

MED 5th year report, 2012-2016

5th Year Report Committee

Barbara A. Ritter, MED Chairperson

Peter McNamara, MED Chairperson-elect

Toni Ungaretti, Past MED Chair

Katherine Karl, Past MED Chair

We have worked with a number of individuals representing multiple constituency groups across MED to complete this report. The members of this working group include:

Senior member—Dr. Ben Arbaugh, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Senior advisor—Dr. Kenneth G. Brown, University of Iowa

New member—Dr. Erika Small (joined 2015), Coastal Carolina University

Academic member—Dr. Sabine Hoidn, Harvard University

Student member—Mr. John Ross, New Mexico State University

Former EC member—Dr. Katherine Karl, University of Tennessee Chattanooga

Practitioner member—Dr. Wanda Cousar, Vice President/Career Consultant, The CS Team

Upcoming program chair-elect—Dr. Kim Gower, University of Mary Washington

Summary of the Results of the Member Survey

The member survey results are summarized below. Responses to this survey and feedback from the working group (listed above) form the baseline from which we were able to draw many of the conclusions in this report.

Summary of descriptive information about respondents

- The majority of respondents (43.73%) were newer members (0-3 years).
- 80% were academic members and only 7.48% were students, 9.7% were practitioner.
- Most respondents were from North America (70.08%) or Europe (16.07%) or Australia/Oceania (5.82%). All other percentages were below 5%.
- Participation from males and females was equivalent.
- Strong age cluster between 40-69 (83.56%), with only 1.11% of respondents between the ages of 18-29.
- Most respondents were at doctoral-granting institutions (60%).
- 75.2% of respondents suggested MED was their primary division, they identified equally (or almost equally) with MED as with another division.
- Majority of respondents are MED members to gain and share info about teaching or research. Few are members to learn about MED as a new domain or maintain social connections.
- 59.77% attend the conference pretty much every year and/or when on the program.
- Lack of funding is the number one reason not to attend, followed by lack of time.

Summary of substantive information from participants

- Respondents are most likely to serve as a reviewer or attend a paper or PDW session, as well as participate in social events with MED.
- Satisfaction is highest with PDWs (3.71 on a 5-point scale), followed by access to participation on program (3.53) and symposia (3.50).
- Respondents are most satisfied with fair and open elections (3.82 on a 5-point scale), the selection process for awards and recognition (3.68), and responsiveness of division officers (3.48). Members are least satisfied with opportunities outside of the annual meeting to network/collaborate with peers (2.82) and opportunities to be mentored (2.88).
- Members suggest priorities should include provision of teaching resources (3.93 on a 5-point scale), invited or special presentations by leaders in the field (3.54), more attention to junior faculty (3.53), career development resources (3.51), and international opportunities (3.49).
- 80.72% of members are satisfied, very, or extremely satisfied with membership in MED. Only 1.96% are not satisfied.

Analysis of Challenges and Opportunities

1. Membership

1.1. General membership trends, and responses

There has been an overall net drop of 4.4% in MED membership in the five-year period, compared to a broadly flat AOM membership (which grew by 0.3% in the period). But we do not see the shift in membership as a cause for alarm, since:

- a) The internal competition from the Academy's Teaching and Learning Conference (TLC), which addresses one of the main reasons members belong to MED (gaining and sharing information on teaching was rated most important by 44.7% of members in our survey). Given the internal competition introduced by the Academy in recent years, our membership is holding up really well in relation the inevitable cannibalization pressure. The real question that arises for us here is "how are we still holding up so well, and what inherent strengths can we locate and maximize?"
- b) A significant proportion of the drop in MED membership relates to the Vancouver conference, which was a comparatively expensive location for the 59% of MED members that are based in the US (for most overseas members, most North American locations are roughly equally expensive – international flights represent a large proportion of the costs for them). These marginal cost differences matter for our members, since 57.2% of those who did not attend reported a lack of funding as being the major reason for their non-participation. In addition, we speculate that our membership is likely to attract disproportionate numbers of members from relatively teaching-intensive universities where research allowances are less generous. Some of the free-text data in our survey also supports this insight.
- c) For North American (and especially US-based) members the OBTC teaching conference for management educators offers a good quality, low-cost (scenic university-campus) based arena for discussing practical teaching concerns. In years when North American

locations for the Academy are expensive for US participants (such as Vancouver) or indeed unattractive, this competition may become more salient.

