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PREZIDENT’S LETTER

Supporting the Regions

Thomas E. Callarman, Arizona State University

As was mentioned in the last letter, one of this year’s objectives for the Decision Sciences Institute is to continue to strengthen the relationships between the various regions and DSI, and among the regions themselves. A part of this includes the redesign of the Web page to improve the visibility of the regions as well as to foster better communication. The second part would be to call on the members of DSI to support their region(s) of choice through attendance at meetings and participation in other activities of the regions. This is the subject of my second letter.

I attended my first regional meeting of DSI in 1976 as a PhD student at Purdue University. My first meeting was a Midwest DSI meeting, and it was well attended by professors and graduate students from all over the Midwest. I quickly realized how important to my career participation in regional meetings would be. The attendees at this meeting included faculty and graduate students from almost all of the Big Ten Schools (Wisconsin, Purdue, Indiana, Michigan State, Minnesota, and Ohio State, at least), as well as representatives from many smaller schools. It was clear that there was a dynamic and healthy network that had been formed. During my years at Purdue and as an assistant professor at Bowling Green, I continued to develop my network of colleagues and friends. Some of my most cherished and long-lasting personal and professional friendships were developed in these early years.

I then moved on to Texas Tech, where I began attending both the Southwest and Western meetings. Again, there were professors and graduate students from all sorts of schools in attendance at the meetings. I began to encourage the PhD students from Tech to attend and network at the regional meetings. Some of those students have gone on to be officers and board members both of the regions and of DSI. Many have had successful research careers, as well, and I attribute that partly to the experiences of presenting their formative
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FROM THE EDITOR

G. Keong Leong, Management Department, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

T he hot summer is fading away quickly and before we realize it the fall semester will be here. We start off with a letter from our president, Professor Thomas E. Callarman, Arizona State University. He recalls having attended many regional DSI meetings during his early years as a faculty member. However, he observes that participants at recent regional meetings tend to be from local universities, with fewer faculty members from major universities. As such the regional meetings “no longer serves the networking function that it used to.” He feels that senior faculty should remember how they got started and continue to help build on the strength and quality of the regional organizations.

Professor Krishna Dhir, Berry College, in his article titled “Exploring Liberal Applications for Decision Analysis” notes that business schools today are encouraging cross-functionality in our curriculum, but the crossing of the boundaries tends to be within business functional areas. He suggests that decision analysts can benefit greatly from liberal arts. This view is consistent with a recent Wall Street Journal article (“Future CEOs May Need to Have Broad Liberal-Arts Foundation,” April 12, 2005) reporting that corporate CEOs are looking in graduates an understanding of philosophy, culture, social issues, human condition, etc., and not just disciplines and functions of business administration, from accounting to personnel. Liberally educated graduates are expected to be more adaptable to different cultures, and responsive to the responsibilities the corporation has to the society.

The POM feature article is entitled “The ACID test: An Extension of the Case Method,” written by Professor Vidyaranya B. Gargeya, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. ACID stands for Analysis and Application, Content and Conceptualization, Integration and Implementation, and Decision and Discrimination. The ACID test developed for MBA students taking the global operations strategy course involves a presentation and interactive discussion as part of the exam based on the write-up of organizations such as Deere-Hitachi Manufacturing Company, American Express Cards, VF Corporation, FedEx, Konica Manufacturing USA, United Healthcare International, R. F. Micro Devices, and United Guaranty Corporation. Overall, students agreed that the ACID test “added value to their learning experience.”

Professor Rick Hesse, Pepperdine University, examines the Traveling Sales Problem (TSP), which is NP-complete and difficult to solve optimally. He presents a 15-city geometrically accurate problem and shows how it can be solved heuristically with the help of the Premium Solver from Frontline Systems. The example represents a good illustrative exercise to enable students to observe different solutions to the problem.

“The Deans’ Perspective” column has two feature articles. In the first article, Milton R. Blood, former managing director, Accreditation Services AACSB International, discusses the issue of evaluating educational quality in business schools. He points out that the “new” AACSB standards contain several key features of quality in higher education that can be found in the three domains of strategic management, participants in the educational process (faculty, students, administrators, and staff), and assurance of learning (demonstration of student accomplishment).

In the second article, Professor Peter Barr, provost of Coastal Carolina University, feels that higher institutions should address “the perilous disconnect between what we higher education professionals understand to be our task and what the public understands to be our task” through public engagement. He describes Coastal Carolina’s Public Engagement Initiative, which has directly benefited both students and faculty.

G. Keong Leong is professor and chair of the Management Department in the College of Business, University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He holds a Bachelor of Engineering from the University of Malaya, an MBA and a Ph.D. from the University of South Carolina. Professor Leong has held leadership positions in Decision Sciences Institute such as at-large vice president, Doctoral Student Consortium coordinator, Instructional Innovation Award Competition coordinator, and POM track chair. He has published articles in Decision Sciences, Journal of Operations Management, Interfaces, Journal of Management, and other journals. His current research interests include international operations, operations strategy, technology management, and supply chain management. Professor Leong has co-authored two books, won teaching and research awards, and received the Educator of the Year award from the Asian Chamber of Commerce in Las Vegas.
Exploring Liberal Applications for Decision Analysis

by Krishna S. Dhir, Dean, Campbell School of Business, Berry College

Not long ago, a prestigious college in New York, renowned for its outstanding liberal arts curriculum, was searching for a suitable candidate to lead its business administration program. It had never awarded tenure to a business faculty member, and was engaged in a lively debate on the role of the business administration program in a liberal arts college. It would be fair to say that there was some hostility towards the business program when it was initiated a few years earlier. The predominantly liberal arts faculty was not fully reconciled to the presence of a professional program of study amidst them, and did not consider business administration to be a legitimate academic discipline. In the course of the search, the short-listed candidates were invited to the campus to meet with various constituencies, and they were also asked to make a presentation on a topic of their choice to the entire faculty community. One such candidate came prepared to speak on the issues of quality improvement leading to accreditation of the business administration program. However, as he rose to speak, a philosophy professor from the back of the room stood up and shouted a question: “Sir, why do you think that a business administration curriculum belongs in a liberal arts college?” The candidate paused, and asked, “How would you describe liberal arts?” The faculty member gave a precise response, “Life relevant!”

The candidate put away the notes he had prepared on the business accreditation because he felt a need to describe the humanity of business, if possible, in the language of liberal arts. He was going to speak extempore and from the heart. He proceeded to describe business activity as ‘life relevant.’ He described the conditions that created and guided the evolution of the corporation throughout the past four centuries, making it the youngest but still an important constituent institution of the modern society alongside those that have existed since pre-recorded history such as the family, government, church, and academe. He described the role of business in the shaping of American experience, history, and way of life, from the establishment of Jamestown to the exploration of space. He reminded his audience that in 1853, a decade before the Civil War, Melville had already written Bartleby, the Scrivener, placing it among the early literary works in America about business. With a subsidiary title, A Story of Wall Street, it addressed the darker, dehumanizing aspects of the emerging American financial district.

Then he spoke about the important role business has played in improving human condition, producing food and shelter, improving health, and extending life. He described business leaders as modern philosophers, who decentralize the political power of governance and define the course of our social system. He spoke of decision making as a human experience, quoting from Robert Frost’s The Road Not Taken to illustrate the relevancy of the process to living a life well and making a difference. Also, he commended to the audience William Dean Howells’s The Rise of Silas Lapham, another early work and a uniquely American fiction about business, written in 1885, that featured a rags-to-riches entrepreneurship, financial emergence, and decent good sense of propriety and prudence—today we have a word for this, ethics—that was...
much desired in a country recovering from the trauma of its Civil War. Some in the audience seemed persuaded. Others remained skeptical. The candidate was offered the job. However, dismayed by the collective failure of a liberal arts faculty to recognize business as an essential ingredient of the American way of life, he turned down the offer.

Whose Decision Is It, Anyway?
Both Melville and Howell, along with other 19th century writers in America, were writing about decision making. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, for instance, described purposeful, decisive action as the very essence of human existence in *A Psalm of Life*, published in 1838. However, the context of works by both Melville and Howell was the administration of business. Melville’s *Bartleby, the Scrivener* is a study of how individuals cope with painfully repetitive tasks that are routine, stunt creativity, and require no decisions. A stifled Bartleby insists on his right to make decisions and actively declares that he prefers inactivity. Howell, too, weaves his fiction to take Silas Lapham, a self-made Boston entrepreneur, and his family through a series of difficult, complex situations that tested him, his ethics, and his values. Lapham measures up to the challenges, makes difficult decisions, and stays true and honest. His rise as an ethical individual, however, spells the downfall of his business and brings an uncertain future to his family. Eventually, both Bartleby and Lapham, in their respective fictions, come to sad endings. Unfortunately, neither of them had the benefit of decision analysts, who specialize in aiding decision makers with an analysis of operational research. Their criticism of our practice lies, among other things, in the absence of an element deemed by them as essential to operational research, that being the involvement of the decision maker who is to be the beneficiary of operations research in the first place. They say so in no uncertain terms (Ackoff, 1979; Pidd, 2001). One would infer from this argument that the exercise of applied mathematics as a discipline is deemed an aspect of mathematics separate and distinct from operations research, and analysis of hypothesized problems represented in the sophisticated mathematical language of high complexity brings little life to operations research as a discipline. It is demanded that the decision maker be invited by the analyst to participate in the process of analysis, and the gap between the decision maker and the decision analyst be minimized (Churchman & Schainblatt, 1965; Dhir, 2001). Whatever the merits of the British pronouncement on the status of operations research in the U.S., it is easy to accept that the inclusion of the decision maker in the problem-solving team would make for exciting operation research. At the very least, cooperation and knowledge sharing enhances the efficiency of problem solving. In a problem-solving team, the knowledge regarding the definition of the decision problem resides in the individual seeking to make a decision. The issue is that of relevance to the decision problem as perceived by the decision maker, not the analyst.

History and the Telling of Stories
It is not unreasonable to expect of the decision analyst to ensure that the analysis presented to the decision maker carries relevance to the decision maker’s situation. What are the criteria of relevance? Where would the analyst find these criteria? Clues to relevancy may indeed be obtained by exploring the story told by the decision maker. The criteria of relevance may also be gleaned from the history of the decision maker. It has been said that “storytelling is a relentless human urge, and its power forges with memory to become the foundation of history.” (Annenberg/CPB, 2000a). Clues to relevancy may be found in both the decision maker’s internal history and external history. The internal history accounts for the decision maker’s sentiments, motivations, psychology, and personal experiences and conditions. The external history presents a public and social accounting of what transpired, even if by a third party. The story told by a person whose eyesight is restored by a surgeon would differ markedly from the same story told by the surgeon (Dhir, 1990). The analysis of a problem described by a decision maker must consider these different histories. Niebuhr (1989) states:

> Events may be regarded from the outside by a nonparticipating observer; then they belong to the history of things. They may be apprehended from within as items in the destiny of persons and communities; then they belong to a life-time and must be interpreted in a context of persons with their resolutions and devotions. (Niebuhr, 1989, p. 31)

It is noteworthy that, in general, the study of external history is impersonal. Such a study may deal with stories of objects, things, ideas, interests, movements, and human beings—but essentially as a thing or an element. The study of internal history, however, deals with stories of a personal nature. These are stories not of ideas or things, but of selves and of the soul itself.

In addition to enhancing the efficiency of problem solving, cooperation and knowledge sharing improves the relevancy of the decision analyst’s work. However, the challenge is a formidable one. The character of the decision maker is ever changing, responsive to experiences encountered and utilities derived. The adaptability of the decision maker to the environment in which the decision problem resides also makes the decision maker supple. Therefore, the story told by him or her is subject to many interpretations. History, too, has its limitations. Professor Donald L. Miller of Lafayette College describes history as a “crippled discipline.” According to him, history is “a discipline
that can’t get at the truth.” Storytelling, too, is flawed. As Professor Miller describes it, one’s narrative is “a brain-washer” based on one’s “own point of view and perspective” (Annenberg/CPB, 2000a). Yet, it is this personal point of view that defines the decision problem. Therefore, knowledge of the relevant history, crippled or otherwise, is essential to the analysis of the decision.

