REPORT TO THE ACADEMY PROFESSIONAL DIVISION REVIEW COMMITTEE

FIVE YEAR REVIEW OF THE

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT DIVISION OF

THE ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT

January 23, 2001

Authored by:

Laurie R. Weingart, Division Chair

236A Posner Hall
Graduate School of Industrial Administration
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Voice (412)268-7585
Fax (412)268-7357

Email: weingart@cmu.edu

Table of Contents

9
A. Current Status
B. Trends
C. Composition

APPENDICES

REPORT TO THE ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT

PROFESSIONAL DIVISIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT DIVISION

This report reviews the activities of the Conflict Management (CM) Division of the Academy of Management for the years 1996/1997 - 2000/2001. It is prepared in accordance with the five-year review policy of the Academy's Professional Division Review Committee, and follows the instructions outlined by that body.

I. DOMAIN/MISSION OF THE DIVISION

Domain Statement: The nature and management of conflicts at the individual, group, organizational, inter-organizational and societal level; power processes including influence, coalitions, coercion, deterrence, and persuasion; bargaining and negotiation, negotiator characteristics and behaviors; collaboration and competition; third party interventions (such as facilitation, arbitration, mediation); distributive and procedural justice and dispute resolution procedures. Major topics include application of the above conceptual foci to a wide variety of contexts including team interactions, intercultural relations, organizational diversity, labor relations, workplace disputes, community conflict and public policy development.

Commentary: In response to feedback we received in our last division review and with the support of the membership, other divisions, and the Academy, we changed our mission statement in 1996-1997. We did this for two reasons. First, our previous statement had been narrowly focused, but our program offerings covered a much wider array of topics. We wanted to reflect this wider perspective in our statement. Second, we wanted to distinguish ourselves better from the OB division and to attract new members who might not realize that their work fit within our domain. We believed this would attract researchers, such as those interested in environmental conflict, workplace violence, multiparty alliances, etc., who might not have realized that we speak to all those issues.

II. GOVERNANCE

A. *Constitution/Bylaws*: The Constitution of the CM Division evolved from the Constitution of the Power, Negotiation and Conflict Management Interest Group. Our current Constitution can be found in Appendix A. There has been one change in the current Constitution which does not appear in the Constitution in the Appendix. In 1994, the CM membership voted to change our voting structure to be consistent with those of other divisions. Prior to 1995, we voted yearly for Representatives at Large, Program Chair-Elect, *and Division Chair-Elect.* We now vote yearly only for the positions of Program Chair-Elect and Representatives at Large. The Program Chair-Elect now automatically succeeds on an annual basis to the roles of Program Chair, Division Chair-Elect, Division Chair, and Past Division Chair. Such continuity in the leadership positions has been deemed a plus by the membership.

B. *Governance Structure*: The CM Division is governed by the Division's Executive Committee, which consists of the following officers: Past Division Chair, Division Chair, Division Chair-Elect, Program Chair, Program Chair-Elect, two Representatives-at-Large, and the Newsletter Editor. The Executive Committee is responsible for determining policy consistent with Academy objectives. Committee members (including all elected and appointed committee members) meet annually at the Academy Meeting and communicate frequently via E-mail and telephone. Positions and their duties are outlined below. The officers of the division (elected and appointed) during the review period can be found in Appendix B.

Appointed/Volunteer Positions

- Membership Chair. The Membership Chair monitors membership patterns and sends invitations to potential new members of our division.
- Webmaster. The webmaster develops and manages the division's website, posting newsletters, finding links to CM related sites, etc.
- Listserve moderator. The listserve moderator manages the CMDNet discussion list.
- Newsletter Editor. The Newsletter Editor directs all activities connected with the production and distribution of the Newsletter. The Editor also acts as a liaison with the Academy's Newsletter Editor.