- d) The insights on relative cost drivers for US participants alluded to above are confirmed by the fact that our 5-year change in *non-US* membership is +10.8%, almost the same as that of the whole Academy (+10.9%). On the global stage, where relative cost issues and non-Academy US competition effects are more marginal, MED is doing as well as the Academy overall.

So in general, the overall membership figures are, we contend, not unexpected and are actually in good shape, when bearing in mind the cost pressures for our members. We remain a key, *medium-sized* AOM division of 1800-1900 members – about 1 in 10 of the AOM population. We are confident that we will remain in this member range based upon the positive feedback we continue to receive from our members about the member-appreciated intimate, friendly feel, which belies our size and impact.

The positive lessons we take away from this are:

- a) *MED's distinctive linkage between research, teaching and management practice is important.*

These areas were all valued highly by respondents to our survey, although there was a call for strengthening our leadership in teaching. We see the need to serve all our members, and as MED members ourselves we see these three areas as being systematically linked. What we need to do though, is make the linkages between research, teaching and management practice even more coherent and explicit. Facing competition from TLC and others in the basic teaching practice domain, we have to do that by focusing on our key distinctive strength: our research, as evidenced by a vibrant scholarly program (see section 2). So we will underline a distinctive, coherent, integrated mission that connects the scholarship and practice of teaching and learning, which is:

“To advance pedagogic research in management education, research the management and practice of business schools, enhance the status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and so support research-informed teaching practice and management development.”

If we did not have obvious strength in this approach, and continue to invest in it, then cannibalization of our division might become a significant issue. So we want to underpin this leadership role by:

- (i) Working more closely with leading research-oriented journals in our field, for example; AMLE, the Journal of Management Education (since these connect well with the North American audience), Management Learning, International Journal of Management Education, and Studies in Higher Education (which connect us with European and Asian audiences). Studies in Higher Education would represent a new partnership for MED by connecting us with the wider education research community. The work published by this journal is congruent with our

mission and they do publish management work, but also offer a wider perspective of education in university settings for students, faculty and administration alike.

- a. We will do this by inviting the editors-in-chief to be ex-officio advisory members of our executive committee, and by investigating the development of additional conference activities (we already engage with these journals at the annual meeting, but there is scope for more) and special-issue tie-ins with these key partners.
 - (ii) The MED website acting as a resource for information about publishing SoTL research. The website will collect and showcase, for example, information about various journals that publish SoTL related research and possible funding sources for such research.
 - (iii) Undertaking to have a collegial and collaborative involvement between MED, OBTS (the organizers of OBTC), and TLC (and potential key international partners such as the Management Knowledge & Education Group of the British Academy of Management), so that the distinctive missions of each can be signposted and grow collaboratively.
 - (iv) Clearly signaling and communicating our core mission *to advance pedagogic research in management education, research the management and practice of business schools, enhance the status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and so support research-informed teaching practice and management development*. We have a keynote planned for the upcoming conference that will highlight our research mission, and we will work to make this mission explicit in all our communication and outreach activities (see point *b* below, and further detail in section 2).
- b) *We need to work even harder to show value to potential US members.*
We face competition in the North American, and particularly US, markets from within and outside the Academy. Yet these competitor organizations and initiatives do excellent jobs and add capacity that we believe will grow the field in the long term, so we have no wish to decry them and instead (as indicated above) wish to work collaboratively. What we do need to do, though, is promote our specific message more effectively to the US audience. We will do this by:
- (i) Seeking to work collaboratively with key journals, and community events (OBTC and TLC) as already indicated above.
- c) *Build upon strengths in international membership.*
- (i) Re-ignite an international liaison program in order to engage international members further and capitalize on interests in this area.
 - (ii) Work collaboratively with other divisions to offer workshops or other sessions in various countries in order to promote our mission internationally.

1.2. Specific membership demographic issues, and responses

Strengths overall remain in committed members that are satisfied with membership in the division. It is clear that MED members appreciate a focus on teaching and learning and the sense

of collegiality within the division it is seen as a smaller and more approachable division than others. MED provides a home for AOM members that might otherwise feel disenfranchised by what is seen as a heavy research focus and delegitimation of teaching activity in other divisions.