Decision Analysis with and for Liberal Arts

This brings us to the crux of the issue. The decision analyst has much to gain through the study of liberal arts. Also, the decision analyst has much to contribute to the liberal arts. Virginia Schraff, a historian at the University of New Mexico, stipulates that history must answer true/false questions all the time (Annenberg/CPB, 2000a). The same is true for decision analysis. The criteria of relevance require that throughout the process of analyzing a decision problem, the analyst copes with recurring true/false questions. The analyst must continually ascertain those facts that inform the decision maker’s narrative, or the history that defines the decision problem as told by the decision maker. The analyst must do this to put flesh and blood on the bones. Decision analysis is more than computations with figures and statistics. The decision analyst, like the historian, must cope with “the realm of the undecided” (Annenberg/CPB, 2000a), along with the associated ethical challenges. H. Richard Niebuhr offers us insights into how story and history provide meaning in our lives, actions and behavior, and information on the standards of behavior we refer to as morality, and on the standards of beliefs supporting a particular view of morality we refer to as ethics. In Niebuhr’s own words:

It is one thing to perceive from a safe distance the occurrences in a stranger’s life and quite a different thing to ponder the path of one’s own destiny, to deal with the why and whence and whither of one’s own existence. (Niebuhr, 1989, p.29)

Problems facing the decision maker usually transcend disciplines. Yet, we in the business of analyzing decision problems have been particularly inefficient in benefiting from a wide range of disciplines available to us. While increasing emphasis is being placed in our business schools on the assurance of cross-functionality in our curriculum, this crossing of the boundaries is generally limited to those of functional areas within business administration.

The question is whether the analytic treatment of the decision-making process accounts for the broader consideration of human condition. There is much at stake. My colleagues in liberal arts tell me that narrating stories creates a culture. In operations research, the language we use is that of mathematics. It is seldom the language of the decision maker. If we were to use the language of the decision maker as well, applied mathematics would make for some good operations research and change the culture of our practice. Also, my liberal arts colleagues tell me that good drama results from well-conceived actions, executed in a timely fashion. Good actions result from good decisions. Applied mathematics with some drama could result in good operations research. With the knowledge of liberal arts, we could expand the realm of operations research application.
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The “ACID Test”: An Extension of the Case Method

by Vidyaranya B. Gargeya, Bryan School of Business and Economics, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

The case methodology for the purposes of instruction was first initiated by Christopher Langdell at the Harvard University Law School around 1870 (Osigweh, 1989). The Harvard Business school adopted this approach in the early 1920s, thanks largely to the pioneering works of Wallace B. Donham (Copeland, 1954; Donham, 1949). Since that time, it has become a very popular vehicle in imparting knowledge in business schools across the country. With particular reference to courses in operations management, Bandyopadhyay (1994) made a strong recommendation for a greater emphasis on using the case approach as opposed to the conventional lecture method. Osigweh (1989) has enumerated many major sets of appeals for the case approach over the conventional methods of teaching:

1. focuses on “doing” in a classroom setting as a way to improve skill development;
2. enhances learner development of verbal and written communication skills;
3. fosters mastery through the invitation to solve a mystery;
4. possesses an illustrative quality;
5. exposes learners to a wide range of true-to-life management problems;
6. enables the learners to explore the situation and listen to one another’s views without directly confronting the actual, sensitive issues;
7. offers a vehicle for constructive change;
8. inspires interest in otherwise theoretical and abstract training material;
9. provides concrete reference points that foster learning by association and help bridge the gap between theory and practice; and
10. helps unlearn skilled incompetence.

Over the years, the approach has been criticized for several shortcomings. Osigweh (1989) listed actual or potential weaknesses in the approach as follows:

1. the case and its discussion focus on the past and static considerations;
2. inhibits “double-loop learning”;
3. reduces the learner’s ability to draw effective generalizations;
4. diminishes individual accountability for learning and promotes the development of “parasitic” attitudes among learners;
5. reinforces norms of non-criticism and thus inhibits the growth of knowledge;
6. may foster "groupthink"; and
7. may compromise quality for quantity of interaction.

The "ACID Test" was developed to overcome some of the shortcomings of the conventional case methodology. It is a unique combination of a "live" case study, an interactive "guest" speaker presentation, and a comprehensive written exam. The "ACID Test" is particularly useful in the area of operations management because it combines several vital aspects of learning to help make the case "come alive" to the student. This article describes the method and evaluates the effectiveness of applying this approach.

ACID Test

The ACID Test was introduced into the Global Operations Strategy (MBA 627) course, a required module in the three-tiered MBA program at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG). Generally, the students in this program take the course after having completed at least about 30 credit-hours of course work in the basic (functional) areas (such as Presentation and Interpretation of Financial Statements; Economic Analysis; Organizational Behavior; Financial Management; Marketing Management; and the Operations Function), foundation level knowledge (such as Advanced Business Statistics; Ethics, Public Policy, and Business; Cost Management Systems; Economic Policy and the Global Environment; Management Science; International Business; and Business Processes and Information Technology), and a core strategic course in the Analysis of the Business Environment. The Global Operations Strategy course is one of the strategic management core courses (Strategies for Managing Human Resources; Creating Value through Financial Policy; Advanced Marketing Management; Global Operations Strategy; and Strategy Implementation). Each of the required courses accounts for 1.5 semester credit hours. Each course runs for eight weeks (one-half of a semester) and class meetings are held once a week. In addition to the 33 credit hours of required courses, 15 more credit hours of elective courses are needed by the students to complete the MBA program at UNCG.

The word "ACID" in the ACID Test is an acronym for Analysis and application, Content and conceptualization, Integration and implementation, and Decision and discrimination. It is imper-ative that MBA students, once having gone through the program, are in a position to place the content learned in the right perspective and conceptualize the issues at hand, integrate the material, analyze a given situation and apply the principles appropriately, discriminate between when to make a decision and when not to as well as between the relevant and irrelevant issues, make the right decision, and then implement the decision.

The ACID Test was developed to comprehensively address the above mentioned objectives and is administered during the last meeting of the course module. One week prior to the end of the module, the students are given an eight page write-up on a specific real organization. The write-up is prepared by a senior executive of that organization in consultation with the professor. On the day of the exam, several questions relating to the organization are handed out to the students at the beginning of the class period. After the students have digested the questions for about five minutes, the senior executive of that organization walks in and makes a 20-minute presentation. After the presentation and before the students write their answers, the students are given time to elicit additional and relevant information, interactively, from the executive so as to answer the issues/questions on the written exam. The executive leaves the class room when the students start writing their answers to the questions in an hour period.

The presentation and interactive discussion (which lasts for about 60 minutes) as a part of the exam is the main thrust of the innovative effort. A good understanding of the content and concepts prior to taking the exam, integrating the issues during the presenta-tion, discriminating between the relevant and irrelevant information (and seeking it) during the discussion session, analyzing the qualitative and quantitative factors as new material is presented, moving towards the appropriate decision, and understanding the consequences of implementing it on the part of the students is a prerequisite for a good score on the ACID Test. The students are only graded on the written comprehensive exam and not separately on the extent of interaction with the executive during the discussion session. Just like chemical acids are used to check whether the metal is a "noble" one (such as gold, etc.) or not, the ACID Test is a good reflection of the quality of our students for managerial responsibilities.

Effectiveness and Benefits of the ACID Test

The effectiveness of the ACID Test approach from a student’s perspective was measured using a questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of specific questions as well as an open-ended one. The questionnaires were administered to sections of the Global Operations Strategy (MBA 627) course in 25 semesters from summer 1994 to fall 2004. There were about 25 students on the average in each of the classes. The organizations used for the ACID Test include Deere-Hitachi Manufacturing Company, American Express Cards, VF Corporation, FedEx, Konica Manufacturing USA, United Healthcare International, R. F. Micro Devices, and United Guaranty Corporation. Students were asked to rate on a five-point scale whether they strongly disagreed (1), disagreed (2), neither agreed nor disagreed (3), agreed (4), and strongly agreed (5) whether the ACID Test added value to their learning experience. An overwhelming majority of the students agreed (or strongly agreed) that the content of the presentation (87%), the
speaker and the process of the presentation (86%), and the overall Global Operations Strategy course (91%) added value to their learning experience. A sizable majority agreed (or strongly agreed) that the class discussion after the executive’s presentation (81%) and the overall method of presentation/examination in the form of the ACID test (75%) added value to their learning experience. When asked whether the ACID Test should be continued in the future, more than 78% of the students either agreed (or strongly agreed) that it should be.

In each of the modules when the course was run, the professor observed closely the process of the ACID Test while it was taking place. It should be pointed out that the quality of the discussions with each of the executives was extremely good. In addition, students were fairly accommodating to let others ask questions rather than usurping the time. The primary reason for this was that the students probably felt that rather than asking questions which may not add much value to their understanding for taking the written portion of the ACID Test, someone else might have something to query about which might add a greater value to their overall process. It was also observed that when a few (though substantially few in number) students sought information regarding irrelevant issues, the rest of the students did not take much notice of those acts. It was heartening to note that the students analyzed the information and applied the concepts, understood the content, integrated the material, understood the implications of implementation, made the right decisions, and discriminated the relevant issues from the irrelevant ones. This made the ACID Test a reality!

The student comments (from their responses to the questionnaire) also underscored the fact that a great deal of value was added to their learning experiences. A few of the comments are stated as follows:

The course has tied together a lot of what I have learned in previous courses. I enjoyed the exam format, and in particular, the access to the speaker. The direct feedback (excuse the pun) from the president [of the organization] brought the case ‘to life.’

I think the format [of the ACID Test] is a good way to deal with a real company. The opportunity to listen to and interact with speaker added a lot to the information from the case.

The presentation and exam method is the best I’ve had in the MBA program. Keep it up! It is real world and great experience. It was even fun! Imagine that in an exam.

I liked the novel and effective method of giving a final examination. I really enjoyed it and was able to tie a lot of the course together.

Overall, I think this type of exam is a great simulation and a good measure of critical thinking.

It was helpful to be presented with a real company to be able to address current issues. In addition, it is important to maintain the question and answer format for the discussion.

The faculty member greatly benefited by developing and running the ACID Test. The primary benefit has been the fact that the faculty member has gained insights into structuring the course based on real-world issues. The university and the business community have benefited with the initiation of a strong industry/university collaborative learning environment. This is very much in line with the thinking expressed by Robinson, Poling, Akers, Galvin, Artzt, and Allaire (1992), and Singhal and Hayes (1992). It is expected that in the near future, many more courses in our business school would be run using this methodology. The respective executives (and their organizations) who have taken part in different ACID Tests in the 10 years have expressed that these kinds of exercises have made them rethink some of the ways in which they conduct their business. Some of the executives requested to be invited back for repeat performances in other ACID Tests due to the tremendous benefits they experienced—and the faculty member complied with their requests. It is also expected that many more organizations in the area would take advantage of such approaches. In summary, it has been found students, business executives, and the business school have all benefited from the ACID Test.

The case approach may compromise quality for quantity of interaction. In the ACID Test, each student is not evaluated on the number of times he/she asks a question of the “guest” speaker, but rather on his/her performance on the comprehensive in-class written exam. Since the discussion time is limited to about 30 minutes, the students have to make use of the available time wisely and ask the relevant questions. This forces the students to move towards quality of interaction rather than quantity. It has been observed by each of the professors that many of the students ignore an irrelevant question by a student and move on to other issues, thereby confirming that quality is also important to them as well.

In a conventional comprehensive written (in-class or out-of-class) exam based on a previously written case study, the students are unable to extract information beyond what is presented in written form. In such an instance, students require clarifications on the facts of the case presented. Usually, the instructor clarifies through his/her own interpretations. The students’ understanding and perceptions of the facts of the case are blurred by the instructor’s interpretation of the situations. Whereas in the ACID Test, the students get an opportunity to seek the clarifications directly from the individual (i.e., the senior executive from the organization) who has all the relevant facts.

The ACID Test is a versatile method and can be adopted for most courses in any MBA program and a few advanced courses at the undergraduate level. The approach is appropriately suited for interdisciplinary courses as well. Most business schools are located close to organizations and this should make it possible for active cooperation between business schools and organizations and for professors to generate more ACID Tests in the courses they teach.

See POM, page 35
Alldifferent Constraint and the Traveling Sales Problem Heuristics (Part I)

by Rick Hesse, Feature Editor, Pepperdine University

Back in the days of rotary calculators and vacuum tube computers with punch cards and plug-board compilers (IBM 650), I took my first OR/MS course, and the one problem that really caught my attention was the Traveling Salesman problem (to be politically correct now, let’s call it the Traveling Sales Problem). It was so easy to state: Minimize cost, time, or distance for a salesperson to visit “n” cities once and only once and return to the start. But the problem quickly becomes impossible to enumerate all the possible solutions and choose the best one, even on those “new” computers—and still stretches the limit of any computer power available these days. Mathematicians call this type of problem NP-complete, and there are n!/2 possible solutions for a symmetrical problem (distance from city A to B is the same as B to A). This number grows astronomically large and computing even millions of routes per second would require millions of years to enumerate all possible solutions for a 30-city problem. Optimal solutions for this problem are difficult to achieve on a spreadsheet for even moderate-sized problems (up to 14 cities which means 14^2 = 196 variables, solving it as an assignment problem with constraints).