Elected Positions

- Representatives-at-large. Two representatives-at-large each serve a one-year term and are responsible for the Sunday morning pre-conference sessions the CM division presents at the Academy Annual Meeting.
- Program Chair-Elect. The Program Chair-Elect is responsible for the overall Professional Development Workshop program at the academy meetings. This includes running the division's doctoral consortium or junior faculty research incubator. (The division alternates between a doctoral consortium one year, and a junior faculty research incubator the next year.) The program chair-elect also coordinates all interactions with the Academy of Management regarding pre-conference activities, including the Sunday morning session (run by the reps at large). The Program Chair-Elect is elected by a vote of the membership and serves in this capacity for one year, after which time s/he automatically advances to the position of ....
- Program Chair. The Program Chair is responsible for the CM Division's program at the Annual Academy of Management Meeting. This responsibility consists of: (1) selecting reviewers to anonymously evaluate papers/symposia submitted for the next national Academy of Management meeting, (2) sending reviewers papers and receiving their evaluations, (3) selecting the top 1/3 of papers and symposia to be presented at the meeting, using the data provided by the reviewers, (4) sending reviewers' feedback on the disposition of their papers/symposia, and (5) ordering food and drinks at the Academy Meeting for Division activities. The Program Chair serves in this capacity for one year, after which time s/he automatically advances to the role of .....

- Division Chair-Elect. The two primary responsibilities of the Division Chair-Elect are (1) to assist the Program Chair in performing the duties of Program Chair as requested, and (2) to plan and organize the division's informal (i.e., not on the program) Sunday evening social event. The Division Chair-Elect serves for one year, after which time s/he becomes the .....
- Division Chair. As the Chief Executive Officer, the Division Chair oversees all Division activities and is ultimately responsible for the financial health of the Division. Particularly lucky Division Chairs also get the opportunity to prepare the Division's renewal materials for the Academy! The Division Chair serves for one year, after which s/he becomes the .....
- Past Division Chair. The Past Division Chair serves for one year, after which his/her appointment as a member of the Executive Committee automatically expires. In addition to providing counsel to the Executive Committee, the Past Division Chair runs the election for the incoming rep's at large and program-chair elect.
- Academy Council Representative. We also elect a representative to the Academy Council every other year. The representative serves as an ad-hoc member of the executive committee.

I. Nomination and Election Procedures

Elected Offices: The positions of At-large Representative and Program Chair-Elect are elected annually by a vote of the membership. The vote occurs through a mail ballot or e-mail ballot, on which all candidates' biographies appear. At-large Representatives serve a one-year term, after which their service to the Division is completed. The Program Chair-Elect is effectively beginning a five-year trek through the hierarchy of the Division. After serving as Program Chair-Elect, s/he subsequently serves one-year terms as Program Chair, Division Chair-Elect, Division Chair, and Past Division Chair, respectively.

Appointed/Volunteer Offices: The Newsletter Editor, Listserve moderator, Webmaster, and Membership Chair are solicited by asking for volunteers at the division's business meeting at the academy and through ads placed in the newsletter and on the listserve. The Executive Committee appoints these officers. They serve on a continuing basis, though in the past they have routinely served no more than three years. Past appointed officers have typically been willing to serve until a suitable replacement could be found. The process by which Newsletter Editors are found is by far the most "informal" method used in the CM Division.

Nominations: Nominations for the elected positions described above are solicited in two ways. First, at the business meeting (held at the annual meeting), nominations are solicited for individuals to serve as program chair and at-large representatives for the program that will be held two years from the current Academy meeting. Pieces of paper are distributed to all in attendance, filled out, and then collected. This provides us with an initial set of names. In addition, a "call for nominations" is sent to each member through the mail sometime in the fall. Usually, this appears in the fall edition of the Newsletter, but it has sometimes appeared as a separate mailing. For example, this year we included the call for nominations along with information about the Division Survey that is required of us as part of our five year Division review. Thus, this year's nominations were for program chair and at large representatives for the 2002 meetings.

Upon receipt of the ballots, the two most nominated names for Program Chair-Elect and the four most nominated names for the at-large positions are identified. We then seek to secure their agreement to run for the positions. In the event that there are too few nominations or no strong consensus choices to run for these positions, the CM Division Nominating Committee (outlined in the CM Constitution) may try to identify suitable candidates. Those serving as officers of the Division for the period covering this review are shown on the next page.

III. ANNUAL MEETING ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM

A. Pre-conference and Professional Development Activities

The CM division's PDW (pre-conference) program has two main elements in any given year. First, each year the division holds either a doctoral consortium or a junior faculty research incubator; the two alternate from year to year, so each appears every other year. Second, we convene a Sunday morning session each year that has consisted of various session types, formats, and topics. All PDW sessions and consortia have been open to members of all Academy divisions, subject at times to registration requirements and space limitations. The individual elements of the PDW program are explained below. Specific information on these programs over the last five years is provided in Appendix C.

