

EASM member survey regarding the charters and bye-laws

Presentation of the results

General information:

- All 442 current EASM members were individually invited on 20th Jan 2018 to participate in the anonymous online survey.
- In order to make sure only members can participate individual links were created and individually sent to the members. The link could not be used a second time.
- For two members a second individual link was created and the results from the first link deleted (total sample 444).
- All members who did not participated in the survey before 4th Feb 2018 were finally reminded via email.
- The survey was closed on Saturday 10th Feb 2018, some days later than announced because some members asked for an extension.
- 177 members (40%) started the survey and 114 (25.8%) completed the survey.
- The online survey was conducted via the software provider "unipark".

Note:

All data from the membership survey are available and accessible for interested people to make the process as transparent as possible. In order to ensure that all ideas and comments are considered for the changes of the charters and bye-laws, the results were consolidated for Paul Johnson, an external person with legal expertise. Based consolidated results, which are present below he will provide recommendations how the charters and bye-laws have to be changed and how the respective paragraphs should be expressed.

Next steps:

- 15 Feb 2018: Presenting the results within EASM's Executive Committee
- 28 Feb 2018: Sending the consolidated results to Paul Johnson
- 31 Mar 2018: Expected recommendation for the changes from Paul Johnson and share them within the board
- 23 & 24 2018: Discussion of the draft within the Executive Committee board meeting

- Before 31 May 2018: Presenting the final draft to the members

Diversity of Board members

At present, we have a solely nationality-based definition of diversity in the charter. Yet, it might make sense to think much broader here.

Please select from this list up to three categories that you deem most important for finding new board members:

Rank	Criteria	Modus	Mean (STD)	Frequency Top 1 (%)	Frequency Top 2 (%)	Frequency Top 3 (%)	Sample
1	Experience	1	1.64 (.724)	45 (50.0%)	32 (35.6%)	13 (14.4%)	n=90
2	Competencies	1	1.70 (.715)	45 (44.6%)	41 (40.6%)	15 (14.8%)	n=101
3	Age	2	2.09 (.0684)	4 (18.2%)	12 (54.5%)	6 (27.3%)	n=22
4	Gender	3	2.11 (.894)	13 (34.2%)	8 (21.1%)	17 (44.7%)	n=38
5	Nationality	3	2.34 (.745)	8 (16.0%)	17 (34.0%)	25 (50.0%)	n=50
6	Key Position (e. g., ESMQ editor or Incoming / Past Conference Chair)	3	2.68 (.626)	3 (8.1%)	6 (16.2%)	28 (75.7%)	n=37

Electing members of the Executive Board

How do you see the procedure for electing members of the executive board? Should EASM have a nomination committee, should there be nominations from the membership base only, or would you prefer a mixture of both?

Please let us know here:




Figure 1: Overview of the member's attitude in terms of the nomination committee (n=101)

Provided arguments for a nomination committee

- Nominations by membership to the nomination committee.
- I would appreciate a nomination committee
- Transparency is important and I believe a nomination committee can play an important role in establishing transparency.
- nomination committee
- It is important that EASM establishes a Nomination Committee with well-defined remit and procedures.
- Nomination committee which receives recommendations from EASM members and partners.
- EASM nomination committee
- The best way for the procedere is to have a nomination committee.
- Nomination comittee
- Nomination committee should be nice