Heuristics

If the problem is geometrically proportional, we know that the optimal tour cannot intersect itself. Figure 1 shows that the top path must be longer than the bottom one, because each dotted line is the hypotenuse of a triangle, which must be longer than either leg. Therefore AC is longer than CD for triangle ACD and BD is longer than AB for triangle ABD.

But just because a tour has no intersections, does not mean that it is the minimum length. And if the time or cost between stops is not geometrically proportional (and what airline fares are?!), then even looking at the loop does not yield any useful information. The well-known Two-Opt procedure (Lin) uses a heuristic to remove all sets of two links and reconnect to determine if there is a smaller tour cost or length, and has proven an effective way to deal with large problems. But this too is difficult to perform on a spreadsheet.

Traveling Sales Spreadsheet

A 15-city problem, compliments of Steve Sacks of the University of Connecticut is shown in Figure 2, with a heuristic solution that gives 558 total miles (Sacks). Steve (Stephen.Sacks@UConn.edu) has a nice Visual Basic program which allows students to attempt to find the optimal solution to this geometrically accurate TSP (and also 6-, 10-, and 13-city versions), and then the user can see the results of the “nearest neighbor” and 2-opt procedure. The spreadsheet shown in Figure 2 uses the distance table in E22:T37 to compute the distances along the path in D4:D18, and the graph points are plotted using the distances normalized on a 10-point scale in C22:D37. Although this path does not intersect itself, it is not optimal. Each number in A4:A18 indicates the beginning city in each link in the corresponding column B, and the city in column C is the ending city of the
link corresponding to the number in column A in the next row. This means 14→3 is Waterbury to Hartford for 23 miles. The tour “wraps around” with 11→14. The total tour length is in cell D19 and is the sum of D4:D18. The templates appearing in this column are available on the Decision Line website from links at www.decisionsciences.org/DecisionLine).

**Alldifferent Constraint in Premium Educational Solver**

The Premium Solver from Frontline Systems (Frontline Systems, http://www.Solver.com) and the Educational Premium Solver that accompanies most texts that teach management science has a feature that is extremely valuable for solving this problem. An integer constraint named Alldifferent is available which must be used with the Evolutionary Solver (also only available in the Premium Solver Platforms). This constraint allows the Solver to start from an initial solution and then employs branch and bound to find the best possible ordering of the set of “n” numbers (1, 2, 3, …, n) that minimizes or maximizes the objective function. It does not perform implicit enumeration of all possibilities (so there is no guarantee of optimality) but does investigate a large number of possibilities from the current best solution. To set up and execute this heuristic, the “Premium” button must be selected in the Educational Premium Solver, so that the “Standard” button shows. Then you click on the dropdown box and select Standard Evolutionary for the type of solver. Then click the “Add” button and highlight the decision variables in A4:A18 and select “dif” as shown in Figure 3.

**Solution**

The initial setup for the decision variables must be any number in the range 1→15 (in fact, can be all 1’s), and I have found that you don’t even need a good solution to start with. Figure 4 shows that just starting with the numbers in rank order gives an “etch-a-sketch” solution of 1,244 miles that is clearly not optimal.

After over 100,000 subproblems have been run, the Solver stops and states that it cannot improve the solution of 553 miles (shown in Figure 2). By running the Solver again, entering the same starting point of 1→15 (or choosing a new starting point of all 1’s or 15→1) the optimal solution of 548 miles is obtained, as shown in Figure 5. It may be that different computers will arrive at different answers due to round-off, etc. It is well worth trying several sets of starting points to see if an improvement can be made. Because this model does not have to be run as an assignment problem with break tours (to find the optimal), there are just “n” variables instead of “n^2” variables, which means we can attempt a problem with 200 cities instead of just 14, since the standard Solver included in Excel (as well as the Educational Pre-

![Figure 1: Triangle Proof of Non-intersecting Traveling Sales Tour.](image1)

![Figure 2: 15-city Problem Heuristic Solution.](image2)
mium Solver) has a limit of 200 variables.

Traveling Sales String

With almost the same setup as the TSP, the Traveling Sales String (TSS) minimizes the distance, cost, or time to visit all the cities but not return to the start (which I call a string instead of a tour). Figure 6 shows the solution, and the only difference between the TSP and TSS template is that the string length is \text{SUM(D4:D17)} instead of adding the length back to the beginning. There are still 15 variables (alldifferent), and again, choosing different starting points may result in different solutions. But this is still a very efficient heuristic and allows up to 200 cities. Of course, any of the templates shown in this column can be expanded to work with larger problems and the distances between cities do not have to be geometrically proportional, nor does there have to be a graph of these points. As an illustrative exercise in class, it is nice to be able to “see” different solutions, but cer-

Figure 3: Evolutionary Solver Setup with alldifferent Constraint.

Figure 4: Initial Solution for 15-city Problem.
To Be Continued

In the next issue I will show how to make a change in the template to tackle the Delivery Problem, where you can have more than one tour returning to the base and also attempt to keep the same number of stops for each tour.
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Through its accreditation function, the AACSB International seeks continuous quality improvement in the content, delivery, and administration of management education. In this essay, Dr. Milton R. Blood, formerly the managing director of the AACSB’s Accreditation Services, describes how to spot quality in education. While doing so, he explains how the AACSB developed the new accreditation guidelines adopted by its members in 2003. The reader learns first-hand from one who was intimately involved in the process of revision what the new standards have in common with previous standards, and how they present departures.

Spotting Quality

by Milton R. Blood, Former Managing Director, Accreditation Services, AACSB International

Bulletin Boards! Not the carefully managed ones that hang behind glass, but the bulletin boards that line busy hallways and display both official and casual notices. Over many years of visiting schools and examining voluminous data to spot the quality of education dispensed, I’ve noticed that these semi-controlled signposts are excellent indicators of educational and intellectual activity of the school where they are found. Some are cluttered with offers of cheap magazine subscriptions, reminders of pitcher night at Bubba’s, and temp warehouse work opportunities. Others are filled with notices of distinguished visiting speakers, advertisements for upcoming chamber music series, meeting news from discipline-based clubs, and fliers for summer learning opportunities and graduate study. Bulletin boards reflect the seriousness of purpose both of the persons who post notices and of their intended readers. They provide unobtrusive indicators of educational quality.

Potential students, and also especially their parents, want to know how good a school is before they enroll. Potential faculty members want to know the quality of an institution they are considering joining. Magazines look for indices to use to rank schools. Many people look for signs of quality in education. But no one expends as much effort on the task of evaluating educational quality as accreditors. They pour over extensive self reports from the schools, examine comparative data, send teams of evaluators to visit the campus where they meet with a wide variety of interested parties, and then they deliberate carefully over all that they discover. Yet even with all of this information, the phenomenon of educational quality is elusive enough that the accreditors constantly ask if they have gathered the correct data and asked the right questions.

A few years ago at a regional meeting of business school deans I posed this question. “Suppose you must choose a business school for your son or daughter. You can choose among as many schools as you want, but you can only know three things about each school. What are the three things you would want to know so that you could choose on the basis of educational quality?” The answers contained the usual ideas about what constitutes quality in education and a few unexpected notions. Among the anticipated answers were, of course, faculty qualifications, curriculum content, job placement of recent graduates, characteristics of the student body including entrance exams, etc. Some of the less anticipated indices proposed were proximity to a metropolitan area, dollars spent on teaching
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technology per student, student body diversity, and strength of programs in the natural sciences. This was an artificial exercise, but one that asked the deans in attendance, “How do you spot educational quality?”

In my time (more than 20 years) directing the accreditation efforts of AACSB International we have twice undertaken a complete review and revision of the accreditation standards. These efforts represented searches for the most effective indicators of quality. In each case, a group of diverse and respected educational thinkers was assembled as a task force to engage this complex task. Additionally, each task force made a concerted effort to draw ideas from the membership and other higher education thinkers so that the resulting revised standards would reflect a broad array of perspectives. No part of the previous standards was “off limits” to a task force. That is, their charge was to create standards that identified educational quality, however different their approach might be when compared to previous approaches. No sacred cows enjoyed privileged status if a strong case could not be made for their inclusion.

Inevitably, the revisions that resulted were influenced by the issues that were current in the higher education and management education communities at the time. Likewise, the revisions were influenced by concerns and emphases of the contributing persons, and as AACSB standards they showed the effect of traditions in business education and in AACSB accreditation. Standards that emerged from the 1991 changes and the 2003 changes had much in common with earlier standards, and at the same time they presented significant differences.

What the “new” standards had in common with preceding standards was a core of key features of quality in higher education. Thus, regardless of changes in the organization or vocabulary of the standards, they were sure to include something about the intellectual capital represented in the faculty, educational content of curricula, and resources devoted to education. AACSB and business education traditions assured that they would include attention to intellectual contributions of faculty members and to general education as a part of the undergraduate experience. These were not included merely because of the tradition, but because among business educators strong support exists for them in defining quality.

Both sets of revised standards also included features that were new in either focus or emphasis. The standards adopted in 1991 introduced a formal declaration of mission-linked accreditation, attention to management processes, and measured educational outcomes. The 2003 revision brought increased systematic consideration to strategic management and to student-faculty interactions, and it required direct observation of learning accomplishment.

To better define the intentions residing in the most recent standards, I wish to direct your awareness to the three major subdivisions of the 2003 standards. These reflect the thinking of the task force that educational quality can be spotted in these three categories of educational characteristics—strategic management, participants, and assurance of learning. These categories became the organizing structure for the standards. While many of the specific accreditation requirements of the standards within these categories are familiar from prior standards, these organizing domains, themselves, convey intentional meaning about what creates quality in business education.

**Strategic Management**

Strategic management, simply put, is a focus of resources and efforts toward established priorities. It is about operations and implementation, not planning and documents. It is about what happens in the daily, weekly, and annual activity of organizations. Whether or not the organization has something called a “strategic plan” is not the focus of this set of standards. In fact, the standards ask for only a minimum of official documents that guide operations and form part of the fulfillment of the strategic management standards.

The accreditation applicant must have some way to state its priorities publicly. The standards ask for a “mission statement” to accomplish this. Of course, it is not having a document by that name that is important; the critical factor is that the applicant school operates from an explicit indication of its operating priorities whether in something called a mission statement, a vision statement, both a mission statement and a vision statement, or in some other document(s). These days most schools put this statement on a web site, in catalogs and brochures, and other materials that describe the purpose of the school. In some way, this statement answers the question, “How is the world different because this school exists?”

This priority statement (mission statement) must have certain features. It must be publicly available so that it is known to major constituents. It must demonstrably play a role in decisions made in the operations of the school. Its construction and its periodic review should involve various constituents of the school. It or other documents should state the school’s expectations concerning faculty members’ intellectual contributions, and it should describe the student populations served by the school. Major and critical characteristics of the priority statement are to distinguish the school from others and to clearly state important aims of the school.

As another part of the documentation of its strategic management, the applicant school must also list its “action items,” those actions to be taken in the next year or two to enact the priorities shown in the mission statement. The actions items may be a diverse set of steps such as hiring or replacing a faculty member, reviewing a curriculum, renovating classroom space, etc. Importantly, the action items must be consonant with the priorities revealed in the mission. That is, the actions items show how the school is creating and enhancing quality in the declared areas of em-
phasis. Further, the school is expected to disclose the financial implications of the action items. This ensures that action items that require additional resources are not just a wish list. Of course, all action items do not require new funds. Some will require no new funds (e.g., review the BBA curriculum), and some will generate funds (e.g., implement a fee-for-service distinguished speakers series).

It is not enough that the school has these minimal documents, that is, a mission statement and action items. The school must show a pattern of strategic management of its activities that implements the mission statement through a focus of resources and efforts on the stated priorities. For schools that have achieved accreditation and are in the maintenance of an accreditation program, these strategic management activities assume even more importance; they become the focus of the periodic five-year reviews. Thus, having demonstrated the level of quality required for initial accreditation, the school shows how it deploys resources and efforts to maintain and improve quality and to achieve the distinguishing priorities it acknowledges in its mission statement. This leadership toward quality embodied in the strategic management standards is the first arena in which the accreditation process spots quality in business education. These standards look at the stewardship of resources and whether the school applies resources toward the most important ends.

Participants

The second domain of accreditation standards spots quality by looking at the participants in the educational process. This includes faculty, students, administrators, and staff. The standards inquire about the characteristics of participants and about schools’ processes for serving student and faculty constituents in accord with the mission. They also speak to the specific responsibilities of faculty, administrators, staff, and students in fulfilling their roles.

In addition, a standard regarding faculty sufficiency raises the issue of interaction between and among faculty and students. Interaction among participants is a feature that educational researchers have found to be extremely important as a part of the student learning experience. The interpretive materials for the standards enunciate a new set of principles to describe the expectations with regard to interaction (AACSB International Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation, 2005, p. 38).