CM Doctoral Consortium. The CM division had convened a doctoral consortium annually, and shifted to an every-other-year rotation (alternating with the Junior Faculty Research Incubator) beginning in 1998. Although the themes and structures of the doctoral consortia vary somewhat from year to year, each consortium has combined a focus on the development of student research interests with coverage of professional socialization topics, such as publishing, the job market, and the like. Enrollment in the doctoral consortium has been fairly steady at about 20-30 students each time. The CM consortium is geared especially toward students at pre-dissertation stage - ideally those who have completed coursework but not yet defended a dissertation proposal. A strong focus on research at the CM consortium gives students an opportunity for collegial interaction around germinating research ideas. Admission is through pre-nomination by a student's faculty advisor.

CM Junior Faculty Research Incubator. Starting in 1995, the CM division has convened a junior faculty research incubator every other year. The goal of the incubator is to provide support to junior faculty at a critical time in their careers, by helping them find other young scholars with similar interests, develop projects that could lead to publications before they come up for tenure, and get

some support from senior faculty members. The way this has been done is to bring together junior faculty and a set of senior faculty on Friday and Saturday before the start of the Academy meetings. At the outset of the incubator, junior faculty talk about their interests, and form into research teams. Each team has assigned to it a senior faculty member with similar interests. While still at the incubator, teams meet to plan research projects, including hypothesis development and data collection strategies. The research incubator has been successful because we have found a way to engage junior faculty with senior faculty, bridge differences between different divisions of the academy, help junior faculty develop research agendas, build intellectual communities, and produce research that will appear at conferences and in print. The CM division has received both an innovation award and a mentoring award from the Academy for the incubator. Details on incubator participation appear in Appendix C.

Sunday Morning Session. Each year the division's Representatives-at-Large are responsible for putting together a three-hour Sunday morning program that addresses issues in depth that would not otherwise find a home on the regular Academy program. Details of these sessions over the last five years appear below. The Sunday morning session in recent years has captured a mix of themes and formats, including teaching workshops and roundtables, panel discussions of research methodology, conversations crossing the academic/practitioner divide, etc. The division has tried to spread the focus of these sessions across the varied topic areas of the division's domain. These sessions have been well attended and well received.

Co-Sponsorship of Other PDW Programs. The Conflict Management Division has been a co-sponsor of the Critical Management Studies Workshop since its inception. The division has also been a supporter of and financial contributor to the New Doctoral Student Consortium.

B. Meeting Program

Selection Procedures. Papers and symposia for the CM Division's main program are solicited through the Academy's "Call for Papers." A duplicate statement also appears in the CM Division Newsletter and on the CM Division Web site, and is announced on the list-serve for the CM division. Submissions are received by the Division's Program Chair, who then asks for reviews from three reviewers who have interests in conflict management in general, or in the specific topic of the submission. Most reviewers receive around four papers to review.

Reviewers are asked to evaluate the submission using a standardized reviewing form created by the program chair. The form varies somewhat from year to year, but asks the reviewers to assess the technical quality of the paper, the quality of theoretical arguments, the importance of the topic, and the degree of interest the topic holds for CM Division members. It also asks the reviewer to assess the overall quality of the paper on a 100-point scale. Symposia have a slightly different form, which also asks about the coherence of the papers as a symposia, and the proposed presentation format (typical rating forms can be found in Appendix D). This information is used to create a numerical score for each submission, and the submissions are ranked. The highest ranked submissions are accepted (within the constraints set by the units allocated to the CM Division), with the exception that papers on the border-line are often assessed more carefully by the program chair, who uses his or her discretion to make those final choices. The program chair also uses his or her discretion to allocate units between papers and symposia.

At the time designated by the Academy, letters of acceptance or rejection are sent to those who made submissions, along with the reviews of their submission and the numerical scores they received (examples of these letters can be found in Appendix E).

Reviewers. Reviewers are selected by the Program Chair. They include people who volunteer and those solicited by the Program Chair. Those who reviewed in previous years are generally asked to review again for the division. In most years, the business meeting is a time to ask for new volunteers. We have had on average 70 reviewers each year. See Appendix F for the program committee for each of the years covered in this report.