- The nomination committee itself is value able as it should “check” the candidates qualifications. The committee itself should not make own suggestions. Suggestions should come from members (individuals) to make sure, everybody is able to come up with suggestions. The committee should work with a pre agreed check list to evaluate theses suggestions and show their evaluation for all suggestions prior to the GA online.
- By having a nomination committee we enable a strategic approach to be taken to board member recruitment and succession planning. If it is solely from the membership basis there is the possibility that what we have is rather ad hoc. It would make sense for prospective candidates to apply to the Board who then authorise and (if necessary) short list the applicants. Those on the short list can then communicate with the membership and partake in the vote at the AGM as was the case in Bern.
- There should be a nomination committee which should propose candidates after their evaluation of the suggested candidates done by the members. I do not think there should be nominations of people not members of EASM
- I believe that EASM should have a nomination committee.
- there should be nominations from the membership base only
- A nomination committee can be very helpful in the way to identify and approach appropriate candidates for becoming an EASM board member.
- Given that there are criteria to be fulfilled by nominees to be possibly elected, the goal of the nomination committee must be to control for these criteria. However, the nomination committee shall not give any advices but only secure that all nominees meet the criteria and present the respective information for every nominee that is accepted in a neutral form.
- The procedure with a nomination committee would be better since the members are individual persons only (association). If the format of the organisation was a federation, with associations as members then the nominations from the membership base would be more suitable.
- It should have an independent Nomination Committee who receives suggestions also from the members. The nomination Committee is also allowed to nominate persons themselves.

Provided arguments against a nomination committee

- Nomination committee never worked well.

- No, not at all—I firmly believe in the power and competence of the General Assembly.
- The executive board, President, VP, SG and Treasurer, should be elected by the GA. The past years have shown that we don't need a NC. Last year the NC didn't even know the names of all the candidates neither did the contact all of them!! The procedure can be run in a transparent way without a NC. 1) the empty positions are announced in good time, ... We don't need any group/NC to rank the candidates.
- I do not agree with a nominations committee, it is bias and does not take into account all members and their competencies. The rationale for a nominations committee is vague and weak and the justification provided by them regarding why they chose specific candidates is very poorly explained. As far as I know they did not consult effectively with all people that put their names forward rather they chose individuals based upon set criteria that they deemed important, not the board or members.
- I think the executive board should be the matter of the board. The general assembly votes of the board, and then the board votes for the Exec board.
- Nominations from the membership base only
- Only nominations from the membership base
- Membership base nominations.
- nominations from all members
- Nominations from the membership base.
- nominations from the membership base
- Bottom up: members should elect new executive board members. Also non members can become part of the board once they are elected by the members.
- The opportunity of nominations from the membership base would be great
- Membership base
- From membership base only.
- I would prefer nominations from the membership base only.
- I prefer only nominations from the membership base only, because they shown their extra involvement in EASM.
- Nominations from the membership base
- Nominations from the membership
- Nominations from membership
- Bottom-up-approach: nominations from the membership base

Mixture of both

- In general, I would be pro nominations from the member base, but not exclusive.
- Maybe a mixture of both
- mixture of both
- Proposals from the nomination committee as well as from the assembly/membership base -
- Both
- I would vote for a mix that would first be based on nominations from the membership base and then a nomination committee could provide suggested nominations from that. After this process a second round would go through by the members in order to give the members a decision in the final stage before the nomination committee confirm the nominations.
- I would prefer a mixture of both. I think it's important to have people on the board how really wants to be part of the EASM Family and doing it because they love the EASM and not just for there own goals. Someone how really wants to make the EASM even bigger en better then it already is. Someone how can mentain the course of the EASM and expand that course to achieve greater goals. And therefore, in my opinion, you need a nomination committee and first look inside the EASM Family, because those are the people how already committed themselves to the EASM Family.
- Mixture of both
- A mixture of both is preferable
- I guess mixture should be the right procedure.
- Mixture sounds good.
- Mixture
- A mixture of both
- Mixture of both
- a mixture of both
- i would like a mixture of both
- I would prefer a mixture of both.
- Nominations by members or mixture.
- both
- a mixture of both
- A mixture of both