The shift to assurance of learning is the largest conceptual change in the 2003 standards. It signals a strong concern for the products of our schools, and it is in line with programs in other areas of higher education and in the larger society that call for enhanced accountability.

Student-Faculty Interaction Principles

1. Interaction opportunities are available to meet unique needs of individual students. Students have opportunities to gain assistance regarding idiosyncratic questions and needs in interactions with faculty members, staff, and other students.

2. Interactions are consistent with the school’s mission and characterized by integrity and respect among participants. The interactions that students have with faculty members, staff, and operations of the school are consistent and reliable. Students’ views and circumstances are not neglected in the learning experiences. A level of professionalism is practiced among participants.

3. Constituent groups have opportunities to learn from each other. Learning experiences provide opportunities for sharing of knowledge and experience from faculty to students, from students to faculty, among students, and among faculty. A learning community is established that allows free expression and continuous learning.

4. Students have access to disciplinary experts in curricular and extracurricular situations. Students have access to faculty members who have in-depth expertise in their fields of teaching. Course material, feedback on student performance, and extracurricular interactions are informed by faculty knowledge that is both current and relevant.

5. Interaction among faculty members produces a coherent and integrated learning experience. Degree programs result from coordinated faculty efforts to provide systematic, cumulative learning.

The concern for interaction among participants is a new issue introduced with the 2003 standards revision. It has high relevance for spotting educational quality.

Assurance of Learning

The third domain of interest for spotting quality in the accreditation process looks at direct demonstration of student accomplishment. The 1991 standards had introduced the concept of outcome measures, but that term was broadly defined to include both direct and indirect measures of student learning. The 1991 outcomes approach was in addition to the traditional look at curricular content. With the most recent standards change, the focus has been narrowed to only direct measures of student learning, and the prescriptive curricular approach has been dropped. In the thinking of the standards-generating task force, the previous curriculum standard indicated what the school intended to teach; the new assurance of learning approach is about what the students have actually learned. It is up to the school to set learning goals for each degree program and to demon-
Provost Peter Barr of Coastal Carolina University has pondered over the issue of institutional social contract and the responsibilities of a university to the community in which it resides. While we have a commendable tradition of taking research and teaching seriously, do we take our service contract with society seriously enough? Public engagement of a university requires its faculty members, staff, and students to collaborate with communities, agencies, organizations, business, and government to address critical societal issues and to share the university’s intellectual and cultural assets. At Coastal Carolina University, Provost Barr has not only sought quantifiable outcomes and convincing accountability of public engagement, he has gone further and committed the University to integrating an appreciation for social responsibility, personal responsibility, character/values/ethics, wellness, and environmental concerns into its culture. In the following essay he narrates this initiative.

An Institutional Public Engagement Initiative

by Peter Barr, Provost, Coastal Carolina University

In the hurly-burly of ending the fall semester, I found myself recalling Stanley Fish’s categorical and emphatic declaration in last year’s New York Times, “A professor’s job is to teach students, not to fashion citizens” (1).

As a chief academic officer, I monitor, regulate, and oversee the instructional proceedings of Coastal Carolina University. I take these duties seriously and I believe that this institution, along with others across the nation, does a commendable job of teaching the liberal arts and professional disciplines with an admirable body of qualified faculty. I do not dispute Professor Fish’s argument for the primacy of teaching. Rather, I believe his distinction between “teaching students” and “fashioning citizens” is a distinction without a difference. Furthermore, I believe that Professor Fish mistakenly commingles a professor’s discipline-governed job and an institution’s more inclusive job.

Any broad institutional public engagement addresses the perilous disconnect between what we higher education professionals understand to be our task and what the public understands to be our task. I cite two constituencies of higher education as examples. Despite the generous approbation regu-
larly accorded to colleges and universities by state and federal legislators, there is a distinctly grudging dispersal of funds. While I fully realize the highly competitive marketplace for public dollars, I am also keenly aware that the pervasive public distrust of governmental agencies extends to higher education and gets translated into legislation. Whatever motivates the distrust, I accept as true that we higher education professionals have made our case in a lacklustre way.

The second constituency representing this disconnect between them and us is a more vested group, the parents of our students. Each summer, I talk to the parents of incoming students. In addition to responding to the myriad of queries that typify any parent handing over a child to an institution, I ask what expectations they have of Coastal Carolina—what do they want us to do for their child. After eight years as a business dean and serving in my third year as provost, I have never been answered with “a clear understanding of Moby Dick” or “four accounting courses.” Rather what I repeatedly hear is “helping my son or daughter become someone who will make this world a little better place.”

So, if the public, students’ parents, and students themselves believe that “fashioning citizens” is the counterpart of “teaching students,” I would suggest that institutions of higher education take a corporate stance that benefits their immediate communities in a transparent and immediate way. I believe that “teaching students” and “fashioning citizens” should be indistinguishable because the latter will not only enhance our students’ grasp of content but will also provide meaningful public service.

I believe that “teaching students” and “fashioning citizens” should be indistinguishable because the latter will not only enhance our students’ grasp of content but will also provide meaningful public service.

The key ingredient to successful mentoring is an adequate and sustainable source of mentors. Coastal Carolina intends to be that source. With a comprehensive institutional commitment to building and supporting sustained mentoring relationships, Coastal Carolina’s goal is to transform at-risk students into successful students. With the right social stability and influence between the fourth- and tenth-graders, the majority of at-risk public school students can graduate. Addressing a declining graduation rate that ranks 50th nationally is intended to have a salutary effect on the University and the social and economic quality of life in South Carolina.

I recognize that the social and political justifications for Coastal Carolina’s Public Engagement Initiative, while perhaps critical to the institution’s wellbeing, do not attend directly either to the institution’s teaching and learning mission or to Fish’s argument. Moreover, my close acquaintance with the glacial nature of higher education recognizes that assigning substantial resources to an external agency demands no-nonsense justifications to students who worry about post-graduation employment and to faculty

**I believe that “teaching students” and “fashioning citizens” should be indistinguishable because the latter will not only enhance our students’ grasp of content but will also provide meaningful public service.**

Coastal Carolina has paired teams of two or three university students with a public school student. The team approach, which allows a sustained mentoring relationship for the public school students as university students matriculate or transfer, responds to numerous mentoring studies showing that short-term mentoring may do more harm than good. The accepted wisdom is that “the longer the mentoring relationship, the better the outcome” (3). Mentoring time was spent in establishing caring relationships between the university and the public school student. Tutoring, while occasionally useful to emphasize the importance of academic performance, plays a minor role in the mentoring process, which seeks to engage the broader range of human concerns and performances—social, emotional, and cultural.

The selection of a critical social concern that could purposefully engage the entire university evolved from the numerous studies and reports identifying South Carolina’s lack of a skilled and knowledgeable work force as the greatest danger to the state’s economic and social well being. The Foundations for the Future report funded by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education further focused and drove the relevant selection of an institutional commitment (4). Specifically, South Carolina’s high school graduation rate in 2003-04 ranks last in the nation with just 51 percent of students starting the ninth grade earning a high school diploma on time. The national average is 68 percent with the highest, New Jersey, graduating 86 percent.

Fortunately, experts in the field advise that students likely to drop out before graduating from high school can be identified as early as the fourth grade. Interestingly, South Carolina’s PACT test results show that fourth-grade students in our state score significantly better on nationally normed tests than do our eighth-graders. Moreover, not only can dropout candidates be identified early on, there are well-accepted retention methods that work. Chief among these methods is mentoring. The Horry County School District and a persuasive body of research believe that mentoring works. Studies regularly attest that mentoring achieves improved academic success, reduces substance abuse, and advances social attitudes and skills.

In collaboration with the Horry County School District, Coastal Carolina has paired teams of two or three university students with a public school student. The team approach, which allows a sustained mentoring relationship for the public school students as university students matriculate or transfer, responds to numerous mentoring studies showing that short-term mentoring may do more harm than good. The accepted wisdom is that “the longer the mentoring relationship, the better the outcome” (3). Mentoring time was spent in establishing caring relationships between the university and the public school student. Tutoring, while occasionally useful to emphasize the importance of academic performance, plays a minor role in the mentoring process, which seeks to engage the broader range of human concerns and performances—social, emotional, and cultural.

The selection of a critical social concern that could purposefully engage the entire university evolved from the numerous studies and reports identifying South Carolina’s lack of a skilled and knowledgeable work force as the greatest danger to the state’s economic and social well being. The Foundations for the Future report funded by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education further focused and drove the relevant selection of an institutional commitment (4). Specifically, South Carolina’s high school graduation rate in 2003-04 ranks last in the nation with just 51 percent of students starting the ninth grade earning a high school diploma on time. The national average is 68 percent with the highest, New Jersey, graduating 86 percent.

Fortunately, experts in the field advise that students likely to drop out before graduating from high school can be identified as early as the fourth grade. Interestingly, South Carolina’s PACT test results show that fourth-grade students in our state score significantly better on nationally normed tests than do our eighth-graders. Moreover, not only can dropout candidates be identified early on, there are well-accepted retention methods that work. Chief among these methods is mentoring. The Horry County School District and a persuasive body of research believe that mentoring works. Studies regularly attest that mentoring achieves improved academic success, reduces substance abuse, and advances social attitudes and skills.

The key ingredient to successful mentoring is an adequate and sustainable source of mentors. Coastal Carolina intends to be that source. With a comprehensive institutional commitment to building and supporting sustained mentoring relationships, Coastal Carolina’s goal is to transform at-risk students into successful students. With the right social stability and influence between the fourth- and tenth-graders, the majority of at-risk public school students can graduate. Addressing a declining graduation rate that ranks 50th nationally is intended to have a salutary effect on the University and the social and economic quality of life in South Carolina.

I recognize that the social and political justifications for Coastal Carolina’s Public Engagement Initiative, while perhaps critical to the institution’s wellbeing, do not attend directly either to the institution’s teaching and learning mission or to Fish’s argument. Moreover, my close acquaintance with the glacial nature of higher education recognizes that assigning substantial resources to an external agency demands no-nonsense justifications to students who worry about post-graduation employment and to faculty
who worry about another intrusion into normal classroom conduct.

In response, I return to the aforementioned hurly-burly end of a semester that, this time, was highlighted by two notable events. The first occurred following a recent commencement exercise. An accounting graduate, now employed in the New York offices of Deloitte & Touche, told me that he considered his participation in UNIV 360 to be “an educational capstone.” He went on to say that, during his Deloitte Touche interview, he referred to his mentoring a fourth-grader and asked if Deloitte Touche encouraged community engagement. Surely, he got the job because he has the requisite accounting courses, but I suspect his acknowledgement of corporate duties beyond the ledger gave him a distinct advantage.

The second event—53 student evaluations of a course introduced in the fall 2004 semester, UNIV 360, Topics in Citizenship and Community—corroborated the accounting student’s story. Enrolled students, after training and the required legal checks, were assigned to mentor fourth- and fifth-grade public school students weekly throughout the semester. University students signed up for the course on an elective basis, and the public school students were identified by the school district using a standard at-risk profile and teacher recommendations. The University student evaluations produced testimonials that differ with Fish’s assertions on the proper job of higher education. One student cites what I think is a critical life skill:

I am learning a lot from my student about patience and the challenges of building a relationship in an unfamiliar situation. I feel that together she and I closed some of the gaps of insecurities and shyness and were able to have a productive interaction.

Mentoring time after time resulted in mutually beneficial exchanges. A University student writes:

My student really showed how much she trusted me by asking me to read her journal that discussed her feelings about her dad. I told her I could relate because I have not talked to my father in almost seven years. I hope that from my experience I will be there for her to help her through this tough time. I especially know how much it hurts. This visit was very encouraging to me. I really feel as though they feel close to us and trust us.

Another student writes:

I feel so lucky to be in this program. This new relationship rewards both of us as we journey through this trip called life. Dan’s father thanked me for being there for Dan and told me the little guy always talks about me. He said whatever I have done for Dan is just amazing.

Another student reports her student’s budding self-esteem:

My student seems to feel special about me coming to see her. The other kids are looking up to her more and want to know what we are talking about. They all gather around and Angel likes that extra attention.

A graduating senior remembers meeting her student and the student’s father for lunch:

I met my student and her father for lunch. Her father talked to me as if I was one of the family. He turned to me and asked, ‘Did she tell she made the honor roll?’ He did this with a smile as if he was so proud of her, and was happy to share that sentiment with someone who also cared for his daughter.

Finally, a student-athlete says:

I was also very touched when I walked my student into her classroom, and another student asked her who I was. She replied, ‘That’s my mentor!’ It made me feel that I was important and a special person in her life.

The experience that produced these extraordinary testimonials was spending a few hours each week in mentoring fourth- or fifth-grade students. University students would join their assigned student in the lunchroom, at recess, in the classroom, for after-school recreation, or bring the student to the campus for a cultural or athletic event.

