American Accounting Association

Strategic and Emerging Technologies Section

Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting

Liberty Room, Hilton New York, NY, NY

August 3, 2009

Opening: The Annual Business Meeting of the Strategic and Emerging Technologies Section was called to order at 2:10 pm on August 3, 2009 in the Liberty Room of the Hilton New York, NY, NY by President Roger Debreceny.

Present:

President Roger Debreceny and 35 members of the SET Section were present.

**Presidents Report: Presented by current President Roger Debreceny.**

Financial Foundation:

Roger Debreceny indicated that the section would be destitute if current spending levels were continued. In order to meet current financial needs some external funding was sought. Bob Cuthbertson from CaseWare Idea has committed to funding the Section for three years at $10,000 per year. The Section was not required to make any commitments to obtain the funding except to maintain research focus of the section and to seek additional support except from firms in direct competition with CaseWare such as ACL.

Executive Committee:

Roger Debreceny indicated that this year the Executive Committee held monthly conference calls. These conference calls were not restricted to the Executive Committee as the Chairs of the Research Committee and Education Committee attended when necessary. Roger Debreceny indicated that these conference calls seem to have increased the productivity of the Executive Committee.

Education and Research Initiatives:

Roger Debreceny said that overall the charge to these committees is to pick one thing and to do it. The emphasis of these committees should be on delivery of an agreed upon outcome.

Mid-Year Meeting:

Again the Mid-Year meeting will be held in cooperation with the Information Systems Section, January 6-9, 2010 in Clearwater Beach, Florida. The Strategic and Emerging Section intends to run two (2) or three (3) sessions at the meeting. The Section will be embedding people into the IS meeting structure to ensure the coordination. Graham Gal will chair the SET section’s efforts for the meeting. Richard Dull, past SET president is chairing the 2010 Mid-Year meeting for the IS Section so the coordination should be smooth.

Workshop:

In the prior year the workshop was seeking suitable abstracts and that format was followed this year. There were forty (40) abstracts submitted. By reviewing the abstracts researchers were given a suitable timeframe for decisions about attending the workshop.

Podcasts:

There was a discussion on how to communicate relevant content to Section members. Webcasts and webinars were considered, the choice was to use Podcasts as the model. Currently there are three (3) available on the Section website. Stephanie Farewell is working on podcast ideas. Roger Debreceny indicated that people would like transcripts of the podcasts and a fee has been paid to get the transcripts completed. Roger Debreceny also indicated that Nancy Bagranoff’s podcast could be edited. Roger Debreceny said some suggestions for future podcasts include interviews with noted practitioners, with young researchers, such as past dissertation award winners, to discuss where they see their work going, and with the leadership of the section such as incoming President Guido Geerts or past editor of the Section Journal Miklos Vasarhelyi.

This ended the President’s report.

The following resolution was made:

Resolved that the SET Section thank Bob Cuthbertson and CaseWare Idea for their generous support of the Section:

Moved: Stewart Leech

Seconded: Guido Geerts

Carried: Adopted unanimously by voice vote

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the Annual Business Meeting held August 4, 2008, Anaheim, CA were distributed by Ingrid Fisher, Secretary/Treasurer. Stewart Leech mentioned a spelling correction.

Moved: Greg Gerard moved for the minutes to be accepted with the spelling change.

Seconded: Guido Geerts

Carried: Adopted unanimously.

**Treasurer’s Report**

Secretary/Treasurer Ingrid Fisher presented the financial position of the Section. She noted that over the past three years there were no major changes. The information provided from the AAA was as of June 30th. Rick Dull observed that the previous year’s cost for the journal was $7,000 and questioned if the $14,000 was for two years or if the costs had doubled. Roger Debreceny reported that previously the Section was getting a benefit from the AAA to start the journal and that we were no longer getting that benefit. He said that we are now paying full cost for the journal and that the previous cost for two years is now the cost for one year. Peter Gillett asked if we are now running at a negative cash flow. Roger Debreceny indicated that the Section was running at a negative cash flow. The revenues from the Annual Research workshop would make up for part of this negative cash flow. Ingrid Fisher mentioned that the statement does not include revenues from the workshop. Rick Dull asked about plans for the journal and Roger Debreceny asked that this discussion wait for the presentation by the Publications Committee.