- A mixture of both would be best; as only nominations from the membership base could be biased. There are many outstanding scholars whom the EASM members can trust to provide excellent service on a nomination committee.
- nominations from the membership base only and nomination by committee
- Mix method: nomination committee + application and vote of the members
- Mixture of both
- Both
- Institute both a nomination committee and allow nominations from the membership.
- A mixture might be a suitable option, e.g with 50 percent of the candidates coming from each
- mixture of both
- I would have no problems with potential board members applying for nomination before the vote. In relation to the presidency, it would make sense for the board to nominate one or two people that they feel are suitable to lead the association.
- A mixture of both
- A mixture of membership-based nominations and a nominations committee would be best to remain member-based and avoid the reproduction of similar individuals
- Nomination committee for a President or Secretary General; others based on members' votes
- Mixture - committee to pre-screen and members to decide
- Mixture of both
- Mixture
- A mixture of both
 - ⇒ no nomination committee, nominations from the membership base only
- I think mixture of both is better.
- mixture
- A mixture of both sounds good.
- A mixture of both: nominations from membership and Nomination committee and, in both cases, with assessment from the NC
- Mixture of both
- Mixture of both
- I think a nomination committee could help with attracting the right candidates but bottom-up nominees/candidates should be possible.

- I believe a mixture of both a nomination committee and suggestions from the membership base will give the best pool for possible Executive Board members.
- Nomination from the membership base is interesting because it enables the entire community to be part of the association. A mixture could eventually be appreciable for more transparency.
- yes, a mixture
- I would prefer a combination of both.
- mixture
- Mixture of both - the nomination committee are usually experts, and consist of people who take the time to run through the dossiers of the electing members - while the EASM members are less aware of capacities - and the disadvantage is, that some electing members, may convince others to vote for them (as we have had 3 years ago)
- Mixture but with very clear communication and scope
- A mixture of both seems to be a way to consider the members' opinion additionally to a nomination committee.
- I think a mixture of both would be good.
- I would prefer a mixture of both.
- Mixture
- Mixed and a nomination committee would be a good idea
- Mixture of both
- Mixture of both
- Mixture of both
- I prefer mixture of both

Further recommendations

- Executives should always have the experience of being on the EASM board for at least one year before they go for a position in the executive board.
- ... 2) nomination deadline is earlier than now, for ex May 1st and 3) candidates announce for ex. June 1st - that will give the candidates a fair run. ...
- If, in worst cases, the General Assembly decides to keep the NC it should be regulated that a person can be a NC member for max 2 years.
- What I find crucial is that the roles, responsibilities and duties for the nomination committee must be clearly defined. Furthermore, the EASM board and the nomination

committee should be work closely together and sare common interests and principles. The experience from the previous years was frustrating and damaged the reputation of EASM.

Appointment of Secretary General (rather than election)

Given the importance of this office, and given the long-term orientation of the tasks of the Secretary General, we would suggest to appoint the Secretary General by the General Assembly based on the proposal of the board.

If you have ideas relating to this suggestion, we would love to hear them via this form:




Figure 2: Member's opinion about appointing the General Secretary by the General assembly based on the proposal by the board (n=63)

In favour of appointing the Secretary General by the General assembly:

- Yes suggested by the EASM Board and appointed bu teh GA.
- Yes, SG should be proposed by the board.
- Agree!!
- Totally agree, the board are the only people who genuingly know how the organisation works and and such they know the operational issues - a nomination committee does not know this
- its fine

- I agree with appointment
- I believe this proposal is great.
- Agreed with the above suggestion
- I consider this a key position. Secretary general should be a professional role, based on a mid term mandate
- I agree
- Yes
- sounds reasonably
- I am fine with this
- I would support this motion but it is important to specify that the person who will be proposed for the position of SG needs to be very clear of their responsibilities and institutional support needed to effectively perform their role, and to accept them.
- That is a good idea and I know of other organisations that also use this way to find someone for the role of Secretary General.
- I agree
- Agree. As per previous comment.
- yes
- Fine like that
- Agree
- This seems reasonable
- it's good idea, I accept
- Sounds logic. Go for it!
- Agree with the suggestion
- Agreed
- This is fine!
- This is a very good idea.
- Agree
- ok
- This is a good idea.
- YES I agree
- yes, I agree; the GA has an important but time intensive role to fulfill. the board members can best estimate who and what they need for what purpose; the broader members cannot (and it is easy to complain and comment on the board ... know knowing the workload)

- I support this suggestion.
- Good
- I Agree on your point of view
- I agree with your suggestion
- That's a good process for the appointment of the Secretary General.
- Agree.
- Your suggestion makes sense
- I agree
- I accept with us.