I hold the view that the direct beneficiaries of the Public Engagement Initiative will be Coastal Carolina students and faculty. The public school students earning a high school diploma in a timely and economic fashion are obvious beneficiaries. As an institution, Coastal Carolina needs to introduce students to an appreciation for social responsibility, personal responsibility, character/values/ethics, wellness, and environmental concerns.

The sort of broad and interdisciplinary learning, that is, teaching students and fashioning citizens, can best be achieved with integrated on-campus and off-campus components. For the internal component, a faculty task force has developed an English 101/102 curriculum that incorporates life skills instruction—character, values, and social responsibility—through a series of textbook readings, writings, and reflection. ENGL 101/102, Common Ground: Thinking and Learning in Community, incorporates two first-year, writing-intensive courses that seek to foster a critical understanding of social concerns through historically and politically informed reading and writing. Specifically, students engage with and write about academic, civic, and global issues that are central to community life. Students also have the opportunity to combine academic inquiry with community outreach by participating in a focused service project for the Horry County schools.

The external component of public engagement, mentoring in the schools, begins in the second year by introducing students to the value of involvement in the quality of life in the University’s contiguous communities and calls for a specific curriculum-based course in a student’s major with content addressed to mentoring.

The goal of improving our high school graduation rate to the national average is unarguably the right thing to do, and the commitment of institutional resources appears justified on education, social, and political grounds. I appreciate that the University’s Public Engagement Initiative will not answer all the questions and resolve all the issues of South Carolina’s disturbing high school graduation rate. However, even based on early assessments, I
am convinced that the educational experience offered at Coastal Carolina will bring significant benefits.

Some of my associates and colleagues will argue, with Stanley Fish, that institutions of higher education, Coastal Carolina included, should continue to focus on “teaching students” in the classroom without regard to molding citizens. Even so, when it is evident that a more thorough understanding of classroom instruction is achieved through “hands-on” practical applications, why shouldn’t we, as educators, use the proven learning process to address critical social concerns?

Acknowledgement: I am grateful for the contributions of my colleague David Millard in preparing this commentary.

Endnotes


3. While I cite the Jekielek et al. article at http://www.childtrends.org/Files/MentoringBrief2002.pdf which summarizes the significant mentoring literature through 2002, I also refer readers interested in further public engagement research and resources to The Corporation for National and Community Service at http://www.nationalservice.org/ and the National Service-Learning Partnership at http://www.service-learningpartnership.org/service_learning/organizations.cfm

The National Service-Learning Clearinghouse at http://www.servicelearning.org/index.php provides valuable resources that are indexed on the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). ERIC offers a rich database of journal and non-journal education literature. Coastal Carolina’s public engagement and mentoring website address is at http://www.cochal.edu/cec/mentoring/index.html

4. The text of *Foundations for the Future* report funded by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education is available online at http://www.che400.state.sc.us/InfoCenter/FoundationForTheFuture.htm

**Conclusion**

The three major divisions of the accreditation standards indicate AACSB International’s definition of how to spot quality. The accreditation process is a systematic evaluation of the operations in place in higher education institutions. Accreditation truly represents ideas and contributions from business educators worldwide. While the process is more involved than observing bulletin boards, it is an effort that provides tremendous informational value to participating schools (and to reviewers). Schools should use the process for their own benefit through bringing the careful and conscientious quality-spotting capacity of qualified professionals into the service of the school.
Why Alpha Iota Delta?

by Stephen E. Lunce, Midwestern State University

On December 5, 1776, five students at the University of William and Mary, the second oldest college in the United States, formed the first Greek letter fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa (ΦΒΚ). “Their motive was to arrange, within the bonds of strict secrecy and of tested friendship, for opportunities to discuss freely the exciting issues of their times, including the recently proclaimed Declaration of Independence” (Lambda Phi Epsilon Web site, “7M+ History,” at www.johndesigns.com/stonylmbdas/history.html). This initial fraternal society embodied all of the ideals found in honor societies found on college and university campuses today. Phi Beta Kappa was the first college society to have a Greek letter name, and in its early years it introduced the essential characteristics of such societies: an oath of secrecy (discarded in 1831), a badge, mottoes in Latin and Greek, a code of laws, and an elaborate initiation ritual. The members held regular meetings, generally with an emphasis on literary exercises, especially composition and debating. Fraternal sentiments were fostered, while the purpose of some meetings was simply good fellowship (Phi Beta Kappa Web site, “History,” at www.pbk.org/about/history.htm).

In 1971, a group of the members of the Decision Sciences Institute chartered Alpha Iota Delta (AΙΔ), the national honorary in decision sciences and information systems. Over 30 years later, the honor society continues to be linked to the Decision Sciences Institute and supports those activities of DSI which are aimed at student involvement in the disciplines of interest to the Institute. The purpose of the society is threefold:

- To confer distinction to students in the decision sciences and information systems disciplines for academic excellence.
- To promote the infusion of the functional and behavioral areas of business with the tools, concepts, and methodologies of the decision sciences and information systems.
- To promote interest in the disciplines of decision sciences and information systems (Alpha Iota Delta Web site, “About Alpha Iota Delta,” at www.alphaiotadelta.com).

Why would a student seek initiation into Alpha Iota Delta? Why would a member of DSI choose to promote or support this specific honor society? The Decision Sciences Institute was established to provide a focus on the integration of research in the art and science of managerial decision making across traditional functional academic disciplines, including, but not limited to: accounting, management, management science MIS, operations research, quantitative analysis, and statistics. The founding faculty members of DSI were seeking the opportunity to share new knowledge across the functional area boundaries of the business disciplines. The mission statement of DSI states:

“The Decision Sciences Institute is a multidisciplinary international association dedicated to advancing knowledge and improving instruction in all business and related disciplines. To pursue this mission, the Institute will facilitate the development and dissemination of knowledge in the diverse disciplines of the decision sciences through publication, conferences, and other services.” (www.decisionsciences.org/dsi.htm)

The dissemination of new knowledge is part of the mission of most, if not all, business schools, colleges, and universities. The recognition of students who perform above the norm has long been a part of the academic profession. Thus the answer to the second question above, concerning why a DSI member should be interested in Alpha Iota Delta, is as...
simple as the realization that the purpose of the Honor Society and the Institute are historically and philosophically intertwined.

If the goals and vision of DSI and Alpha Iota Delta are intertwined, and if this is the justification for faculty interest, why would a student be interested in being initiated into the Society? The answer might be found, in part, in an excerpt from an Alpha Iota Delta Initiation Ritual which addresses the meaning of the Greek letters A (Alpha), I (Iota), and Δ (Delta).

**ALPHA** represents the beginning. It not only signifies the beginning of a career in the decision sciences and/or computer information systems but also it signifies a commitment to leadership. A leader develops guiding ideas and articulates them deliberately, demonstrating philosophical depth and recognizing the process as ongoing. The meaning, and sometimes the expression, of these guiding ideas evolve as people reflect and talk about them, and as they are applied to guide decisions and actions.

**IOTA** represents integration, both of knowledge and also of concept. The synergy between theories, methods, and tools lies at the heart of any field of human endeavor that truly builds knowledge. The continuous cycle of creating theories, developing and applying practical methods and tools based on the theories, leading to new insights that improve the theories – is the primary engine of growth in decision sciences and computer information systems.

**DELTA** is the universal symbol for change. It signifies that the initiate will respond to change with rationality and logic. (Initiation Ritual, Alpha Iota Delta Chapter, University of Detroit Mercy).

Honor society membership, like most worthwhile things in life, does not come easily. Therefore, when an invitation to membership arrives, it truly is a **matter of honor**, reflecting exceptional academic achievement and, perhaps, outstanding campus leadership and service. It is an honor typically bestowed upon students by faculty, and it provides lifetime distinction. The members of an honor society share similar interests; in the case of Alpha Iota Delta, the members share an interest in the decision sciences and information systems. Through the society and the parent Decision Sciences Institute, the member can maintain currency in the fields of interest. Alpha Iota Delta allows its members to stay in contact through meetings at the annual DSI meeting, and it provides lifelong recognition of a member’s search for excellence (Association of College Honor Societies website, “A Matter of Honor,” www.achsnatl.org).

If you are interested in creating a chapter of Alpha Iota Delta at your college or university, or if you are interested in membership in the national chapter, please contact Greg Ulferts (ulfertgw@udmercy.edu) or Steve Lunce. For more information about Alpha Iota Delta, please visit the website at http://www.alphaiotadelta.com.

---

**NAMES IN THE NEWS**

**CAROL LATTA, Executive Director, Decision Sciences Institute**

**Jeff Harper**, Indiana State University, has been promoted to the rank of full professor. He joined ISU in 1998 where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses including Systems Analysis and Design, Electronic Commerce [Grad.], and Management of Information Systems [Capstone]. He holds a Ph.D. in MIS from Auburn University. Professor Harper’s research and consulting interests include aligning information technology with strategic intent and technology transfer. His research has appeared in a variety of academic publications and his book, *Practical Student Outcomes Assessment: A Faculty-Driven Approach*, will be published later this year by Jossey-Bass, Inc. He has served as an IT consultant for such organizations as NASA, the U.S. Justice Department, the Department of the Navy, Monroe Guaranty Insurance Corporation, and BellSouth Corporation. He is also the program coordinator for Management Information Systems in the College of Business.  

**JeffHarper@indstate.edu**

**Sandra P. Storrod**, the Institute’s Home Office Accounting and Membership Services Supervisor, was one of the few applicants chosen from Georgia State University’s College of Business to participate in the Georgia 100 one-year mentoring program which is sponsored by the Advancement of Women Committee (AofW) at Georgia State. The program combines mentoring by a senior executive with leadership education and peer networking. The AofW serves as a resource for developing programs and initiatives toward the promotion of women faculty, administrators, and staff. The mission of the AofW is to enhance collective efforts to improve the status of women at Georgia State University.  

**dsisps@langate.gsu.edu**

---

Carol Latta, Feature Editor
Executive Director
Decision Sciences Institute
clatta@gsu.edu
DSI Marketing Director Coordinator Vacancy Announced

Terrell Williams’ second term as Marketing Director ends December 31, 2006. Pursuant to Institute procedures, the Board of Directors is seeking qualified candidates for this position. The Marketing Director serves a three-year term and may be reappointed for a second three-year term. Anyone interested in the position should contact Carol Latta at the address below.

The overriding role of the Marketing Director is to foster a marketing orientation to support member attraction and retention throughout the leadership of the Institute. The Marketing Director is responsible for developing an annual marketing plan and overseeing the implementation of the plan. The Marketing Director regularly attends various committee meetings at the Annual Meeting in November and a meeting with the Strategic Planning Committee in March. The Marketing Director may be asked to attend Executive Committee and Board of Directors meetings in January and April. Thus, the position requires significant travel support from the Marketing Director’s institution.

The major responsibilities of the Marketing Director include:
1. Develop and implement programs and activities that will secure new members and retain existing members of the Institute.
2. Manage and expand contact e-mail lists of prospective members.
3. Interface with Institute members to encourage ongoing activity in the Institute.
4. Report to the Executive Committee, the Strategic Planning Committee and the Board of Directors on Institute marketing activities and membership trends in the Institute.
5. Support, contribute to, and analyze various surveys to members and nonmembers of the Institute and their results.
6. Make recommendations to the Home Office, Executive Committee, the Strategic Planning Committee, and the Board of Directors, with information provided to the Member Services Committee, and the Development Committee.

See MARKETING DIRECTOR, page 34

DSI Director of Development and Corporate Relations Vacancy Announced

Tim Smunt’s term as Director of Development and Corporate Relations ends March 2006. Pursuant to Institute procedures, the Board of Directors is seeking qualified candidates for this position. The Director of Development and Corporate Relations serves a three-year term and may be reappointed for a second three-year term. Tim has indicated that due to other administrative responsibilities that he will not be able to serve a second term. Anyone interested in the position should contact Carol Latta at the address below.

The Director of Development and Corporate Relations oversees and coordinates major sponsorships with corporations and other business organizations. The Director is responsible for developing additional major sponsorships for the support of the Annual Meeting and for cultivating and maintaining long-term relationships with corporations. The Director personally presents an annual report to the Institute’s Board during its January Meeting, as well as providing a written report to the Board. The Director of Development and Corporate Relations may be asked to attend other board meetings. Thus, the position requires significant travel support from the Director’s institution.

The major responsibilities of the Director of Development and Corporate Relations include:
1. Develop and maintain a sponsorship framework for the annual meetings.
2. Solicit donations from publishers and other organizations.
3. Manage and expand contact e-mail lists of prospective sponsors from both universities and corporations.
4. Communicate with potential sponsors through email, letters and telephone.
5. Cultivate and maintain long-term relationships with corporations on behalf of the Institute.
6. Locate and contact volunteers to develop more and larger corporate sponsorships.
7. Coordinate with the Executive Director of DSI on all matters related to sponsorships.
8. Report to the Board of Directors on Institute on sponsorship activities and initiatives related to developing long-term corporate relationships with the Institute.

