for networking and involvement. Among the specific suggestions on how this could be done were (1) establishing local chapters to enable people to meet and discuss between the meeting closer to home (2) leveraging social networking mediums (such as more virtual interaction, establish webinars, develop apps) and (3) involve (more) people in more things (as one respondent put it "Let me *in* somehow").

A second suggestion was to increase the number of PDWs. Specifically PDWs on research methods, frameworks in action, and innovative and critical PDWs as well as PDWs targeting new or underserved members. Although the time available for PDWs is limited, what this does suggest is that the division leadership could make more of an effort to solicit and invite PDW proposals that address these types of interests. In this regard, we could become more proactive in generating the PDW program rather than rely only on what is submitted.

Other suggestions reflected the diversity in the membership. While academic members would like to see an increase in the quality of the research in the ODC division, others request activities that appeal to scholar-practitioners and particularly PhD students who are not seeking an academic career.

2.2   Top Issues

To get member ideas on what the division should be paying attention to over the next five years, we asked members "What issues should occupy the ODC division's time over the next 5 years?" There were 125 written responses to this question, of which 25 were some form of "don't know" or "NA." Of the remaining 100 responses, 56 were about things the ODC Division could do to become a better or stronger Division, such as increase member engagement, promote more scholar-practitioner collaboration, or increase the quality of its scholarship. 44 responses related to areas of research interest, such as differences in change theories across cultures, sustainability, or change leadership.

The 56 responses about things the Division could do to become a better or stronger Division clustered around the following issues:
- Promote more scholar-practitioner collaboration, do more high-quality research on issues of practice, and do more to include and engage practitioners.
- Do more to attract new members and engage existing members both in face-to-face forums and through the website and social media.
- Increase the academic quality of the division and provide intellectual leadership in the area of change.
- Encourage more theory building, especially more emergent theory and theory focused on new, emerging areas of the ODC domain.
- Encourage ODC to forge stronger alliances with other divisions in the Academy.
- Re-brand the division to make it more fresh and contemporary.

The 44 responses pertaining to areas of research interest clustered around encouraging and supporting more research on:
- Comparative ODC research across cultures and nations to expand the scope of our theories and theorizing. Within this cluster of responses, there were two comments about doing more to include more international members in the Division and one comment about promoting international research partnerships, but the rest of the comments were about doing more research on the phenomenon of ODC internationally and globally.
- Leadership and change leadership.
- ODC in "non-traditional" perhaps marginal settings, such as with homeless people, in developing nations, and in the context of initiatives designed to "change the world" by addressing issues like poverty, human trafficking, etc.
- ODC and social and environmental sustainability.

The results suggest that members clearly want more high-quality, active engagement with practitioners; more outreach to potential new members and engagement with existing members, including better communication, social media, website, and networking opportunities; and continued emphasis on increasing academic quality and providing intellectual leadership in the area of change. All of these are things that the division can support and facilitate.

In terms of research interests, they want to see more comparative research across cultures and nations to expand the scope of our theories and theorizing, more research on leadership and change leadership, more research in "non-traditional" settings, and more research on ODC and social and environmental sustainability. Although the division does not itself do

research, it clearly can promote what research is being done in these areas in its communications, create occasions for people doing innovative and creative research to present their work, and facilitate interactions among people doing such research.

2.3   New Initiatives over Next 5 Years

To gain a long term perspective on what members thought should be done going forward, we asked them to "identify three (3) new initiatives or investments of resources they thought the division should make over the next five years that they felt would add the greatest value to them either personally or professionally". From the 140 responses received, the most commonly mentioned input for new initiatives had to do with improving the website and communications with members. Respondents suggest that the division should engage in innovative approaches and make better use of social media, e.g. periodic online webinars or discussion chats where scholars and practitioners meet to discuss relevant topics. Another way of making use of social media is to create a blog to share experiences and network with other members. In addition, some members suggest that the division could make better use of more traditional communication, specifically by improving information about the division; its history, relevant papers in the field, key thinkers within the field, relevant practices and tools, feature stories on members, case library and material for teaching (videos, etc.) and pointing to emerging new directions.

A second initiative involves reaching out to young scholars and getting them involved. One respondent pointed out that "For some reason the OD and change field still seems dominated by the same names as decades ago. As a junior faculty, I feel unable to break into and influence the conversation". Another respondent suggests that the division should mentor interested members into leadership positions in the division. Identifying and promoting new ODC thought leaders can prevent the division from appearing "aged". Other activities that would appeal to younger scholars are career development opportunities.