Program Statistics. Statistics for the CM Division's Program for 1996 through 2000 are summarized in the following table.

Year	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Location	Boston	San Diego	Chicago	Toronto	D.C.
Submissions	80	78	68	62	92
Papers	75	63	55	45	84
Symposia	5	15	13	17	8
Competitive Papers Accepted	38	31	29	30	na
CM Symposia accepted (single and co-sponsored)	4	10	8	6	na
Shared Interest Papers	6	7	4	4	na

Commentary: After a slight decline in submissions, we received a large number of paper submissions, resulting in an overall increase of 50% from the previous year, for the upcoming 2001 conference in Washington D.C. Part of this increase might be attributable to a letter that the program chair sent out to prospective submitters. At the meetings in Toronto, the board noticed that submission rates had been slipping. In response, we decided to go through the 2000 program, identify authors who presented papers

in other divisions that would also fit within our domain, and invite them to submit to the CM division. We also encouraged members of the division to submit papers at our business meeting and via our newsletter. We believe this strategy was effective in boosting our submission rate.

C. Special Events

The Conflict Management Division sponsored two types of special events during the review period -- social events and awards. The first is social events. During the 1996-2000 period the Conflict Management Division hosted a number of special events during the Sunday evening of Academy. These social events included a Boat Cruise in 1996, Dessert Reception in 1997, a Clam Bake in 1998, Dinner at a Blues Bar in 1999, and a Reception at a local restaurant in 2000. We offer a reduced price to graduate students and encourage members to bring a potential member as a guest to this event.

The Conflict Management Division also regularly sponsors three awards. The first was created in 1998 to recognize recent articles in the field that have made a major impact on the field. The "Most Influential Article or Chapter" recognizes the impact of one paper or article with most impact on the field published between one and three years prior. This award is determined by the CM Division awards committee which is appointed by the division chair each year. The other two awards are determined by the program chair based on reviews of submissions to the CM division for the annual conference -- the "Best Paper" and "Best Student Paper" awards. The past five years of award recipients are listed below.

CMD Division Award Winners

1996

Best Paper - Jeanne Brett, Debra Shapiro, & Anne Lytle

Best Student Paper - Cathy Tinsley

1997

Best Paper - Evert Van de Vliert, Aukje. Nauta, Ellen Giebels, & Onne Janssen

Best Student Paper - Peter Kim

1998

Most Influential Article or Chapter -- Peter Carnevale & Dean Pruitt

Best Paper -- Laura Kray, Leigh Thompson, & Allan Lind

Best Student Paper -- Lucy Gilson

1999

Most Influential Article or Chapter - Ray Friedman & Joel Podolny

Best Paper -- Kelly Mollica

Best Student Paper -- Wendi Adair

2000

Most Influential Article or Chapter -- Tie: K. Etty Jehn; Evert Van de Vliert

Best Paper -- Greg Janicik & Sally Blount-Lyon

Best Student Paper -- Don Moore

Commentary: In 1998 we added a new award for the Most Influential Article or Chapter. This was in response to suggestions from the academy to do more to recognize achievement among our members.

IV. MEMBERSHIP

A. Current Status

The CM division currently consists of 557 members. The division remains a smaller, niche division in the Academy.

B. Trends

The CM division membership has experienced some growth over the past 5 years. We had an 15% increase membership in 1998, which has since leveled off to about 7% over membership levels in 1996 and 1997. We attribute our growth to the efforts of our Membership Chair, who sends information about the CM division to new members of the Academy and other potential members as identified by current members. See Appendix G for a copy of the letter and flyer that were sent out in 1999.

Membership Patterns 1996-2000

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
ACAD	366	374	433	395	390
EXEC	40	36	47	45	40
STU	101	104	108	104	121
EMER		5	5	7	7	6
TOTAL	512	519	595	551	557

C. Composition

As shown in the table above and graph below, the large majority of our members are academicians (70%) and students (22%). The number of executives and emeritus members are relatively small (8%) and have remained constant. It appears the majority of the growth in 1998 and the subsequent slight decline and leveling off can be attributed to fluctuations in the number of academicians. We have also experienced some growth in the number of student members from 1999-2000 (16%).