The principal demographic issues in our membership are: a drop in academic membership (of -4.2%) against modest growth in the academy overall; a significant drop in student membership (-23.9%) against a more limited fall in the academy (-5.8%); and strong growth in executive members (+8.1%) against a fall in the academy overall (-5.7%). There is also a pattern of relative increase in the mean age of our membership (but the emeritus category is also the strongest growth area in the academy as a whole (+31.5%)). Our analysis of these trends is that:

- a) They are strongly related – the drop in students and young faculty skews our data. We attribute this drop to the excellent job being done by TLC for students and young faculty who find – as most inevitably do – that their employment is in a much more teaching-intensive university than they were trained in. TLC is great for getting them started with the basic good practice of teaching and learning in management education (and it's a great workshop for all teaching enthusiasts), but it crowds out some of the conceptual space for MED to engage with some junior colleagues.
- b) The cost-responsive nature of our (often teaching-intensive, poorly funded) members to location costs apply all the more to doctoral students (by far the largest annual drop was associated with Vancouver) and junior faculty.
- c) Increasingly demanding tenure requirements in the US (studies that show it's increasingly difficult to accumulate the necessary publications for the tenure packet, tenured posts are declining, and that tenure is under attack in some US states, with tenure and its security declining outside the US for many years) mean that junior colleagues from research-intensive institutions, who might value MED's research-intensive, research-based focus from the get-go, are constrained before tenure from engaging with us unless their research is also centrally focused on pedagogy or related themes.
- d) MED and the field of management education research as a whole has a strong tradition of deriving practice impact from research, and engaging with post-education management development. This strength accounts for our solid appeal to executive members and to numbers which are holding up well in that area.

Common suggestions for improvement include better integration of new members, a mentoring program, provision of teaching resources, more attention paid to management education outside of academia, and some feel we should focus on recruiting international members and events. By far, the biggest comment in terms of improvement was related to communication to members. Members want more frequent, and more highly technological communication. Some suggested weekly updates, twitter conversations, videos, webinars, and an improved website.

It was also clear that some disagreement exists between members related to the extent to which MED should focus on teaching practice versus research about teaching. Many appreciate the division because it does bring the importance of teaching into the limelight and provides a network to support effective teaching practice. Others feel that focusing on teaching practice delegitimizes MED and the focus should be brought back to pedagogical research and well-published persons in the field.

Finally, confusion was evident amongst members about what MED is. Some related it to a journal and others believed MED was highly correlated to TLC. This confusion may also be an issue related to declining membership—if members do not know what MED is, non-members most surely do not.

Overall we consider that we should not view these trends as alarming. And in response to cannibalization, we do not wish to compete with the excellent work that TLC is doing for students and junior faculty, but rather build our distinctiveness. Thus we do need to take more action to make sure that – after the initial lessons are learnt and the tenure packet is full – young attendees at TLC ‘graduate’ to MED research-led sessions in the future, and become members of the division. Since our conference submissions are growing (we discuss this later) the ‘raw’ engagement is there. What is needed is a focus on ‘conversion’ of interested early-to-mid career academics, at the point in their careers when the pedagogic research focus of MED becomes more salient. We will do this by:

- a) *Leveraging MED’s distinctive linkage between research, teaching and management practice.*
 - (i) Undertaking to have a collegial and collaborative involvement between MED, OBTC and TLC, so that the distinctive missions of each can be signposted and that MED can be seen as a natural ‘next step’ for younger faculty or those coming to an interest in pedagogic research through wrestling with issues in practice.
 - (v) Clearly signaling and communicating our core mission *to advance pedagogic research in management education, research the management and practice of business schools, enhance the status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and so support research-informed teaching practice and management development.*

- b) *Build in developmental, progression themes / aspects to our conference calls.*
 - (i) Specifically encourage some academic submissions that show how teaching issues in practice can lead to pedagogic research, and highlight the value of pedagogic research for teaching and management development.
 - (ii) Specifically encourage some PDWs that consider the role of management education research in the development of rounded academic careers through and after tenure.
 - (iii) Enhance our established focus on supporting research development in the field (we have usually offered very popular writer and reviewer response PDWs) by specifically encouraging some PDWs that help beginners with pedagogic research methods.

- c) *Continue to reach out to doctoral scholars and build in a focus on mid-career faculty.*
 - (i) We have recently established a partnership and presence with the NDSC and will continue to build on this. We have to be realistic about our expectations in this area though, given our analysis above.
 - (ii) We will pilot a social event focused on mid-career faculty mentoring.