Questions about the position may be directed to the current Director of Development and Corporate Relations, Tim Smunt, Wake Forest University, at (336) 758-4423 or tim.smunt@mba.wfu.edu. All interested parties should

See DEVELOPMENT, page 34
Institute Meetings

The 36th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 19-22, 2005, at the San Francisco Marriott in downtown San Francisco. The submission deadlines were: Refereed papers, April 8, 2005; abstracts and proposals, May 1, 2005. Contact: Manoj K. Malhotra, University of South Carolina, Moore School of Business, Department of Management Science, 1705 College Street, Columbia, SC 29208, (803) 777-2712 / fax: (803) 777-6876, DSI2005@moore.sc.edu.

http://www.dsi2005.org/

The 2005 International Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute was held July 3-6, 2005, in Barcelona, Spain. Contact Marc Sachon or Jaime Ribera Segura, IESE Business School, Av. Pearson, 21, 08034 Barcelona, Spain, tel. +34 93 253 42 00, fax. +34 93 253 43 43, dsi2005@iese.edu.


The Asia Pacific Region will hold its 2006 Annual Meeting on June 14-18, 2006, Sheraton Hong Kong Hotel and Towers, Hong Kong, China; Conference Chair-Elect is Xiande You, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Department of DSE, Leung Kau Kui Building, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, 852-2609-7650 / Fax: 852-2603-6840, xiande@baf.msmail.cuhk.edu.hk.

http://www.apdsinet.org/dsi/

The Mexico Region is planning its 2006 Annual Meeting. Contact Program Chair Felipe Burgos, Universidad de las Americas, Puebla, Anta Catarina Martir, Cholula Puebla, 72820 MEXICO, phone: 52-222-229-2630, fax: 52-222-229-2726, fburgos@mail.udlap.mx.

The Midwest Region is planning its 2006 Annual Meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana. Contact Program Chair Carl Briggs, Indiana University - Bloomington, Department of ODT, 1309 E. Tenth Street, Bloomington, IN 47405, phone: (812) 855-3489, fax: (812) 856-5222, briggsc@indiana.edu.

The Northeast Region will hold its 2006 Annual Meeting on March 30-April 1, 2006, at the Caribe Hilton, San Juan, Puerto Rico. Submission deadline is October 7, 2005. Contact Jennifer Swanson, Program Chair, Stonehill College, 320 Washington Street, North Easton, MA 02357, Phone: (508) 565-1349, Fax: (508) 565-1444, NEDSI@stonehill.edu. http://www.nedsi.org

The Southeast Region will hold its 2006 (36th) Annual Meeting on February 22-24, 2006, at the Hilton Wilmington Riverside in Wilmington, North Carolina. Submission deadline for regular papers and special session proposals is September 20, 2005. Deadline for student papers is October 28, 2005. For more information, contact Program Chair Robert T. Barrett, Francis Marion University, School of Business, P.O. Box 100547, Florence, SC 29501, phone: (843) 661-1419, fax: (843) 664-3475, rbarrett@fmarion.edu.

http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region will hold its 2006 (27th) Annual Meeting on March 1-4, 2006, at the Sheraton New Orleans Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana. Submission deadline is September 15, 2005. Contact David C. Chou, Program Chair, Department of Computer Information Systems, College of Business, Owen 412, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197, Phone: 734-487-0054, Fax: 734-487-1941, Email: dchou@emich.edu.

http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region will hold its 2006 (35th) Annual Meeting on April 11-15, 2006, at The Hilton Waikoloa Village (http://www.hiltonwaikoloavirusage.com), in Waikoloa, Hawaii. Submission deadline is October 1, 2005. Contact Vijay R. Kannan, Program Chair / Vice President for Programs / Proceedings Editor, College of Business, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-3510, 435-797-7212, wdsi@business.usu.edu.

http://www.wdsi.net

Call for Papers

Conferences

International Workshop on Successful Strategies in Supply Chain Management will be held January 5-6, 2006, in Hong Kong, China. Abstract submission deadline is October 1, 2005. Contact IWSSSCM Secretariat, Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong, Phone: (852) 27666947, Fax: (852) 23629045, maevayiu@polyu.edu.hk.

http://www.acad.polyu.edu.hk/~machanck/workshop/home.htm

2nd International Conference on Six Sigma, Integrating Six Sigma and Lean Strategies to Achieve and Enhance Competitive Advantage will be held June 5-7, 2006, in Glasgow, Scotland. Deadline for submission of abstracts is October 28, 2005. Contact Dr Jiju Antony, Editor-in-Chief, International Journal of Six Sigma and Competitive Advantage, Division of Management, Caledonian Business School, Glasgow Caledonian University, Glasgow, G4 0BA, Scotland, United Kingdom, Tel: 0141 331 8475, Fax: 0141 331 8496, j.anton@gcal.ac.uk

https://www.inderscience.com/mappper.php?id=62#01

5th Global Conference on Business & Economics, sponsored by Association for Business & Economics Research and International Journal of Business & Economics, will be held July 6-8, 2006, at Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK. Submission deadline is November 30, 2005. Contact Dr. Atul Gupta, School of Business & Economics, Lynchburg College, 1501 Lakeside Dr., Lynchburg, VA 24501, USA, Telephone: (434) 544-8651; Fax: (434) 544-8639; E-mail: Gupta@Lynchburg.Edu

See ANNOUNCEMENTS, page 36
Theme: “Decision Making at the Functional Interface”

The Decision Sciences Institute’s 2005 Annual Meeting is drawing closer. The program team has finished putting together all the sessions in different tracks and miniconferences, which we have scheduled from Saturday (November 19) morning to Tuesday (November 22) morning. The preliminary program will be available for viewing on the DSI 2005 meeting Web site (http://dsi2005.org) after August 31st. We have taken every scheduling request, whether made on an individual basis by a presenter or by a track chair, into consideration before finalizing the schedule.

We have broad-based participation for the San Francisco meeting with over 850 individual presentations scheduled into close to 300 sessions scattered among refereed papers, abstracts, symposiums, panel discussions, and special invited sessions. Presenters represent a broad array of schools from all over the U.S. and international universities. A balance has been struck between research, teaching, and service issues. Similarly, the three miniconferences focus on both research and teaching aspects of the diverse fields represented within the Decision Sciences Institute. My program chair message published in the previous issue of Decision Line contains several program highlights, to which we have added even more in the past two months.

We designed and brought on board this year a new Conference Information System (CIS), which will hopefully become a legacy system for the Decision Sciences Institute for the future. Andrea Williams and Sunny (Sung-Hee) Park made major contributions in this regard. While far from perfect, we have made significant progress in enhancing its functionalities and are working towards making it more user friendly for the future. I appreciate your patience and kindness as we worked towards populating the data bases with new user ID’s and passwords, ensuring that the right messages get to the right set of presenters (we did not bat 100 percent in this case), creating procedures for submitting presentations and uploading proceedings, and finally putting in place routines for creating overall program schedules and displaying them on the conference Web site. All these activities represented a major effort, and you as our stakeholders were remarkably supportive as we worked through our errors and mistakes. For that support, the program team, the Institute, and I owe you a note of thanks and gratitude.

As you plan your trip to San Francisco, I encourage you to make reservations at the conference hotel, the Marriott, located at 55th Fourth Street in the heart of downtown San Francisco (register online at http://dmsweb.moore.sc.edu/dsi2005/hotelreg.htm). Staying at the conference hotel is the most convenient option for meeting and networking with colleagues at the meeting. It also helps in defraying the cost of the conference and keeping the registration fees down. At each of the hotels where we hold our annual meetings, we make a “room-night guarantee” to the hotel. In exchange for room rentals, the hotel makes meeting rooms, audio-visual equipment, refreshment breaks, and various other amenities available at reduced cost or no cost to the Institute. If we are unable to meet our guarantee, the hotel will add charges that, depending on how far we miss our mark, can run into tens of thousands of dollars. The Institute has negotiated very competitive rates at the Marriott, so please, when you plan to attend the annual meeting in San Francisco—plan to stay at the conference hotel and let them know at the time of registration that you are with the DSI 2005 meeting.

I would also like to encourage you to start registering now for the meeting. Please notice that all refereed papers must have at least one author registered for the conference by September 30, 2005, for a paper to be included in the conference proceedings. In addition, at least one author from each presentation should register for the conference as soon as possible. After October 21, 2005, the conference registration fees will increase from $250 to $300 for DSI members, and from $350 to $400 for non-members.

Finally, in making your flight plans, please notice that the conference starts in earnest on Saturday morning, with several important sessions and miniconferences being scheduled throughout that day. Such a schedule allows us to finish the meeting with Tuesday’s luncheon, and have everyone returning home (or their Thanksgiving vacation destination as the case may be) later that afternoon. So when making your travel plans, please plan on arriving in San Francisco by Friday evening.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or others on the Program Planning Team if we can do anything to help you with your conference plans. I will look forward to welcoming you in San Francisco in November 2005.
2005 Competitions

For a listing of past DSI award winners, see www.decisionsciences.org.hallfame.htm.

Best Paper Awards Competition

Best Paper Awards will be presented at the 2005 Annual Meeting. Categories include Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper, Best Application Paper, and Best Interdisciplinary Paper. In addition, there will be a Distinguished Paper Award for outstanding papers within each track. Reviewers will be asked to nominate competitive paper submissions for these awards. Nominations will then be reviewed by a best paper review committee, which will make award recommendations.

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition

The purpose of the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition is to encourage and publicize outstanding dissertation research by selecting and recognizing the best dissertations written in the past year in the decision sciences. The Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award, accompanied by a $1,500 stipend, will be presented at the annual meeting. Applicants for this award should submit three (3) hardcopies of their dissertation in the required format directly to the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator by May 1, 2005. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Roger Schroeder, University of Minnesota
E-mail: rschroeder@csom.umn.edu

Instructional Innovation Award Competition

The Instructional Innovation Award Competition seeks to recognize outstanding contributions that advance instructional approaches within the decision sciences. The focus of this award is innovation in college-or university-level teaching. Three finalists will be chosen to make presentations at the conference competition. The winning entry receives an award of $1,500, and $750 will be divided among each of the other finalists. Applicants are required to submit all contributions electronically using instructions on the conference Web sites. The due date for submissions was April 1, 2005. For information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

S. Thomas Foster, Jr., Brigham Young University
E-mail: tom_foster@byu.edu

Viswanath Venkatesh, Univ. of Arkansas
vvenkatesh@walton.uark.edu

Innovative Education
Sanjay Ahire, Univ. of Dayton
ahire@udayton.edu

International Business
Danny Samson, Univ. of Melbourne
d.samson@unimelb.edu.au

Manufacturing Management
Peter T. Ward, Ohio State Univ.
ward.1@osu.edu

Marketing: Theory, Models, & Applications
Subhash Sharma, Univ. of South Carolina
sharma@moore.sc.edu

MS/OR: Techniques, Models, and Applications
Umit Akinc, Wake Forest Univ.
akinc@wfu.edu

New Product Development and Project Management
William H. A. Johnson, Bentley College
wjohnson@bentley.edu

Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory
Paul Mallette, Colorado State Univ.
Pual.Mallette@business.colostate.edu

Quality
Kwei Tang, Purdue Univ.
tang@mgmt.purdue.edu

Kevin Linderman, Univ. of Minnesota
klinerman@csom.umn.edu

Service Management
Richard Metters, Emory Univ.
Richard_Metters@bus.emory.edu

Statistics and Decision Analysis
Young H. Chun, Louisiana State Univ.
chun@lsu.edu

Strategy and Policy
Arnoud De Meyer, INSEAD
arnoud.de.meyer@insead.edu

Supply Chain Management
Vaidy Jayaraman, Univ. of Miami
vaidy@miami.edu

Jonathan D. Linton, Rensselear Polytechnic Institute
linton@rpi.edu

2005 Track Chairs

Accounting: Theory, Applications, and Practice
Mary Jane Lenard, Univ. of North Carolina at Greensboro
mjlenard@uncg.edu

Case Studies
Robert Klassen, Univ. of Western Ontario
rklassen@ivey.ca

DSS/AI/Expert Systems
James F. Courtney, Univ. of Central Florida
jim.courtney@bus.ucf.edu

Demand Management and Forecasting
Nadia R. Sanders, Wright State Univ.
nadia.sanders@wright.edu

E-Business
Tonya Boone, College of William and Mary
tonya.boone@business.vm.edu

Finance/Financial Management
Rebecca Abraham, Nova Southeastern Univ.
Abraham@nova.edu

Information Systems
Fred D. Davis, Univ. of Arkansas
fdavis@walton.uark.edu

Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory
Paul Mallette, Colorado State Univ.
Pual.Mallette@business.colostate.edu

Quality
Kwei Tang, Purdue Univ.
tang@mgmt.purdue.edu

Kevin Linderman, Univ. of Minnesota
klinerman@csom.umn.edu

Service Management
Richard Metters, Emory Univ.
Richard_Metters@bus.emory.edu

Statistics and Decision Analysis
Young H. Chun, Louisiana State Univ.
chun@lsu.edu

Strategy and Policy
Arnoud De Meyer, INSEAD
arnoud.de.meyer@insead.edu

Supply Chain Management
Vaidy Jayaraman, Univ. of Miami
vaidy@miami.edu

Jonathan D. Linton, Rensselear Polytechnic Institute
linton@rpi.edu
2005 Professional Activities

Curricular Issues Miniconference
Is your curriculum getting stale? Have you struggled unsuccessfully with program restructuring? Would you like an opportunity to benchmark world-class curricula? If so, the Curricular Issues Miniconference may be just what you need. This year’s conference will provide a forum for exchanging ideas and discussing curricular challenges and opportunities in degree-granting business education. Separate tracks will explore issues of interest to those who design, run, and contribute to programs at the undergraduate, MBA, and Ph.D. levels.