Moved: Peter Gillett moved to accept the treasurer’s report

Seconded: Rick Dull

Carried: Adopted unanimously

**New Officers and Committee Appointments**

Incoming Section President Guido Geerts presented the new officers based on the results of the election.

President: Guido Geerts

President-Elect: Greg Gerard

Vice-President Academic: Ingrid Fisher

Vice-President Practice: Tom Lamm

Secretary/Treasurer: Graham Gal

Guido Geerts also presented the incoming committee chairs and editors:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Webmaster and Newsletter Editor | |
| Webmaster | Rob Nehmer |
| Newsletter Editor | Murphy Brown |
| Committee Chairs | |
| Research Committee | Rick Newmark |
| Education Committee | Janie Chang |
| Membership Committee | Arline Savage |
| CPE Committee | Julie Smith David |
| Regions Committee | Nancy Uddin |
| Publications Committee | Andy Lymer |
| Workshop Committee | Amelia Baldwin, Carol Brown, and Greg Gerard |
| Chairs Awards Committees | |
| Awards Committee | Alex Kogan |
| Outstanding Dissertation Award Committee | Carlin Dowling |

**Awards**

Outstanding dissertation:

John Cheh, chair of the committee, indicated that this year the committee did not pick an award winner. Steve Sutton raised the question of whether the Section should reconsider the time frame for dissertations to be considered for this award. Originally dissertations in the past two years could be considered, but with the by-law changes it is now one year.

Outstanding researcher:

Stewart Leech announced that this years’ award winner was Murphy Smith.

Outstanding educator:

Stewart Leech announced that this year’s award winner was Clinton “Skip” White.

Outstanding service:

Alex Kogan announced that this year’s award winner was Miklos Vasarhelyi. Alex Kogan made an additional award to Amelia Baldwin and Carol Brown in recognition of the considerable effort required to run the Annual Research workshop over the last decade and because of its importance to the Section.

Carol Brown presented the award for the best paper at the research workshop, as voted on by the participants, to Yongbum Kim, David Y. Chan, Miklos A. Vasarhelyi, Alex Kogan (Rutgers University) for their paper “Unsupervised Fraud Detection: A Rule-Based Model in the Wire Transfer Payment Process of a Major Insurance Company in the United States”

**Committee Reports**

Education Committee:

Chair of the committee Akhilesh Chandra was not present and did not send in a report.

Research Committee:

Chair of the committee Jagdish Pathak reported the three research committee reports were presented at a panel as part of the workshop. The committee reports were still work in progress and would be published when appropriate. Roger Debreceny commented that the three committee reports were in the 40 – 50 page range and would need to be edited.

Publication Committee:

Steve Sutton presented the results of the committee’s investigation of the costs of producing printed copies of the Section Journal[[1]](#footnote-1). The main issue is the cost of the *JETA*, and whether the Section should continue to provide printed copies. Steve Sutton indicated that the implications for authors, as they present their record to promotion and tenure committees, if their work is in an online journal. This is because there is a perception that online journals are not of the same quality as printed journals. Peter Gillett asked about publishing on demand, and still have the option to get copy of Journal. He indicated that this would be an Institution issue. Alex Kogan asked about the three library subscription and whether the Section gets fees for these electronic subscriptions. Roger Debreceny reported that the Section Journal is included in a package of American Accounting Association journals sold to content aggregators. The fees from the aggregation do not go to Sections, and that *The Accounting Review* is really the journal driving the fee for the package of Association journals. Carol Brown indicated that the Section journal is not available at Oregon State. Andy Lymer noted that EBSCO allows you to pick and choose journals in the subscription. Roger Debreceny added that with EBSCO you get all of the Journals in the AAA package. Ingrid Fisher added that at the University of Albany the library subscribes to both ABI/Inform and EBSCO and that *JETA* seems to have been taken out, and that it could be someone at the Institution is making choices about which journals to include. Andy Lymer asked if it could be determined what the policy is. Carol Brown also commented about the low impact of the *JETA* because of the low subscription numbers and questioned about inclusion in the SSCI. Roger Debreceny indicated that the Section journal is five to ten years away from getting in the index. Steve Sutton added that his experience with adding journals to indices and that there may be some competition from Scopus in terms of getting into the indices.