Not in favour of appointing the Secretary General by the General assembly:

- Same as previous. The general assembly votes for the board members, then the board members vote for the Secretary general, as board members will have information the general assembly will not be familiar with.
- Election works.
- I would suggest that the election allows for a more transparent process.
- no
- Election is the best, but the different candidates must also explain how much time they can invest in the job and that their institution support it. The danger with appointment is that a board can appoint someone that the members do not feel is the right person.

Undecided in terms of appointing the Secretary General by the General assembly:

- I do not know enough to have an opinion.
- No comments.
- I have no idea.

In favour under certain condition(s) to appoint the Secretary General by the General assembly:

- Appointment by the General Assembly with the proviso that members of the general assembly can nominate individuals to the position.
- I think the SG should be accountable to the board and the board be accountable to the General Assembly. Accordingly, SG should be appointed by the board. There is a practical issue here too: How can the board, which is more or less new because

there are elections at the General Assembly, suggest a SG? If the board suggests, it will practically have to be the old board!

- Not only based on the proposal of the Board. The General Assembly should be able to nominate individuals also.
 - Appointment could work if the term is set in advance (not indefinite) and up for evaluation by the General Assembly periodically and nearing the end of the term
 - It depends on the Secretary General's position; if hired, then he board elects, if it is a voluntary position, GA elects
 - Appoint on Board recommendation but get member comment on the criteria for appointment
 - Fine in principle, but the process needs to be transparent to ensure inclusivity and to avoid accusations of 'cronyism'.
 - This can be an option but it should be set the maximum period for such position 4-6 years maximum
 - The job of General secretary involves time and dedication and someone that also has some professional support (material, time, people and/or financial) from her/his institution or EASM and to secure some long-term efficiency and efficacy she/he should not be appointed by elections
 - as long as there'll be more than one candidate proposed this could work
 - A possible suggestion to the appointment of the Secretary General would be to have EASM membership (or a subset of EASM membership) approve the appointment made by the General Assembly.
 - I think you should consider an EOI process
 - I support this idea, perhaps even limit it to 5 years in office to ensure circulation and avoid inertia
 - Why the proposal of the board? Why not from the GA?
-

New Board positions

The Scientific Chair and the ESMQ Editor have become quite important during the past, but they are not yet part of the charter and bye-laws, which should be changed. Do you have further thoughts on further roles and positions on the board that should be reflected in the EASM constitution?

Scientific Chair:

- No scientific chair should stay outside the board as they are contractually appointed by the board.
- SC should be a member elected from the board. ...
- I don't think that the The Scientific Chair has to be a part of the Charter/Bye-Laws if he/she is not a member of the Executive Board, if so he/she should also be elected by the GA. ...
- The Scientific Chair is an important role, but so are other roles on the board, what makes them different could be argued and is subjective. I am in favour of keeping the roles of the board as it currently stands
- No, but the above two are of paramount importance to be included.
- The SC and ESMQ should be on the charter and bye-laws.
- No, it would reduces flexibility of organisation within the board.
- The Scientific Chair and the ESMQ Editor have to refer to one scientific ethical framework fixed by the charter and bye-laws. This should help to avoid some ideological behaviours in rejecting certain contributions without respect to collegial evaluation when the contributions are multidisciplinary.
- The Charter should specify that the Scientific Chair and ESMQ Editor should be appointed by the Board. If the publisher of the Journal nominates a person, that person should be approved by the Board.
- i think should be changed
- Scientific chair should be elected by the GA. ...
- It is right and proper to fix these two roles in the EASM constitution.
- What is the rationale for including them in the charter? Important in what sense?
- They should be voting members of the Board if they have such important roles in relation to a major product of EASM (conference, journal)
- So far the elections have worked well; I do not see any reasons to change the system.