David M. Dilts, Vanderbilt University
E-mail: david.dilts@vanderbilt.edu

Doctoral Student Consortium
The Doctoral Student Consortium provides a unique opportunity for doctoral students from across the nation and around the world to interact with one another and with distinguished scholars in a one-day program devoted to career development. Attendance at this consortium is by invitation based on application. All students who meet the criteria will be accepted.

V. Sambamurthy, Michigan State University
E-mail: sambamurthy@bus.msu.edu
Morgan L. Swink, Michigan State University
E-mail: swinkm@msu.edu

New Faculty Development Consortium
The New Faculty Development Consortium deals with research, teaching, publishing and other professional development issues for faculty who are beginning their academic careers. Attendance at this consortium is by application and is open to faculty members who have Ph.D. degree and are in the first two years of their teaching career.

Thomas Choi, Arizona State University
E-mail: thomas.choi@asu.edu
Laura Forker, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth
E-mail: lforker@umassd.edu

Professional Faculty Development Program
The Professional and Faculty Development Program is for Institute’s members in all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. The content of the sessions offered is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing environment.

Marc J. Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
E-mail: mschniederjans1@unl.edu

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference
The Technology in the Classroom Miniconference provides a forum for participants to share novel or innovative applications of technology in the classroom that enhance the student’s learning experience.

Gary M. Kern, Indiana University South Bend
E-mail: gkern@iusb.edu

Research Methods Miniconference: Structural Equation Modeling
This newly designed Research Methods Miniconference on Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) will offer insights into both basic and advanced topics in SEM, and will introduce participants to many tools and techniques that can be immediately put to good use.

Xenophon Koufteros, Florida Atlantic University
E-mail: kouftero@fau.edu

Tips for Doctoral Students—Getting the Most from the Annual Meeting
The Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting provides an opportunity for doctoral students to network, develop professional skills, interview for faculty positions—and have a good time!

For students who want to know how to get the most out of the Annual Meeting, see “Tips for Doctoral Students” on the DSI Web site at

http://www.decisionsciences.org/doc_tips.htm

2005 Instructional Innovation Award Competition Finalists Announced
Three finalists have been chosen for this year’s Instructional Innovation Award competition. The finalists’ presentations will be held at the 2005 DSI Annual Meeting on Sunday, November 20, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

A Learner-Centered Capstone Course for a MIS Master’s Degree Program
Grandon Gill, University of Southern Florida

An Interactive VBA Tool for teaching Statistical Process Control (SPC) and Process Management Issues
Jaydeep Balakrishnan and Sherry Oh, University of Calgary

Bringing Ethics into an Operations Management Course
Christopher A. Voss, London Business School

2005 DSI Annual Meeting Website Links
Online Conference Registration:
www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/public/registernow.asp

Online Hotel Reservations:
dmsweb.moore.sc.edu/dsi2005/hotelreg.htm

For more information & links on the annual meeting:
www.dsi2005.org/
Doctoral Student Consortium

Creating successful career paths for students
Co-sponsored by McGraw Hill/Irwin, Beta Gamma Sigma, Eli Broad School of Business (Michigan State University) and DSI

The 23rd annual Doctoral Student Consortium will provide participants with an engaging, interactive professional experience that is designed to get them off to a strong start in their careers. We are pleased to have the sponsorship of McGraw Hill/Irwin, Beta Gamma Sigma, and Eli Broad School of Business (Michigan State University) for this important event. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 19, 2005, at the 2005 DSI Annual Meeting in San Francisco, California.

Who Should Attend?
The Doctoral Consortium is offered to individuals who are well into their doctoral studies. Because of DSI’s interdisciplinary constituency, the Consortium welcomes students from all subject areas within the decision sciences. A variety of students with backgrounds in operations management, management information systems, management science, strategy, organizational behavior, marketing, accounting, and other areas will increase the vitality of the sessions. The program will focus on career goals, job search issues, placement services, research strategies, teaching effectiveness, manuscript reviewing, and promotion and tenure. Students who are interested in addressing these subjects in a participative, interactive way will enjoy and benefit from the Consortium.

Program Content
The Doctoral Student Consortium involves seasoned, world-class research faculty from several schools, junior faculty just beginning their careers, and key journal editors. All will help guide student discussions in the following sessions.

Teaching Effectiveness. Harvey Brightman plans to return to the Doctoral Consortium for another post-retirement workshop in 2005. His sessions are simply not to be missed—even experienced faculty members will sit in on this session to learn at the feet of the master. If Harvey’s schedule does not allow him to be with us, participants can be assured that we will find a high-caliber substitute.

Research Strategy Workshop. This unique hands-on workshop provides students with the help of tenured faculty mentors in developing a strategic research plan. This plan will help students move from their dissertation into a research program that will see them through tenure. Working in a small breakout group, each student will receive a mentor’s help in identifying their areas of expertise, targeting appropriate journals, finding suitable co-authors, and planning a mix of publications.

Meet the Editors and Academic Reviewing. Editors from journals in the decision sciences and related fields will give overviews of the missions of their publications. In addition they will discuss what components make for strong manuscript submissions, how to improve your chances of getting a journal article accepted, and how to respond to reviews. Good reviewing practices will also be discussed, and editors will field questions from student participants.

Job Search Seminar. Should I target my job search on “research” schools? Teaching schools? Private? Public? What’s the best way to sell myself? What are the ingredients of a good job interview? This session will help students to answer these questions through insights drawn from a panel of faculty experts. Panelists will also use dramatization to illustrate the elements of good (and poor) job interviews.

Join Us
The Doctoral Consortium does more than prepare individual students—it creates a community of colleagues who you will know throughout your entire career. Please plan to attend the Consortium and also encourage students you know to participate in this important program. Although many participants will be entering the job market for 2005-2006, others will appreciate the opportunity to get a better understanding of an academic career and how to approach the job market in the subsequent year.

Application Process
Students in all areas of the decision sciences are encouraged to apply for the DSI Doctoral Consortium. Those wishing to be included should submit:
1. A current curriculum vita, including contact information (e-mail in particular), your major field (operations management, MIS, management science, strategy, and so on), the title of your dissertation proposal or the title of a current research paper.
2. A letter of recommendation from your dean, doctoral program director, department chair, or dissertation chair. The letter should attest to the applicant’s qualifications and good progress in the doctoral program.

Interested students are encouraged to apply early if they wish to ensure themselves space in the Consortium. Materials should be sent to Morgan Swink, Doctoral Consortium Co-Coordinator, by July 30, 2005. Those who apply by this date and meet the criteria listed above will be accepted for participation.

Applications received after July 30th will receive consideration on a space-available basis.

See DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM, page 31
2005 New Faculty Development Consortium Schedule

Saturday 7:00 - 7:30 a.m.
Continental Breakfast

Saturday 7:30 - 8:00 a.m.
Welcome and Introductions
Consortium Coordinators:
Thomas Choi, Arizona State University
Laura Forker, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth

Saturday 8:00 - 8:30 a.m.
Dear Abby—I have These Concerns and Nobody to Turn to . . .
Moderator: Gary Ragatz, Michigan State University
Break up into four groups (see below): Private-Teaching; Private-Research; Public-Teaching; Public-Research.

Saturday 8:30 - 9:00 a.m.
And Then the Four Sages Proclaimed . . .
Moderator: Laura Forker, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth
Private-Teaching: Mark Davis, Bentley College
Private-Research: Jack Meredith, Wake Forest University
Public-Teaching: Chan Hahn, Bowling Green State University
Public-Research: Jim Hershauer, Arizona State University

Saturday 9:00 - 9:30 a.m.
Knowing Different Tenure Policies at Different Schools
Panelists:
Maling Ebrahimpour, Roger Williams University
Janelle Heineke, Boston University

Saturday 10:00 - 10:15 a.m. | Coffee Break

Saturday 10:15 - 10:45 a.m.
What Are Your Concerns about Teaching?
Moderators:
Thomas Choi, Arizona State University
Laura Forker, University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth

Saturday 10:45 - 11:00 a.m. | Coffee Break

Saturday 11:00 - 12:00 p.m.
Building Academic Portfolio: Maintaining Mobility
Moderator: Linda Sprague, CEIBS, China
Panelists:
Aleda Roth, Arizona State University
Laura Birou, University of Tampa
Kevin Dooley, Arizona State University

Saturday 12:00 - 1:15 p.m.
Working Lunch (Shared session with the Doctoral Student Consortium)

Saturday 1:15 - 2:15 p.m.
Writing Publishable Articles—Editors Speak up
Moderator: Thomas Choi, Arizona State University
Editors of JOM (Rob Handfield, North Carolina State University), Decision Sciences (Vicki Smith-Daniels, Arizona State University), and POMS (Kalyan Singhal, University of Baltimore)

Saturday 2:15 - 2:45 p.m.
You Be the Jury—A Virtual Tenure Review
Leaders:
Public – Teaching: Hale Kaynak, University of Texas-Pan American

Public – Research: Lisa Ellram, Arizona State University
Private – Teaching: Bill Youngdahl, Thunderbird, GSIM
Private/Public – Research: Raju Balakrishna Group Breakout.

Saturday 2:45 - 3:00 p.m. | Coffee Break

Saturday 3:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Conclusion and Wrap-up: Go out and Do Good!
Ira Horowitz, University of Florida

2005 Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition
The DSI Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition is named in honor of Professor Elwood S. Buffa, UCLA, for his many contributions to the decision sciences. The purpose of the competition is to identify and recognize outstanding doctoral research in the development of theory or applications of the decision sciences completed during 2004.

WINNER
Tipparat Laohavichien, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand
Leadership and Quality Management: A Comparison Between the U.S. and Thailand
Advisor: Lawrence Fredendall, Clemson University

HONORABLE MENTIONS
Tugba Cayirli, Hofstra University
Ambulatory Care Performance: A Simulation Study of the Role of Appointment Scheduling Rules, Patient Classification and Environmental Factors
Advisor: Emre Veral, Baruch College, City University of New York

Pedro Oliveira, Catholic University of Portugal
An Empirical Investigation of the Antecedents and Consequences of B2B E-Service Capability
Advisor: Aleda Roth, University of North Carolina, Chapel-Hill (presently at Arizona State University)

Dothang Truong, Fayetteville State University
A Study of Business-to-Business Electronic Marketplace from the Buyer Perspective
Advisor: S. Subba Rao, The University of Toledo
New Faculty Development Consortium

The New Faculty Development Consortium is for faculty in the beginning of their careers who would like to learn more about teaching, research, publishing and other professional development issues. Attendance at this consortium is by application and is open to faculty members who have earned their doctoral degree and are in the first three years of their post-doctoral teaching career.

The consortium will last a full day on Saturday, November 19, 2005. It will include interactive and panel sessions with faculty at varying stages of their careers. Also, the journal editors of Decision Sciences, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, Journal of Operations Management, and Production and Operations Management will be featured. The consortium will also provide many opportunities for interaction and networking with peers and more experienced colleagues. The content of the sessions offered is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing environment.

Topics include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Your personal concerns about being a faculty member
- Knowing tenure policies at different schools
- Balancing the needs of different stakeholders (students, corporations, review committees, alumni, etc.) in the educational process
- Publishing strategies
- Obtaining research funding
- Career path strategies
- Building an academic portfolio

Faculty in all business disciplines who have finished their doctorate and are in the first three years of their post-doctoral teaching career are encouraged to participate. Applications, using the form below together with a recent vita, should be submitted by September 15, 2005. Participation is limited to the first 50 qualified applicants. Each participant will be expected to register for the Institute’s 2005 Annual Meeting in San Francisco. No additional fees are charged for the consortium.