Practitioner members emphasize the need to increase the voice of practitioners. Specific suggestions include: giving OD practitioners a platform to discuss OD direction with scholars; enabling practitioners to present and publish theory-based work from consulting and other projects; bringing in practitioners to present with researchers to discuss viability and applicability of findings; bringing more executives into PDWs or symposia; place increased emphasis on practitioner contributions; and inviting one organization per year to showcase its change efforts.

The two suggestions above – getting younger scholars involved and getting practitioners more involved – illustrate the diversity within the membership group and the challenge in meeting the expectations of both groups. The ODC executive committee has attempted to increase the academic rigor and quality while simultaneously catering to scholar-practitioners. However, one member suggests resolving the (sometimes) diverging expectations from these groups by "splitting the division into academic and practitioners so theoretical submissions are more relevant. Then create networking events where practitioners can explain their current issues and academics can propose ways of obtaining that information with an academic contribution".

2.4   Starting Tomorrow

To get a more immediate perspective on what members thought we should do going forward, we asked them "what can the ODC division do tomorrow morning that would increase its effectiveness?" There were 103 written responses to this question. Of the 103, 22 were some form of "don't know" or "NA." Of the remaining 81 responses, the most frequently cited was a desire for more and better communications with members (mentioned 21 times). Among the recommendations were that the division simply communicate better and, do more with social media and website, promote more online and face-to-face networking among members.

The second most frequently cited item was a desire for more partnering with practitioners. This was mentioned 17 times with such recommendations as "more partnering with practitioners" (mentioned 14 times), and do a better job of engaging with executives/practitioners from executive doctoral programs (mentioned 3 times).

There was a tie for third, each mentioned five times. They were: Become a one-stop-shop source for ODC knowledge (articles, teaching resources, practitioner resources, etc.), and increase non-American participation. Of the five who mentioned increasing non-American participation, four simply said increase non-American participation, and one said host events in other parts of the world.

These results suggest that members clearly want better communication, social media, website, and networking opportunities. Some want more active engagement with practitioners. They also want us to provide more one-stop-shop resources, increase non-American participation, increase academic rigor, and make ODC an attractive home for young/new scholars.

Our recommendation is that we focus our energy on the first set of these suggestions: (1) improving our communications, social media, and networking; (2) more actively engaging practitioners (including executive doctoral programs); (3) continuing to increase academic rigor; (4) attracting new/young scholars; and (5) continuing our current efforts at increasing non-American participation (we are doing this well). We do not recommend trying to become a one-stop-shop for ODC resources as this requires a lot of personnel resources and is not sustainable.

3.   What Has Been Done Since 2009

The challenges related to member involvement, member communication, declining membership and division reputation and identity are not new to the executive committee. In fact, over the past five years, the executive committee has initiated a number of actions aimed at dealing with these challenges, though clearly from the response of members, the actions have been insufficient and/or ineffective. The list below is not comprehensive, but it illustrates the scope and breadth of actions taken since the 2009 report.

1. Create exciting (and highly academic) sessions at the Annual Meeting
    a. Organized PDWs and symposia that involved leading scholars in change management from other divisions and disciplines in attempt to broaden our appeal and reputation among scholars. Some of these were "showcase" sessions.

      b. Offer regular PDWs that have high participation among ODC and other divisions and are well received.

2. Engage young change scholars
      a. Each year the division hosts a doctoral consortium in which high quality academic institutions, particularly international institutions, are invited to send doctoral students. This has been well received and the student evaluations of the event are very high.
      b. The division seeks to recruit future board members from among student award winners.

3. Reach out and attract additional international members
      a. The division co-sponsors the bi-annual organization-change conference in Lyon France.
      b. The division ensures that nominations to the executive committee include international members so that international members are always represented. Currently, the executive committee has 1 domestic and 4 international members (2 Europe, 2 Oceania). In addition, The division has added an international representative (Europe) to the executive committee to ensure there is always international representation in addition to the executive committee.

4. Establish more linkages between practitioners and scholars
      a. The division has added two executive/practitioner members to the executive committee. These members are not elected by the members, but are recruited by the executive committee in order to ensure that executive/practitioner members are represented and serve two-year terms.
      b. The division has supported PDWs that involve a mix of scholars and practitioners
      c. The division has developed PDW's that focus on developing research papers from practice.
      d. The division has tried a matching service which matches practitioners with academic scholars in order to facilitate collaborations.