- d) *Propose a revision to the MED Domain Statement to include the study of the management and practice of business schools.* This addition will not only enable us to explicitly contribute to this current and important discussion, but it will also add to MED distinctiveness while catering to the key membership demographics of the division. That is, mid-career and advanced academics are more likely to be involved in leadership decisions in their institutions and the performance of such institutions should be of particular interest to MED members. Informal evidence supports this conclusion in the form of attendance at conference sessions related to this topic and the number of academic administrators involved in the running of the division.

2. Conference engagement and activities

2.1. Trends in scholarly submissions and acceptances

Paper submissions are up 20.9% in the period, which is not very much different from the 23.5% growth across the academy. Yet our growth in acceptances of papers appears to be lower, at 8.0% across the period. Symposium acceptances show a growth of 30.0% over the five-year period, compared to 98.6% for the Academy as a whole. But there are some really important details to be revealed in this analysis:

- a) The figure of only 8% growth in academic paper acceptances is an artifact of a very high acceptance rate at the start of the five-year period. The acceptance rate was 56% for MED in 2011, compared to 50% for the Academy as a whole, which distorts the figures. Over the full period acceptance rates for MED ranged from 50% to 56%, whereas for the Academy as a whole they ranged from 47% to 54%. Across the five-year period, our average acceptance rate was 52.2% and the Academy's was 50.8%. Last year (the final of the five-year period) we were only slightly below the Academy trend at 50% acceptances. Since on average, we have been slightly *more accommodating* than the Academy as a whole, the major skew from the initial year of the period is very misleading. Thus the growth in submissions overall (+20.9%) is the best guide to our attractiveness for scholarly submissions. *There is no obvious problem in this area.*
- b) Accepted symposia face the problem of small numbers and high variability, since they are a relatively minor component of our program, ranging in number from 4 to 13 (joint highest last year, in Vancouver). We do not think it is appropriate to try to draw statistically informed inferences from such small, highly variable numbers.

Overall, we do not see any significant issues with our conference scholarly conference submissions. *The critiqued figure of 10.6% growth in acceptances overall is heavily skewed by our highest paper acceptance rate (56%) at the start of the five-year period.* This makes our growth appear smaller than it really is. If our paper acceptance rates had been a constant 50.8% (the all-academy average for the five-year period, and not very different from our rate last year of 50%) our overall growth in the scholarly program acceptance rate would be 21.7%.

While we are confident that our figures for the scholarly program are solid, they do leave us with questions – why is our membership not holding up in the same way? We believe that we have, in part, addressed this earlier (see section 1), and note that the Academy as a whole has seen similar

growth in conference submissions but virtually no overall growth in membership. Nevertheless we want to capitalize on the potential of our vibrant scholarly program for boosting membership, by taking the following actions:

- a) *Making our identity and distinctiveness visible at the conference*
 - (i) Making sure that our distinctive mission – *to advance pedagogic research in management education, research the management and practice of business schools, enhance the status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and so support research-informed teaching practice and management development* – is distributed on information / contact sheets for all session attendees.

- b) *Encouraging advocacy amongst conference attendees*
 - (i) Profiling our distinctive mission at the annual awards ceremony and communicating its excitement.
 - (ii) Announcing and establishing (from 2017) an annual Outstanding Member award, for the MED member(s) who have done most to promote the mission of the division in the preceding year.

- c) *Building relationships through ongoing and regular communication to members*

Improvement in communication to members was the most frequently cited comment in the member survey. Members want more frequent, and more highly technological communication. Some suggested weekly updates, twitter conversations, videos, webinars, and an improved website. This should be addressed via the following:

 - (i) Communicate important updates (PDW, program, awards, socials) to full membership via e-mail, ongoing throughout year.
 - (ii) Update and maintain website at least twice per year.
 - (iii) Utilize Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, and Twitter.
 - (iv) Broaden the role of the Membership Coordinator to include communications.
 - (v) Create a communication taskforce in 2016-2017 to make and help implement related recommendations.

2.2. Professional development workshops

These are constrained by the Academy's formula and so it is not realistically within our control to grow this part of the program. However, the trend is for us to receive substantially more requests (both in terms of number of sessions and total hours) than the academy formula allows us to accommodate. Offsite expansion can be considered here given our financial strength, but that is predicated on the availability of good quality venue(s) close to the conference HQs.

2.3. Member attendance and participation

Our attendance percentages, reviewer engagement, and election participation are clearly below the Academy averages.