- Board should have also people and responsibilities linked to impact of science, transmitting the results and committing key practitioners to engage into development (associations, governments).
- I do not think that Scientific Chair and ESMQ Editor should be on the board. Both roles are important but do not require a position on the board. The board has many different targets and needs a Scientific Chair and an ESMQ Editor to achieve these goals. However, I do see the need for a position on the board to strengthen relations between sciences and business. EASM has lost this USP over the years. This person should not be working in academia but she should have a sound knowledge of academia.
- They should be automatically part of the charter and bye-laws.
- Yes, I agree that these two positions are important for EASM but think that only Scientific Chair could be included in the Board.
- yes, change is necessary
- I think the Chair and ESMQ Editor should be included in the chapter and bye-laws.
- (I still do not get what this charter will help in this regard)
- To strengthen the academic pillar of EASM seems to be an important aspect for the future of the association. Therefore, I absolutely support the idea to make them part of the Charter and bye-laws.
- If the importance of these two positions is beyond that which could be taken care of as an ad hoc function then yes change the bye-laws
- I believe that the chairman and board of directors should be composed of appropriately trained persons.
- Earlier they have been that ex officio even if that has not been in the charter.

ESMQ Editor:

- ... ESMQ editor should be a member ex officio, but without voting rights on every issue concerning financial and contractual ESMQ matters.
- ... The formal relations between the Board and ESMQ has to be in the Charter and Bye-Laws including whether the ESMQ Editor is a full board member or just an adjunct board member. In the same way the Scientific Chair could be invited to the ESMQ meeting. One idea could also be a joint EASM-ESMQ-meeting in September every year before the annual conference.

- All board members are volunteers, the ESMQ editor is not, hence, I would not be in favour of them becoming a board member if they are to be paid. ...
- No, but the above two are of paramount importance to be included. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- The SC and ESMQ should be on the charter and bye-laws. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- No, it would reduce flexibility of organisation within the board. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- The Scientific Chair and the ESMQ Editor have to refer to one scientific ethical framework fixed by the charter and bye-laws. This should help to avoid some ideological behaviours in rejecting certain contributions without respect to collegial evaluation when the contributions are multidisciplinary. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- The Charter should specify that the Scientific Chair and ESMQ Editor should be appointed by the Board. If the publisher of the Journal nominates a person, that person should be approved by the Board. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- I think should be changed *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- ... ESMQ editor and board need to be independent of the ESMQ board.
- It is right and proper to fix these two roles in the EASM constitution. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- I think the Editor of the journal should be built into the constitution as they have a fundamental role in the Association and Journal.
- What is the rationale for including them in the charter? Important in what sense? *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- They should be voting members of the Board if they have such important roles in relation to a major product of EASM (conference, journal) *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- So far the elections have worked well; I do not see any reasons to change the system. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- Board should have also people and responsibilities linked to impact of science, transmitting the results and committing key practitioners to engage into development (associations, governments). *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- I do not think that Scientific Chair and ESMQ Editor should be on the board. Both roles are important but do not require a position on the board. The board has many

different targets and needs a Scientific Chair and an ESMQ Editor to achieve these goals. However, I do see the need for a position on the board to strengthen relations between sciences and business. EASM has lost this USP over the years. This person should not be working in academia but she should have a sound knowledge of academia. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*

- They should be automatically part of the charter and bye-laws. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- yes, change is necessary *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- I think the Chair and ESMQ Editor should be included in the chapter and bye-laws. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- (I still do not get what this charter will help in this regard) *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- ESMQ Editor should be a standing board role
- To strengthen the academic pillar of EASM seems to be an important aspect for the future of the association. Therefore, I absolutely support the idea to make them part of the Charter and bye-laws. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- If the importance of these two positions is beyond that which could be taken care as an ad hoc function then yes change the bye-laws *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- I believe that the chairman and board of directors should be composed of appropriately trained persons. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*
- Earlier they have been that ex officio even if that has not been in the charter. *[also mentioned under the SC section]*