5. Collaborating with other divisions
      a. The division has explored and continues to explore opportunities to collaborate with other divisions on events other than at the Annual Meeting such as those done by OMT.

6. Communication with and involvement of members
      a. The division has invested $5,000 in a professionally designed website in 2014-2015. The division appointed a new volunteer webmaster in December 2013 and asked that person to modernize the ODC website and coordinate any paid web-development activities in the next two years. Our priorities for this initiative are to project a better ODC image and create means for attracting new members and contacting ODC leaders directly.
      b. The division utilized AOM Connect to initiate research-based connections on ODC topics of relevance such as action research
      c. The division initiated, via a new ODC Communications newsletter and a revived ODC listserv, a scholar-practitioner "matchmaking" collaborative in an attempt to support join projects of interest to both academic and executive/practitioner members.
      d. The division has increased the frequency of periodic communications with the membership to encourage participation in various Academy- and division-sponsored opportunities for collaboration between the annual meetings. Given

this division's interdisciplinary nature, many of our members participate in smaller groups and related communities in their more specialized discussions and forums (e.g., OD Network, organization change research), without the same practical need for one common-subject platform that other, more homogenous, divisions have. The division believes that encouraging or sponsoring these micro-communities of research and practice should be a strategic focus for a division such as ODC, to nurture innovation and feelings of belonging in smaller groups.

e. The division is continuing to explore how to use AOM Connect more effectively. Some members reported not receiving messages posted on AOM Connect, and our communications volunteers were working through these and other challenges with AOM staff to understand how to utilize AOM Connect better. Our director of communications additionally participates in related AOM activities and symposia at annual meetings, sharing concerns and best practices with peers form other divisions. However, the division realizes that success of a social networking tool such as AOM Connect depends on consistent social involvement of division leaders and members, and the division has yet to achieve a desired level of this involvement.

f. The division is benchmarking with other divisions that are successfully using their website to meet division goals (e.g., OB), but these are not fully implemented. Being a much smaller division than OB, ODC needs to carefully prioritize and budget for a website development project. After the changes are implemented and a steady webmaster continues to be in place, the division can start meaningfully benchmarking against best-practice examples. In the interim, the division has consulted with OB and other divisions on smaller, low-budget initiatives such as an electronic newsletter. The division has procured Constant Contact services and implemented a periodic ODC Communications newsletter in 2013.

g. The division has revived the ODC listserv from no activity to approximately 300 subscribers and some informational activity during the last few years.

h. The division has invited ODC scholars and executive/practitioners to present at our doctoral consortium.

i. The division has created numerous opportunities to solicit "field" data at annual meetings. For example, the division had a World Café-type business meeting where there were deeper discussions and direct feedback gathered about member engagement and opportunities for improvement. As another example, the division conducted a PDW where a generational dialogue was initiated between "old timers" and newer ODC members on the purposes and values of our existence as a field. These activities contributed, in part, to our revision of the ODC domain statement and strategic planning.

j. The division created a new domain statement with the involvement of members which was overwhelming passed by the membership at the end of 2013.

k. The division created a new communications strategy which is currently being implemented with the upgrade in our website and electronic newsletters through Constant Contact.

4.   Action Plan

Although the ODC executive committee has taken numerous actions in response to the issues raised in the 2009 ODC Five Year Review and the feedback provided by the DIGR Committee on that report, those actions have been insufficient based on the results of this membership survey. The fundamental issue confronting the executive committee over the next five years is the decline in membership due to insufficient communication, engagement, and member opportunities for participation. In short, the executive committee needs to dramatically increase the value of an ODC membership to its members. This value, however, cannot be limited to the Annual Meeting, but must be a year-long endeavor that involves multiple opportunities for members. Some of the actions we recommend the board consider are listed below. This list is not exhaustive, but we feel it addresses the major issues raised in this report