Notably, survey respondents were extremely satisfied with fair and open elections, hence, the problem in election participation does not appear to be dissatisfaction with the process. In order

to prepare for the next election cycle, MED should gather information from the highest participating divisions to create a list of best practices to follow as the elections ensue. Related to attendance, to some extent we intuit that the cost issues for our membership (discussed earlier) also apply here.

Generally, we strongly believe that the actions detailed above, in relation to outreach and relationship building, may help to improve our situation in all of these areas. Working on our core mission—

To advance pedagogic research in management education, research the management and practice of business schools, enhance the status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and so support research-informed teaching practice and management development.

– will also help, as it will in the long term underpin the field of management education and development as a viable *primary* area of focus for researchers. This is an important point; as Arbaugh (2016:230) has persuasively argued, the legitimacy of the field is now strongly recognized and the time is ripe for research-led growth:

“The vibrancy of a field is predicated on the attraction and sustained efforts of increasing numbers of dedicated scholars. However, in management education research, historically this level of dedicated research appears to have been entrusted to a hearty relative few [... I argue that...] scholars having a dedicated emphasis on management education research is a good, and perhaps even necessary, thing as management education becomes more global [...and there are...] pressing opportunities and need areas for further accelerating the development of new management education scholars.”

Our earlier stated intention of working collaboratively with key communities and journals is going to be a key element of this continued growth in standing in our field and the continuing robust health and profile of the division.

Specific Action Plan for challenges listed above

The analysis above suggests several specific steps MED should take over the next five years to strengthen our division:

1. Focus on MED’s distinctive linkage between research, teaching and management practice.

Use this initiative to better brand MED to members and non-members. Underpin our leadership in this area by:

- Working more closely with leading research-oriented journals in our field, for example; AMLE, the Journal of Management Education (since these connect well with the North American audience), Management Learning, International Journal of Management Education, and Studies in Higher Education (which connect us with European and Asian audiences). Studies in Higher Education would

represent a new partnership for MED by connecting us with the wider education research community. The work published by this journal is congruent with our mission and they do publish management work, but also offer a wider perspective of education in university settings for students, faculty and administration alike.

- We will do this by inviting the editors-in-chief to be ex-officio advisory members of our executive committee, and by investigating the development of additional conference activities (we already engage with these journals at the annual meeting, but there is scope for more) and special-issue tie-ins with these key partners.
 - The MED website acting as a resource for information about publishing SoTL research. The website will collect and showcase, for example, information about various journals that publish SoTL related research and possible funding sources for such research.
 - Undertaking to have a collegial and collaborative involvement between MED, OBTS (the organizers of OBTC), and TLC (and potential key international partners such as the Management Knowledge & Education Group of the British Academy of Management and perhaps also the Society for Studies into Higher Education, whom are the UK society that publish *Studies in Higher Education* – both of whom widen our international audience), so that the distinctive missions of each can be signposted and grow collaboratively.
 - Clearly signaling and communicating our core mission *to advance pedagogic research in management education, research the management and practice of business schools, enhance the status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and so support research-informed teaching practice and management development.*
2. Work even harder to show value to potential US members.
 - Seeking to work collaboratively with key journals and community events (OBTC and TLC).
 3. Build upon strengths in international membership.
 - Re-ignite an international liaison program in order to engage international members further and capitalize on interests in this area.
 - Work collaboratively with other divisions to offer workshops or other sessions in various countries in order to promote our mission internationally.
 - Work with related international learned societies and specialist groups (such as the Management Knowledge & Education Group of the British Academy of Management and perhaps the Society for Research into Higher Education) to explore mutual collaborative developments.
 4. Build in developmental, progression themes / aspects to our conference calls.
 - Specifically encourage some academic submissions that show how teaching issues in practice can lead to pedagogic research, and highlight the value of pedagogic research for teaching and management development.
 - Specifically encourage some PDWs that consider the role of management education research in the development of rounded academic careers through and after tenure.
 - Enhance our established focus on supporting research development in the field (we have usually offered very popular writer and reviewer response PDWs) by

specifically encouraging some PDWs that help beginners with pedagogic research methods.