A summary of the recommendations from the committee are:

* Continue a very limited print production of JETA
* Raise the price for printed subscriptions to $25
* Provide author’s with .pdf or other electronic form.
* Cease the provision of 3-5 copies of print journal to each author.
* SET Section Executive Committee pursue through AAA Council the option of on-demand publishing of the journal
* Cap the number of targeted pages in an issue of JETA to 135 pages.

*JETA* Editor’s Report:

Dan O’Leary, the current editor of the journal, took over the position on July 1st. , 2008. He indicated that his approach to accepting manuscripts for publication would be referee heavy; meaning he was inclined to go with the judgment of the referees. He has been asking for two referee reports for each manuscript. Dan O’Leary reported that there were eighteen submissions (twenty-one if three resubmissions from previous editor are included) and three were accepted. Half of the reviews were turned around in 30 days; three were 120 days or more[[2]](#footnote-2). Dan reported that there had been 18 new submissions and 3 manuscripts that were resubmitted. All of these 21 had been evaluated. Fifteen had been rejected, three had been invited to revise, and three had been accepted. Dan also reported that the SSCI looks at citations. One way to get more citations would be to post the articles to the web. Andy Lymer added that we need to ensure that the editorship remains in good hands and so we must begin looking for a successor.

Website and AAA Commons committee reports:

As webmaster Rob Nehmer wanted to make it clear that he is not responsible for content, and that he would post items to the website as they became available. Rob also reported that at the December meeting of the AAA Commons Editorial Board was looking for ways to enhance content and to see if there was a way for postings to suffice for promotion and tenure consideration. The goal for the upcoming year is to push out more use of the Commons. Rob added that our Section could take a lead in new uses for the Commons and our Section should generate ideas for the use of the Commons.

**By-Laws Changes**

President-elect Guido Geerts reported on the by-law changes. President-elect Geerts reported that thirty (30) members voted and all supported the by-law changes. The new Vice President for practice and CPE Committees were now part of the Section’s structure.

**Election of At-Large Members of the Nominating Committee**

President Geerts called for nominations for At-Large members of the Nominating Committee. The following nominations were received:

* **Stephanie Farewell**
* **Bridget Muehlmann**

Moved: Rob Nehmer moved that nominations be closed.

Seconded: Greg Gerard

Carried: Adopted unanimously.

**Incoming President’s Remarks**

Incoming President Guido Geerts presented the Distinguished Service award to Past- President Roger Debreceny. Outgoing President Debreceny remarked that there is a team in place to continue the work of the Section. President Geerts discussed his objectives for the next year:

1. Further improve collaboration with practitioners. The Section is looking into creating an extra CPE session for practitioners.
2. Creating an “Operations Manual” for the Section.
3. Encourage research that better defines the Section’s “research identity.

**Other Business**

Stewart Leech asked what day might the Section have its CPE section. He asked if Sunday was the best day. Julie Smith David commented that if the Section wants industry people to attend the CPE then Thursday is probably the best choice. She also suggested that we conduct a survey to see what emerging technologies members of the Section are interested in.

**Adjournment**

Moved: Stewart Leech motioned to adjourn the meeting at 3:35 pm

Seconded: Stephanie Farewell

Carried: Adopted unanimously

The next Annual Business Meeting will be held at the 2010 Annual Meeting in San Francisco, CA at a time and date to be determined.