V. MEMBERSHIP SERVICES

A. Newsletters

The CM Division Newsletter is published semi-annually. Prior to 2000, the newsletter was mailed to all members of the division and a copy was posted on the division's web page. In 2000, the board proposed at the division's business meeting that the newsletter only be made available electronically, with e-mail notification sent to members informing them when a new edition was on-line. Members who attended the meeting voted in favor of the proposal. Copies of newsletters from 1999-2000 can be found in Appendix H.

B. Electronic Bulletin Boards

The CM Division offers two electronic services for its members. First, the Division sponsors CMDNet. Managed by John Bunch, CMDNet is an internet based discussion group and list server dedicated to issues of interest to the Conflict Management Division. Second, the Division has a web page on the Academy's server (http://www.aom.pace.edu/cmd/). The web page, which in the past has primarily been used as a place to post the newsletters, is currently undergoing a major overhaul. Under the direction of a new webmaster, Stephen Marsh, research and teaching related materials of interest to our members will be linked to the web page.

VI. **FINANCES**

A. Current Status

According to the financial statement received at the end of the third quarter, 2000, the CM division had an available balance of $1455.76. The year end balance was not available at the time this report was written. The current income statement, as well as income statements from the prior 4 years can be found in Appendix I.

B. Trends
Available funds as of Oct. 1/Dec. 31 (dates vary due to the Academy's change in fiscal year) in each year of the review period are summarized below.

Oct. 1, 1996	Oct. 1, 1997	Oct. 1, 1998	Dec. 31, 1999	Sept. 30, 2000
$8228.04	$3,867.44	($1,061.27)	($540.80)	$1455.76*

* The final balance was not available as of the writing of this report.

Commentary: In 1998, there was a miscommunication about the amount of funds available and a loss associated with a social event at the Academy meetings, resulting in a high level of overspending. Over the next two years, we recovered, thanks to judicious spending and an innovation award from the Academy for our Research Incubator. We have also cut our expenses by shifting our newsletter from hardcopy to electronic versions only.

VII. DIVISION SURVEY

As required, the Division was surveyed in the fall of 2000. Division members received an email message from our membership chair, Cathy Tinsley, informing them about the survey and directing them to a website where the survey could be found. The survey items and results can be found in Appendix J. A reminder was sent about two weeks later. 176 members responded to the survey, resulting in a 31% response rate. The large majority were in academic institutions (70% were full-time faculty members, 16% were students), US citizens (85%), and Caucasian (90%) as reported in Appendix J. The majority of faculty respondents were assistant professors (37%), followed by associates (29%), and full professors (23%). 55% were in a business/mgmt/OB subject domain, 9% Psychology, 4% communication. On average, respondents were 38 years old (sd = 15) and 53% were female. They had been a member of the division for 5.27 years on average.

The core questions requested by the academy were presented first in the questionnaire. Due to an oversight, a 5-point rather than the requested 7-point scale, was used. Therefore the results must be interpreted with a 5-point scale in mind. In an effort to be more precise, one of the core questions asking about the "Division's preconference activities" was expanded into three separate questions that asked about specific preconference activities: The doctoral consortium, the junior faculty research workshop, and the Sunday morning preconference program. Thus the first nine questions on the CM survey correspond to the first seven questions provided by the Academy.

Overall, responses were neutral or positive. For example, members are moderately satisfied with the program content, social events, the way money is allocated to activities, and responsiveness of leadership. Members disagree with the statement that CM leadership is limited to an elite group. On average, members were neutral regarding beliefs about the influence they have on division's policies and the value of the preconference program - some like it and other's don't. Means and sd's for these items can be found at the beginning of Appendix J.

As requested, members were also asked how the division might improve services to its members. As reported in Appendix K, although there was not one area upon which respondents focused, they did suggest a variety of services, including preconference activities focused on mid- to late-career development, a more comprehensive database of members, newsletters in the text of email, more case-studies, more award $$, writing workshops, and more emphasis on teaching.

When asked to rank order their reasons for membership (Appendix J, Background Information, Item #4), members were more likely to rank their research interests on top, followed by teaching, training, social activities, and other ranking second to third.

VIII. SWOT Conclusions

Members freely reported their beliefs about the division's strengths and weaknesses in their responses to the survey. 79 members reported strengths, while 49 reported weaknesses. Based on their comments and other trends in the data, I conducted a quick content analysis and developed the following SWOT conclusions. The full set of comments regarding strengths and weaknesses can be found in Appendix L.