Other thoughts:

- I would suggest to have at least one student representative for two years, which could be elected by the board. Ideally two of these roles where one have focus towards student seminars and the other PhD seminars and perhaps one of each gender.
- Responsible for involving new members/universities/countries should be useful.
- Role/position on Sport Management education. Create something like COSMA for quality improvement
- Education
- Grad student representation

- I do not know the positions and bye laws well enough to comment.
- introduction of permanent working groups, e.g. - for social media - students and PhD candidate
- Would think about someone to deal with the professional sector in sport management to bridge the gap between academy and profession
- Representative of sportmanagers in practice
- I don't need extra / other positions but I would like to see how each position / person is going to contribute to the (very long) list of aims, objectives and properties.
- In line with this, the EASM student representative should be defined as a clear role with all its duties and responsibilities.
- I would make differences between sportsmanagement and sportsmarketing, positions in the board should have pointed representatives from both worlds
- I think, it is important to institutionalize (however, not restrict too much) also the students' representing person.
- Early Career Researcher?

Please put any other suggestions for the charter and bye-laws in the fields provided for this purpose:

Suggestions concerning the mission of EASM

- Be more open to industry people, business people and professionals in sport. The name is european association for sport management not for sport research management
- Improve visibility in international sports media
- I am unsure about the 'teaching sport management' mission that could come in competition with Universities and teaching institutions, that are members. There are no EASM teachers, and there should not be EASM teachers. EASM can organise seminars but they should rely on institutions and individuals who are members. For that reason, EASM should be a organiser, a facilitator but not a teacher per se.
- Help young doctors and researchers to find their first job by broadcasting job offers
- The aims and objectives are rather clumsy and repetitive at times. There is no word on the Board strategic role, which needs to be explicit. There is a need to discuss the

role of different commissions and their formation. Section 9 needs to be expanded and include the permissible sources of financing of EASM. Consider a by-law to article 2 Seat - the EASM office shall be at the Secretary General institution.

- Further encouragement of PhD level research and support / opportunities for early career researchers. Grants / scholarships / research and teaching exchange opportunities.
- It is strange that relations with sports organisations are not even mentioned in the aims, objectives and properties of the association. What is the goal of researching/lecturing in sport management if we are not seeking dialogue with the sports organisations. EASM should try to include sports organisations more and seek dialogue with them (scientists should confront their research with the reality faced by sports organisations, listen to what they are interested in/what could help them, etc).
- the Future focus to be highlighted, anticipation and acting as agent of change and development
- To strengthen the link between academia and business (increase the importance of the organization for the business sector)
- Strengthening the position of research in sports. Involve societal expertise; more companies, government representatives, major brands,.... during the conference and in publications.
- I think the list of Aims, Objectives and Properties is too long. Also they are all on the same 'level'. I rather see one clear goal. Improving sportmanagement in Europe (or something comparable) and than a list with things we do. In order to do so
- Easm should facilitate and promote exchange of researchers, teachers and students as well as practitioners in sport management
- Continue the Student and PhD orientation
- Easm should differentiate in sportsmanagement and sportsmarketing
- Create and coordinate some open research projects that could be joined by researchers around the world
- I believe that to contact with the people of sports science and management science generally and to send them scientific article or other important ideas which help them with career or they job.
- It should be clearly stated that to organize the EASM conference is the main task.