5. Continue to reach out to doctoral scholars and build in a focus on mid-career faculty.
 - We have recently established a partnership and presence with the NDSC and will continue to do build on this. We have to be realistic about our expectations in this area though, given our analysis above.
 - We will pilot a social event focused on mid-career faculty mentoring. We will use this event as a method to consult with this community about what PDWs, symposia and research papers would best serve their needs as they transition from early to mid-career. We note that in the MED executive and our past executive officers, there is a community whom have faced these transitions.
 - We will encourage the establishment of PDWs that support the development of mid-career academics as they transition from teacher and researcher into the addition of academic leadership roles, such as undergraduate, postgraduate or executive education program administration, departmental head and Dean roles. We note at present that many of the MED executive already hold such roles and would have benefited from PDWs in these areas.
 - We will also seek to encourage research symposia and research papers that focus on mid-career challenges and opportunities, providing this community with evidence based insights into practices that work best, how to work through problems and opportunities in these roles, and methods to manage the challenges of multiple roles in academic leadership.
6. Propose a revision to the MED Domain Statement to include the study of the management and practice of business schools.
 - The resulting domain statement might look like the following: The domain of this Division is the study of the organization and delivery of management education (academic) and management development (non-credit instruction). Major topics include: theoretical advances or empirical evidence about effective and innovative instructional methods or technology; applications of learning theories; evaluation studies of the effectiveness of management education and development techniques; *the study of the management and practice of business schools*.
7. Making our identity and distinctiveness visible at the conference
 - Making sure that our distinctive mission is distributed on information/contact sheets for all session attendees
8. Encouraging advocacy outside and amongst conference attendees
 - (Re)establishing our country based MED ambassadors and expanding within the US with the ambition of an MED Ambassador present in every state of the US and as many countries in the world as possible. Ambassadors will be required to first be members of MED and to use their influence within their local and international networks to share insights about management education and development research in their community, feedback the needs of their community to MED to shape our annual meeting and other activates, and to encourage their network to become MED members. In large areas if more than one MED member wishes to be an Ambassador and actively embraces the work then we could have multiple Ambassadors covering different areas of our mission within the region, or covering different sub-regions. This was in the past a program through which

some of our leadership emerged and also a method though which some of us initially came to know of MED.

- Profiling our distinctive mission at the annual awards ceremony and communicating its excitement.
 - Announcing and establishing (from 2017) an annual MED Outstanding Member award, for the member(s) who have done most to promote the mission of the division in the preceding year.
9. Building relationships through ongoing and regular communication to members.
 - Communicate important updates (PDW, program, awards, socials) to full membership via e-mail, ongoing throughout year.
 - Update and maintain website at least twice per year.
 - Utilize Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, and Twitter to and Twitter to communicate with members.
 - Broaden the role of the Membership Coordinator to include member communications.
 - Create a communication taskforce in 2016-2017 to make and help improve related recommendations.
 10. Gather information from divisions with the highest participation in elections to create a list of best practices to follow in MED elections.

Comments on Overall Concerns

Related to the base question from the DIGR committee, “Should the Division continue to serve the two interests identified by members: teaching practice and pedagogical research?”, we find that the interconnectedness of these elements along with the interest in each from the viewpoint of different constituencies, necessitates that MED focus on each. Indeed, there is even a call in the literature for management educators to more overtly draw the linkage between pedagogical research and teaching practice for program continuous improvement (Bacon & Stewart, 2016). Focusing on our revised mission statement that makes the interconnections between the research and practice of teaching and learning explicit should be helpful as a starting place for members to understand that these elements are connected. We hope this mission also demonstrates that MED explicitly draws these connections through division activities.

Whereas many other avenues exist at this point related to the practice of teaching and learning (e.g., TLC), we do not want to exclude this from our domain. Rather, we wish to capitalize on mutual interests and collaborate more broadly with conferences like TLC and OBTC. Further, we hope to support our focus on the SoTL by partnering with academic journals. In this fashion, we can strengthen both aspects while not overtaxing the time of our volunteer leaders.

Finally, in regards to the question about management development (non-credit instruction), we feel that we aptly provide a home for this topical area as each year we have both PDW and program sessions with this focus. We would like to continue to provide a place for the discussion of management development as it is couched in our overall domain. We feel the level of activity is appropriate for the role that non-credit instruction plays as one aspect of a multifaceted domain.

References

Arbaugh, B. (2016). Where are the dedicated scholars of management learning and education?

Management Learning, 47, 230-240.

Bacon, D. R., & Stewart, K. A. (2016). Why Assessment Will Never Work at Many Business Schools a Call

for Better Utilization of Pedagogical Research. *Journal of Management Education*,
1052562916645837.