1.   Actions to Enhance Member Satisfaction with and Participation in the Annual Meeting

   a. Make new members feel welcomed and valued
       i.   have "new member" welcome reception/breakfast with executive committee that is exclusive to new members and "first time" attendees at the Annual Meeting to introduce them to the division and the Annual Meeting
       ii. have "new member mentors" assigned to each new member at the Annual Meeting to help them navigate the meetings and introduce them to accomplished scholars and practitioners
       iii. acknowledge and recognize new members at division business meeting
       iv. in short, make a "fuss" over new members
   b. Be more visible at doctoral student events held at the Annual Meeting
   c. Implement new practices for supporting collaborative research among members
       i.   Consider sponsoring or co-sponsoring with other divisions a junior faculty reception related to publishing in top-tier academic journals
       ii. Offer a research incubator PDW, either alone or in combination with other divisions and interest groups, to help scholars get published and executive/practitioner's craft quality submissions or meet up with academics interested in collaborative research
   d. Create new awards to acknowledge member accomplishments
       i.   Create an award for the best published paper from an Academy journal
       ii. Create an award for the highest rated executive/practitioner paper or session presented at the Annual Meeting
       iii. Add a cash prize to the best student paper/dissertation
   e. Create new ways for members to interact and network with each other at the Annual Meeting
   f. Consider modifying the format of the doctoral consortium to include more executive/practitioner presenters, students who intend to become practitioners, and topics that deal with practice (e.g., consulting).
   g. Consider creating PDWs or symposia sessions on "Practice and Applications" that involve both academic and executive/practitioner members in addressing issues related to the practice of organization development and change and the application of theory/research

h. Create specific sessions that deal with new and emerging practice issues hosted by executive/practitioner members that give all members an opportunity to learn about what is happening "out there"
   i. Consider creating a practice consortium
i. Work with other divisions and interest groups that members are also members of to create cross-division PDWs, symposia, and social events by design
j. Create higher profile sponsored 'Distinguished Speaker' events (e.g., reception, lunch, breakfast) , particularly for students and new members
k. Invite high profile researchers and practitioners to present papers, PDWs or symposia

2. Actions to Enhance Member Satisfaction and Participation between Annual Meetings

a. Create mini-conferences, face-to-face as well as online, outside the Annual Meeting that address specific issues of interest to different member groups
   i. Host webinars several times a year that address both academic and practice issues, particularly for students
   ii. Sponsor or co-sponsor conferences, particularly in conjunction with other AOM divisions or professional associations, that address topics of interest to members and that are hosted by academic and/or practitioner members
   iii. Host webinars or mini-conferences on publishing in top journals for early career scholars
   iv. Create student only webinars that address issues of research where they can get guidance and advice from academic and practice members
   v. Explore and add new mechanisms for supporting member interactions that use both AOM technology as well as other forms that support small group discussions
   vi. Engage members in creating new mechanisms that the division can support
b. Conduct more extensive survey of members, using available AOM technology, to more specifically determine what they would value and support creating
c. Create mechanisms for supporting new members "learn the ropes" once they become members

3. Actions to Enhance Communication and Interaction with Members

a. Survey members more thoroughly to find out what they would find of value in terms of the frequency, focus, and content of communications from the division
   i. make the website more up-to-date and useful with the appropriate sections based on what members say
   ii. make greater use of social media and AOM technology (e.g., AOM Connect, listserv) as a matter of executive committee practice
b. Solicit members for "news" items to include in newsletter and other communications
c. Create a practice of acknowledging and appreciating member service and accomplishment

     d. Create a regular schedule for communicating with members and then keep that schedule so that members learn the frequency and form of our communication rather than wondering
          a. make our communications information rich and useful to members by studying the best practices of other divisions and relating these to what our members say they want
     e. Reach out to practitioner organizations such as Association of Change Management Professionals and OD Network for events so that we can inform members of events.

4. Actions to Enhance Division Governance and Infrastructure

     a. Create a database of students and begin supporting them by being a resource as they move through their program and upon entry into academics or practice, putting them in touch with academics and practitioners that could support them.
     b. Restructure responsibilities on the executive committee in order to more effectively address the issues identified above including creating new committees comprised of volunteers from the membership
     c. Explore creating a different review process for practice oriented submissions to the AOM Annual Meeting that ensures high quality but does not make practice submissions subject to academic review standards.
     d. Obtain guidance from AOM and other "stellar" divisions on how to become a highly effective board

5. Conclusion

The review committee believes that if the ODC executive committee engages fully with this report, gives serious consideration to the recommendations, and alters its practices as appropriate for the implementation of these recommendations (and others they are likely to create), the division has an excellent chance of substantially increasing member value and stemming membership decline. We encourage the executive committee to consider this report a "wake-up" call and to respond appropriately. We were shocked by the dramatic decline in member satisfaction and hope that the ODC executive committee will be also.