Please put any other suggestions for the charter and bye-laws in the fields provided for this purpose:

Suggestions concerning the EASM General Assembly

- shorter
- In order to attract engagement from the newest members and potential members during the conference the EASM General Assembly should try to educate or inform in an easy way the days before the GA takes place. This could be done by providing an email and/or providing a information sheet during the stay of when the GA is, why it is important to participate and what will happen during the GA. If you are not a member at the days during the GA takes place, chances are that you will feel excluded of what to do during the conference if you can't do anything at the GA. Maybe you still want to participate and watch it but without any further information at the location the risk is that potential members lose interest and walk away.
- Because of the below clause, there are conference delegates who cannot exercise their voting rights in the GA 'that' year's conference. By-laws amendments suggest that they can now become member prior the GA (i.e., Tuesday?, Wednesday morning?). Would the alternative resolving the issue be membership to begin the 1st day of each calendar year? 6.4.3 The membership year shall be from the end of one Annual General Meeting of the General Assembly to the end of the next Annual General Meeting. – We should monitor how many and who (member) is attending the GA. I am not sure this is the case at the moment. A special 'e-thank you' (and/or listing names who attended on the website) could be something towards encouraging participation in the GA.
- shorter or at least concentrating the conference time and leave at the end visits or other issues. More networking
- Make it less administrative and more open to discuss few, but fundamental, questions proposed several weeks before the date.
- should elect the Scientific chair
- Maybe some invitation to non-EASM members (e.g politicians, stakeholders etc.) who might be valuable contributors to disseminate the ideas and aims of EASM through outside parties.
- Allow for a free and frank discussion at the Assembly, where critique is part of the discussion. The testiness, and behavior of, I believe it was the general secretary, a

German gentleman who may have been a Dean of School of Business was appalling at the General Assembly in Bern. (My apologies but I cannot remember the gentleman's name).

- These event needs to be made more relevant to the members. Attendance tends to be poor and many delegates use the AGM to have a half day away from the conference.
- Documents according to the Agenda of the EASM General Assembly should be posted on the website that all members could read.
- People who can not attend should be allowed to let someone talk in their behalf or should be able to submit a video / audio speech.
- Increased members from Asia.
- Communication should be direct with members about all aspects to do with the GA - and there should be a monthly news bulletin
- I believe that it should be made up of different people every time.

Please put any other suggestions for the charter and bye-laws in the fields provided for this purpose:

Suggestions concerning the election

- No Nomination Committee needed No proxy voting Make sure that the nationality rules of EASM are in line with EU rules.
- NO NOMINATION COMMITTEE
- You should only be able to vote on people who are present at the GA or on those that have given a reason for absence.
- If sport commercial organisations become members, how making sure EASM remain an academic institution? It might be to cautious, but I would like seeing something saying that academics should remain the majority of individuals on the board.
- The procedure in Bern was a bit unclear which caused irritation. Needs to be clearer.
- Give preference to secret ballot Give preference to short mandates
- It is a problem that only members that attended the last conference are eligible for election. Another better rule could be to approve members with two or three attendences. For geographic eligibility, passport should be the only criteria.

- Call for candidacy should be open prior EASM conference. Resumes (and potentially a letter in which each candidate would express their ideas and aims) should be provided to all EASM member a few weeks prior to the election.
- The election was extremely poorly run in Bern. As was the general meeting. I would endorse stronger leadership and thought to make the election and assembly more professional.
- Skip country ratios. The candidate with the most votes should be elected.
- Election should be online so all members participate, prior to the conference not at the conference (as happens in a number of other Academic associations)
- The voting process in Bern was amateurish and we need to embrace technology to administer the vote.
- Candidates should be suggested by three EASM members outside of EASM board from different nations with different gender and three EASM board members. This suggestion should be supported by minimum three EASM board members to guarantee continuity and team spirit.
- Set up a more formal event rather than distributing cards to the audience
- Make sure you have a good balance between the pure high standard academics, and the people that implement more/link with practitioners. Much more work needs to be done on research, the academic level of EASM (upgrade). I find it very important that an ESMQ member, takes actively part in EASM board meetings. Now that I'm not a board member anymore, I started to realise that -within the board- only few people are aware of the characteristics of publishing in journals like ESMQ.
- Process and eligibility should be made clear. Proxy voting should be allowed to ensure all paid up members have a vote. This would mean voting before the Conference, and thus these votes would be from members who have been part of EASM for a least a year. Online voting would allow the new Board to be in place before the EASM Conference.
- See suggestion for nomination committee only addition to election process
- only members should be elected and decided