Respectfully Submitted, Graham Gal Secretary/Treasurer

Appendix I – Report from Publications Committee

To: Roger Debreceny, SET Chair

From: Andy Lymer, Steve Sutton (Chair, SET Publications Committee), Miklos Vasarhelyi

CC: Dan O’Leary (*JETA* editor and ex-officio member), Bill McCarthy (incoming member)

Date: 31 July 2009

Per the SET Chair’s request, our committee has examined the publication issues surrounding *JETA* and prepared recommendations for the executive board. While the request presumably was under the auspices of the need to stop publishing *JETA* in hardcopy format, we evaluated this request based on what we feel are the best practices for maximizing the value placed on publications.

We have explored the core costs associated with *JETA*’s production in light of the information for which we were able to garner access. The fundamental issue that has to be considered is that it costs $37 per page for AAA to do its pre-press preparation work. This cost is a fixed cost allocation across all journals, thus even if we produced the manuscript ourselves in precise publication form before articles were transferred to AAA, we would still incur a cost of $37 per page. To put this in publication terms, our net dues collections and subscription/advertising revenue would cover production of only 135 pages per issue. Based on recent article lengths, this would mean that about 7 articles could be produced per year. This does not include printing and mailing any copies.

The SET section currently receives an equivalent amount of money to the above revenue in AAA workshops sponsored by the section. If we assume that revenue can be sustained at the current level, this is approximately the same amount of money that would be necessary to cover printing, mailing and postage for print issues. It should be noted that we incurred over $5,600 in such costs in order to provide 65 members and 3 libraries with hardcopy versions.(over $80 per copy). This is distressing on two fronts in particular. First, we incurred $1,150 in mailing/postage costs for what appears to be the shipping of 68 subscription copies along with 3-5 copies per author. Second, initial estimates suggest that on-demand publishers could likely produce a single printing of an issue for less than $10. This is without apparent need for additional preparation costs as vendors such as Lulu.com will produce books from .pdf copy—copy we are already producing for the electronic version. Preliminary discussions with AAA Executive Director Tracey Sutherland indicate a potential willingness to work with the SET Section on the experimental use of on-demand publishing beginning as early as Fall, 2009.

While the simple solution would be to drop the printed version of *JETA*, this analysis is much more difficult as it cannot be quantified. Instead it raises a series of potential risks that should be considered. Will authors be equally willing to submit to an electronic-only journal? Will promotion and tenure committees place equal wait on an electronic-only journal? What are the long-run implications for the survival and growth of *JETA*?

Our committee is unanimous in its position that *JETA* will be significantly and negatively affected if it were to move to an electronic-only format during its developmental stage. The committee believes this is not a practical option over the next several years. The section would be better off to use available funds from workshop revenue to provide printed publication. Given this position, our focus instead has shifted to consideration of how we reduce the cost of printed publication to a reasonable level. We focus on print cost because electronic costs are fixed per the AAA’s cost allocation approach.