A. Strengths

One of the strengths of our division is the academic excellence of its members. Members identified the division's strong research focus, excellent scholars, and strong conference papers and program as strengths of the division. This category was mentioned by over 20 respondents.

Members also cited the topical focus of the division as a strength (14). This suggests that the expansion of our domain statement did not dilute the sense of focus on conflict management and related topics in our division.

The third strength of the division is its inclusive culture and collegial members. Mentioned by over 20 respondents, members felt that CM members are friendly, welcoming, and supportive of one another. Members also cited the small size of the division (n = 19), the resulting sense of community (n = 14) and access/opportunity for involvement (n = 10) as one of its strengths. To avoid losing this sense of community, one of the division's leadership's goal has been to only slightly grow our membership base. We believe that a quick infusion of new members could dilute the culture of the division. The data suggests that we've been successful at doing this - the CM division has grown by approximately 10% over the past 5 years.

Although, as a division we are small, our members link us to 19 other divisions of the Academy. All respondents identified CM as their main or "home" identity, with 63% identifying with one or more other divisions as well. Thus, our members, although focused on topics related to conflict management, have diverse interests. We also attempt to link to other divisions though our research incubator - we typically invite other divisions to join us when the topic of the incubator is relevant to their domain. For example,

members of the ONE interest group joined us when the topic was Environmental Conflict and members of GDO joined in the Conflict and Diversity incubator.

Overall, members are satisfied with their membership in the CM division (M = 4.16 on 5-point scale) and do not feel that other divisions have more to offer their members than does CM (M = 1.91).

B. Weaknesses

While the division's small size was most often seen as a strength, it is somewhat of a double edged sword - other members, albeit fewer, saw the division's small size as a weakness (n = 7). Some were concerned that CM did not have enough influence within the Academy as a whole.

The Sunday morning preconference program has not drawn the attendance that we would have hoped for and the ratings are neutral at best. This is a weakness that needs to be addressed.

There were also some members who felt that the division is too cohesive and potentially cliquish (9), resulting in difficulty in getting involved (7). This is in contrast to the slightly larger number of members who felt the culture of the division was inclusive and the finding that most members do not believe that the division is controlled by a "self-perpetuating elite group". One weakness of the division is our potential inability to extend the feeling of collegiality and opportunity for involvement to all members. Regarding outreach, it appears that a large number of members are not receiving the newsletter announcement electronically. It's unclear why this is happening, as we use the Academy's database to access our members' e-mail addresses.

Some members felt that the division did not focus enough on practical application (5). However, the same number of people identified the "reality" and "practicality" of the topic as being one of its strengths. Thus, it might be unclear within the division how we should be going beyond basic research to address issues of practical application.

C. Opportunities

The CM division should do more to capitalize on its small size by reaching out to a broader group of its members. This could be done by ensuring that nominees for board positions tap into a diverse set of candidates. We could also do a better job of communicating opportunities that are available for volunteer positions. This was recently done when looking for a new webmaster. Rather than appointing someone, the division chair asked for volunteers via the newsletter and CMDNet. Two members volunteered, neither of whom had been actively involved in the division before. Both are working together to develop and maintain the website.

Our Sunday morning preconference workshop could be more responsive to the memberships' interests. We could do more to use member feedback to determine the content of the workshop. We might also consider developing some professional development workshops for mid-career members. Given our division's strength in mentoring (via the research incubator and the doctoral consortium), we could develop a recurring workshops for mid or later career members.

D. Threats

One potential threat is a byproduct of the fact that division leadership positions are typically held by members in relatively early career stages (e.g., our representatives at large are typically assistant professors and our program and division chairs are usually associate professors). The upside of this is the opportunities available to junior people. The threat is that the division could lose the interest and involvement of more senior people in the field who have already done their service and moved on.

Another threat is that as some of our topical areas grow more popular, it might get absorbed by the larger, more general divisions. This has happened with papers on organizational justice being submitted to the OB division rather than CM. We have tried to counter this trend by more aggressively marketing our division and domain.

A third threat relates to the mild interest members have shown in the preconference program and CMDNet. We do not have active involvement from the broader membership base and need to focus on serving their needs.