Please put any other suggestions for the charter and bye-laws in the fields provided for this purpose:

Suggestions concerning the Executive Committee

- Should include Scientific chair
- Representatives from sports organisations should be included. Should be a quota for women (e.g. at least 1/3). Our field really needs to make women researchers more visible.
- Minutes of the EC meetings should be shared between all Board Members.
- Election by general assembly
- If a board member steps down or takes on another board role their position should be filled for a full term (not the remainder of the incumbent's term). It should be determined under what situations that if the board member's status changes during the term they should resign.

Please put any other suggestions for the charter and bye-laws in the fields provided for this purpose:

Suggestions concerning the terms of office

- Depending on the increasing workload EASM should carefully discuss 1) whether there should be a paid SG or 2) a hired EASM office manager to run the day-to-day businesses.
- 6.2.1 person appointed by the board . I think the board should remain the organ that decides. The board can appoint individuals to seek advice, but the approval should in the end be delivered by the board (maybe just a phrasing issue).
- I am critical to electing outgoing members as presidents or vice presidents, because it easily becomes a way to prolong board membership and once elected these persons are difficult to remove. I think they should be elected into these positions in their fifth year of service at the latest.
- Should follow good governance principle (age limit, max 2 or 3 terms)
- 3 years maximum, but with the opportunity for renewal for those who have provided exemplary service and shown boundless energy. A maximum of two consecutive terms but with the opportunity to return after one cycle out of the loop.
- 2 years

- Maybe we can do a suggest a term. For example 4 or 6 years and that people have to explain during the election why they want to have a shorter/longer term. So the members can agree to a longer term if necessary / welcome.
- The term for an elected board member should be in all cases three years and not linked to the remaining time when people stepped down. With the rule to get reelected just once this limits the time to be an EASM board member.
- Limited to 2 terms in one role and not more than 4 terms overall
- Alternate terms so there is some knowledge on the board as new members are added.
- In four years because the executive committee must be have very much time to saw they job.
- Rotating system, which is originally was

Please put any other suggestions for the charter and bye-laws in the fields provided for this purpose:

Other suggestions

- lower costs of participation
- Thank you for your service!
- In the bye-laws, clubs, leagues and athletes unions should be explicitly mentioned. Again, it should be mentioned that one of the goals of EASM should be to seek cooperation/dialogue with the sports sector.
- No other suggestions; keep up the good work. It is good to give members possible to contribute also this way. Greetings Kari
- I recommed that EASM should have much more strong conection with IFs and sport public sectors.
- The activities of EASM have to be shared on the website more often (not only on the newsletter) to avoid just formal way of communication that would help to increase the numbers of members. In the section Become a Member it has to be clear what kind of benefits each member will get as a member, for example reduced registration fee to the conference, weekly newsletters, full access to the ESMQ journal online, including back issues plus hard copies (when ordered) and latest articles (incl. DOI)

published ahead of print, full access to the advertise and search for sport management related employment opportunities and funding, full use of the EASM website to promote and search for sport management related scientific events, full access to the a platform for scientific cooperation among the sport management community, discount on books that EASM has cooperation with, opportunity to be included in the list of experts-reviewers database and etc. New Board members have to be elected at least for 2 years that could be more included in the activities and give added value for Association. Social networks of EASM must be updated each two weeks to be seen wider.

- All has been raised during previous meetings and I think easm is well aware. It is a matter of taking things up and follow up; here there were some barriers in the past.
 - Executive Committee members receive greater EASM support than other board members - this should be made transparent to all members.
 - I trust on the creativity, seriousness, engagement, commitment and intelligence of you responsible persons in developing EASM. Thank you for that.
 - §7.5.2 (1) should be deleted. It must be possible to put a new case on the agenda if 67% of the present members think so. It can have come up a case since the agenda was made. This is a usual possibility in democratic organizations. .
-