**Our Committee Recommendations:**

* Continue the production of a print version of *JETA* with a very limited print production.
* Raise the price of print subscription for SET section members from $15 to $25 unless an on-demand print option can be put in place within a year at a cost below the $25..
* Provide *JETA* authors with a .pdf or other electronic form of their final manuscript with the author having the right to send a single electronic copy to a given individual requesting an off-print copy. The author does not receive the rights to post such article on any website. This is a practice common with other publishers such as Elsevier.
* Cease the provision of 3-5 copies of the print journal to each author and instead allow the author to order journal print copies at $25/copy at the time that the page proofs are processed by the author. This price should be adjusted over time based on actual on-demand costs once such an option is in place.
* Encourage the SET Section Executive Committee to pursue through the AAA Executive Director and, if necessary, the AAA Council the option of producing *JETA* through on-demand publishing as print copies are needed of an issue. This would perhaps best be executed by having print copies ordered directly through the on-demand publisher with a profit margin returning to the SET Section. This option should be pursued immediately while the AAA is representative of executing such an option on an experimental basis with a section of our size.
* Cap the number of targeted pages in an issue of *JETA* at 135 pages (approximately 6-7 articles) until print cost containment can be achieved. As print cost containment takes effect, the number of pages can be increased over time. If print costs were completely eliminated, or even made profitable, theoretically we could handle 270 pages per issue. However, AAA processing costs are likely to also increase and at that page level the section may want to move to two issues per year.
* If the number and quality of submissions is such that more papers should be published in an issue, the editor should request a release of SET Section reserve funds to be used for publication of that year’s issue.
  + Vol 1 = 106 pages.
  + Vol 2 = 90 pages.
  + Vol 3 = 145 pages
  + Vol 4 = 213 pages (includes special issue section)
  + Vol 5 = 242 pages (includes special issue section)

Appendix 2 – *JETA* Editor’s Report

**Format for Annual Editor Report**

**AAA Journals**

(5-14-09)

*Summary of the report and reporting procedures:*

Editors of all AAA association-wide and section journals should provide an annual report on their journal. The report should include two main parts: (1) an overview of the editorial process and the journal’s operations for the previous year(s), and (2) descriptive statistics of key factors (see the tables below). Editors of section journals may adapt the report to include descriptive statistics of key factors that best reflect the specific nature of their journal while also including an overview section in their report.

Editors should submit their annual report to the AAA staff in advance of the AAA annual meeting (i.e., by July 15th of each year). Editors should also publish their annual report in the last issue of the journal each year to inform readers of the journal of its editorial process and operating statistics.

The Publications Committee reviews the editor reports for all of the AAA association-wide and section journals. The AAA Executive Committee reviews editor reports of the three association-wide journals and may also do so for the section journals.

*The report overview:*

The overview section should include a discussion of the editorial process – i.e., an explanation of the procedures followed in the editorial process, beginning with receipt of a submitted manuscript to the assignment of reviewers, including:

* Role of the editor, associate editor, and reviewer(s).
* Procedures for assigning an associate editor or the senior editor to a submission.
* Procedures for selecting reviewers and number of reviewers.
* Who ultimately is responsible for the editorial decision.
* Changes in the process, if any, from prior years.

*The report’s editorial and publication statistics:*

See the suggested tables shown on the following pages.

*Transition to new report format:*

Editors should adopt as much as possible of the new annual report format for reports submitted Summer 2009. For subsequent years, all reports should follow the substance of the new format.

Some of the tables below require data from multiple years that may not be available when the data have not previously been collected. In that case, editors should build up the required data for prior years as they become available over time.

**Discussion of the Editorial Process**

For each paper, I choose three reviewers. I do not make a decision until at least two reviewers have given me their reviews. Unfortunately, in some cases this means that I need to get new reviewers since the originally chosen reviews are not always timely.

Reviewers often are chosen from the references to the paper. Since the journal is a section journal, I rely heavily on the judgments of the reviewers, since they are typically “voices of the section.” For the papers submitted over the period June 2008 to June 2009, I had only one case where at least two reviewers did not completely agree, and that was a case of one indicating rejection and the other indicating major revision.

This is my first year as editor so I do not know if the process is the same or different than years past.

The requested exhibits and tables are listed below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TABLE 1  Annual Activity Summary – For the Journal Year ended (e.g., May 31, 2009)  (Provide data for at least the last 3 years) | | | | | | |
| Year | # In-Process, Beginning of Year  (a) | # of New Submissions  (b) | # of Resubmissions  (c) | # Available for Evaluation  (a)+(b)+(c)  = (d) | # Evaluated  (e) | # In-Process, End of Year  (d)-(e) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008-9 | 0 | 18 | 3 | 21 | 21 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Include submissions in the editor’s hands, but exclude revise and resubmit editorial decisions in authors’ hands.
2. New manuscripts, excluding resubmissions.
3. Resubmissions of previous revise and resubmit editor decisions.
4. Evaluation means all actions by referees, associate editor, and/or editor are complete and the manuscript has been returned to the authors.
5. Manuscripts processed with a decision returned to the author, including manuscripts returned by the editor without involving referees.
6. Submissions where a decision has not yet been sent to the author (note that in-process excludes revise and resubmit editorial decisions that are now in the authors’ hands).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TABLE 2  Annual Outcome Summary  (Provide data for at least the last 3 years.) | | | | | | |
| Year | # Evaluated  (a)+(b)+(c)  = (d) | # Rejected  (a) | # Invited to Revise  (b) | # Accepted  (c) | Acceptance  Rate (1):  (c)/(a+c) | Acceptance Rate (2): (c)/(d) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2008-9 | 21 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 16.67 | 14.28 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The “# Evaluated” should equal (e) in Table 1.

The acceptance rate is computed two ways: (1) accepts/ (rejects+accepts); and (2) accepts/# evaluated.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

|  |
| --- |
| CHART 1  Histogram of Editorial Rounds and Outcomes for (the most recent Year) |
| Show histograms detailing outcomes by editorial review rounds (e.g., Round 1, Round 2, and Rounds 3 and beyond):   1. number of papers accepted by round;   Round 1-0  Round 2-3   1. number of papers rejected by round.   Round 1-15 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TABLE 3  Distribution of Author Affiliation of Manuscripts Accepted | | |
| Author Affiliation by School | # of Authors  Current  Year | # of Authors  Cumulative  from 2009 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Author Affiliation: | # of Authors  Current  Year | # of Authors  Cumulative  From 2009 |
| U.S. Institutions | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Non-U.S. Institutions | 1.5 | 3 |
|  |  |  |

For articles with multiple authors, each author is given 1/n of the credit for each paper, where n is the number of authors of the paper.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TABLE 4  Detailed Processing Time Summary for 12 month period ending xxx | | | | |
| Time | Number of Manuscripts | Percent | Cumulative Number | Cumulative Percent |
| 0 ≤ Days ≤ 30 | 10 | 47.6 | 10 | 47.6 |
| 31 ≤ Days ≤ 60 | 4 | 19.0 | 14 | 66.6 |
| 61 ≤ Days ≤ 90 | 3 | 14.3 | 17 | 80.9 |
| 91 ≤ Days ≤ 120 | 1 | 4.8 | 18 | 85.7 |
| 121 ≤ Days | 3 | 14.3 | 21 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Note: Table 5 is required only for The Accounting Review, though other journals have the option of adopting a similar table as appropriate.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (INFORMATION NOT GATHERED)  TABLE 5  Submissions and Acceptances by Subject Area and Research Method  for (the most recent year) | | | | |
| *Subject*  *Area* | # Submitted | % of Total | # Accepted | % of Total |
| Auditing |  |  |  |  |
| Financial |  |  |  |  |
| Managerial |  |  |  |  |
| Government |  |  |  |  |
| International |  |  |  |  |
| Not-for-Profit |  |  |  |  |
| Systems |  |  |  |  |
| Taxation |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| *Research Method* | # Submitted | % of Total | # Accepted | % of Total |
| Analytical |  |  |  |  |
| Archival |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental |  |  |  |  |
| Field study/Case |  |  |  |  |
| Survey |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

To minimize the burden on the editor, this data should eventually be collected by having authors self-report their subject area(s) and research method(s).

The Publications Committee believes that data should be collected for each of the subject areas and methods shown above, but for the sake of brevity results can be combined for some areas or methods in the published report.

The editor may also display Table 5 from the previous year as an additional part of this table.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. The full text of the report is attached as an appendix to these minutes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. JETA editor’s report attached in appendix 2 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)