Direct all inquiries and applications to either coordinator:

Thomas Choi
Department of Supply Chain Management
W. P. Carey School of Business
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-4706
Phone: 602-965-6135
Thomas.choi@asu.edu

or

Laura Forker
Department of Management
Charlton College of Business
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
285 Old Westport Road
North Dartmouth, MA 02747-2300
lforker@umassd.edu

Application for New Faculty Development Consortium
November 19, 2005 • San Francisco, California

Send in this form and a current copy of your vita to either one of the consortium coordinators (see above) by September 15, 2005.

Name: ____________________________________________
Research interests: __________________________________

Current institution and year of appointment: ______________

_____________________________________________________

Mailing address: ____________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

Year doctorate earned: __________________________________

Phone: ________________________________________________

Fax: __________________________________________________

E-mail: _______________________________________________

Have you attended a previous DSI Doctoral Student Consortium?

____ yes ______ no

If so, when? ____________________________________________
Some Highlights at the 2005 DSI Annual Meeting

Operations Research Models for Supply Chain Management
Jeremy F. Shapiro Professor of Operations Research and Management, MIT, Emeritus
President, Slim Technologies, LLC

In recent years, operations research practitioners have become much more involved in developing and applying data-driven models to support supply chain decision-making. Interest in modeling has grown because managers are swamped with data from newly implemented Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), Point-of-Sales (POS) and other transactional data management systems. If and when it becomes widely implemented, RFID will also generate very large transactional databases. Supply chain managers are seeking to improve their decision-making by acquiring new tools and implementing new business processes that use knowledge extracted from these data. In this tutorial, we review the form and purpose of descriptive and optimization models and methods in analyzing supply chain planning problems. Descriptive models to be discussed include those used in forecasting, data mining, activity-based costing, and data envelopment analysis. Optimization methods to be discussed include linear programming, mixed integer programming, and heuristics. Differences in modeling approaches across the hierarchical scope of strategic, tactical, and operational planning problems will be presented along with illustrative applications in manufacturing and distribution companies. Recent modeling approaches for integrating supply chain and demand management decisions will be examined. The tutorial will conclude with suggestions for business process expansion to exploit data-driven models in improving supply chain decision-making.

Panel Discussion: The Future of OR/MS
Where did the OR/MS profession come from, and where is it headed? From its peak, the OR/MS has not only experienced a continually shrinking role in business education, but has also been garnering reduced attention from managers who manage real organizations (or “messes” as Ackoff prefers). Perhaps at least partly as a result of this, some authors have repeatedly suggested that OR/MS is in a crisis. On the other hand, AACSB has recently shown willingness to put back Management Science in the recommended business curricula. Consequently, a panel of respected experts will discuss the question “Is the OR/MS profession still in a crisis, or are things looking up for the profession?”

Research Methods Miniconference: Structural Equation Modeling
SEM has becoming more of a mainstream approach to data analysis. The sessions will be designed to provide insight into both basic and advanced topics in SEM. Invited sessions will include presentations by some of the most notable experts in SEM. We have a tentative commitment for presentations by Ken Bollen (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), George Marcoulides (California State University, Fullerton), and Randall Schumacker (University of North Texas).

SAP’s Advanced Planner and Optimizer (APO) Software
F. Robert Jacobs Kelley School of Business, Indiana University

This workshop will be an overview of the features of SAP’s APO software. The APO product from SAP is intended to...
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2005 Job Placement Service

The DSI Placement Services Website is open for the 2005-2006 recruiting season. Instructions for using the online database are viewable through the Instructions link on the DSI Placement Services Homepage at www.decisionsciences.org/placement.

Listing fees are a great value at $250 for each position listed, $25 for applicant listings, and no charge for student members. DSI membership must be current for all applicants (membership is not required for submitting a position listing).

A number of Applicants and Positions have already been posted for this year—these can be viewed without registering or logging in by simply selecting the “View Listings” link on the Placement Services Homepage. We anticipate many more listings will be added before this year’s Annual Meeting (November 19-22, 2005 in San Francisco). New listings may be submitted directly through the Internet—there are no hard copy forms.

Applicants

If you would like to link to your Web presence elsewhere, have the URL ready. If you do not have a Web page, you might want to look into setting one up with your university, ISP, or Web sites such as dice.com or geocities. If a URL for your Web page is not yet available, it can be added to your listing later.

Employers

Please have purchase order number or credit card information available. Payment by check will also be accepted—the address for mailing payments is shown on the Web site.

It may be to your advantage to have a more detailed position description posted on your university’s Web site that can be accessed via a link in the DSI placement database. Have the URL ready if you would like to have a link to a more detailed position description or department or school homepage. If this is not yet available, it can be added later.

DSI Placement Services Coordinator

Gerard M. Campbell
Fairfield University
Charles F. Dolan School of Business
Department of Information Systems and Operations Management
North Benson Rd.
Fairfield, CT 06430-5195 USA
(203) 254-4000, ext. 3118
fax: (203) 254-4105
email: gcampbell@mail.fairfield.edu

HIGHLIGHTS, from page 31

support advanced supply chain planning and scheduling. The application includes special planning algorithms and optimization techniques to support these decisions. APO consists of five major modules: Demand Planning (DP), Supply Network Planning (SNP) including Deployment Functionality, Production Planning & Detailed Scheduling (PP/DS), Available to Promise (ATP), and Transport Planning & Vehicle Scheduling (TP/VS). During the session, Prof. Jacobs will attempt to translate the terminology used by SAP into terminology used by academics familiar with research related to the area. Features of the modules will be discussed and topics for potential future research identified.

Program Chair
Manoj K. Malhotra
University of South Carolina
Moore School of Business
Department of Management Science
1705 College Street
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-2712 / fax: (803) 777-6876
E-mail: DSI2005@moore.sc.edu

Associate Program Chair
G. Keong Leong
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
College of Business
Department of Management
4505 Maryland Pkwy Box 456009
Las Vegas, NV 89154-6009
(702) 895-1762 / fax: (702) 895-4370
E-mail: Keong.Leong@ccmail.nevada.edu

Proceedings Coordinator
Jayanth Jayaram
University of South Carolina
Moore School of Business
Department of Management Science
1705 College Street
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-7006 / fax: (803) 777-6876
E-mail: Spark@moore.sc.edu

Annual Meeting Web Site Coordinator
Sung-Hee Park
University of South Carolina
Moore School of Business
Department of Management Science
1705 College Street
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-7006 / fax: (803) 777-6876
E-mail: Spark@moore.sc.edu

Program Scheduling Coordinator and IT Systems Manager
Andrea L. Williams
1109 Sudden Valley
Bellingham, WA 98229
360-715-8808
E-mail: Dsialw@langate.gsu.edu

Local Arrangements and Cultural Program Coordinator
Sameer Verma
San Francisco State University
School of Business
San Francisco, CA 94132
(415) 338-7016/fax: (415) 405-0364
E-mail: sverma@sfsu.edu
On the cultural and entertainment side, we have planned a fun-filled evening after the President’s reception on Monday. LifePlays, an improvisational theater company based in the San Francisco Bay Area, will be performing at the 2005 DSI Conference. The LifePlays team, led by Vijay Mehrotra (who in addition to being an actor is also a professor of decision sciences at San Francisco State University), will provide a highly interactive and entertaining performance based on suggestions provided by the DSI audience and combined with the actors’ creativity and improvisational skills. Because of the unpredictable nature of such a performance and the unexpected events that occur, we anticipate that LifePlays performance will provide high-energy comic entertainment.

We have placed information on our conference Web site on some local tour options and things to do for spouses and others looking for nonacademic activities. The hotel and conference registration is now open, and those attending the conference can make their reservations directly by visiting the conference Web site. As you make your conference travel plans, I would like to mention that we will not have wireless connectivity this year in the conference area because the hotel will not allow outside assistance as we had last year with Airgram Networks LLC. However, a computer projection system facilitated through a grant from SAP will be available this year as well.

Let me once again remind everyone that we will designate Sunday as the “school spirit day,” where conference participants will be encouraged to display their school spirit by wearing caps, shirts, etc. highlighting their school’s logo. Informal dress (on a voluntary basis) for the second day of the conference should make for a colorful sight and some good-natured fun on the side. So do remember to pack in your favorite sweatshirts, hats, etc. to proudly display your school spirit on Sunday, November 20, 2005.

(from the Program Chair’s Message, May 2005) ■

---

**Future DSI Annual, International, & Regional Annual Meetings**

**NATIONAL ANNUAL MEETINGS**

- **November 19-22, 2005**
  - The San Francisco Marriott (Downtown)
  - San Francisco, California
- **November 18-21, 2006**
  - The San Antonio Marriott Rivercenter/Riverwalk Hotels
  - San Antonio, Texas
- **November 17-20, 2007**
  - The Marriott Desert Ridge Resort & Spa
  - Phoenix, Arizona
- **November 22-25, 2008**
  - Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel and Courtyard by Marriott
  - Baltimore, Maryland
- **November 21-24, 2009**
  - Hyatt Regency New Orleans at the Superdome
  - New Orleans, Louisiana

---

**REGIONAL ANNUAL MEETINGS**

**Asia-Pacific**

- **June 14-18, 2006**
  - Sheraton Hong Kong Hotel and Towers
  - Hong Kong

**Mexico**

- **tba**

**Midwest**

- **tba**

**Northeast**

- **March 30-April 1, 2006**
  - Caribe Hilton, San Juan, Puerto Rico

---

**Southeast**

- **February 22-24, 2006**
  - Hilton Wilmington Riverside, Wilmington, North Carolina

**Southwest**

- **March 1-4, 2006**
  - Sheraton New Orleans Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana
  - 2007
  - San Diego, California (tentative)

**Western**

- **April 11-15, 2006**
  - The Hilton Waikoloa Village Resort
  - Waikoloa, Big Island, Hawaii

---
research projects at the regional meetings, in a setting that can be less intimidating than DSI.

Finally, the Western Region has been my home for the past 25 years. Without the experience that I gained going through the board and officer rotation in Western, I would not have been elected to the DSI board of directors several years ago, and I certainly would not have even thought of running for president! Since the Western region meets in places such as Hawaii, San Francisco, and Vancouver, many of the attendees are from the Asia-Pacific region, including Australia and New Zealand. This has made these meetings much more interesting and productive, and has also helped me to form my beliefs about the internationalization of DSI (more on this in a later letter).

In the past few years, it appears to me that the make-up and attendance at the regional meetings have changed. Certainly, what I am about to write is not universally true, but it seems to me to be generally true. As I have attended meetings of several different regions, I do not see as much support from the “major” universities that we used to enjoy. Many doctoral students still attend, but there seems to be fewer of the faculty, especially the senior faculty in attendance. This is both good and bad. The good part is that the majority of attendance is from faculty and students from local universities. Many of the attendees at regional meetings do not attend DSI meetings, either because of cost, the overwhelming size of the DSI meetings, or because their primary professional organization is something other than DSI. It is bad because the region no longer serves the networking function that it used to. I assume that this reduction in attendance from the majors is primarily because many of the universities will no longer fund attendance at these meetings, and I hope it is not because the senior faculty no longer view the regional meetings as important.

I suppose my message is primarily one of encouragement for senior faculty in DSI to remember how we got started and to call upon them to support the regional organizations. DSI has, in my mind, been unique among professional organizations with the strength and quality of its regions. We need to do what we can to continue to build on that strength and quality.

The Marketing Director is a member of the Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences (Ex Officio), the Information Technology Committee (Ex Officio), the Member Services Committee (Ex Officio), and the Strategic Planning Committee (Ex Officio).

Questions about the position may be directed to the current Marketing Director, Terry Williams, Western Washington University, at (360) 650-4896 or terrell.williams@wwu.edu. All interested parties should submit the following to Carol Latta, Executive Director, Decision Sciences Institute, 35 Broad Street, Atlanta, GA 30303:

1. Curriculum vita
2. Statement of activities and service provided to the Institute
3. Statement of interest and availability to serve a three-year term
4. Statement of qualifications and experience related to the position
5. Description of institutional commitment for the support of the director’s job functions for a three year period.
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The Marketing Director is a member of the Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences (Ex Officio), the Information Technology Committee (Ex Officio), the Member Services Committee (Ex Officio), and the Strategic Planning Committee (Ex Officio).

Questions about the position may be directed to the current Marketing Director, Terry Williams, Western Washington University, at (360) 650-4896 or terrell.williams@wwu.edu. All interested parties should submit the following to Carol Latta, Executive Director, Decision Sciences Institute, 35 Broad Street, Atlanta, GA 30303:

1. Curriculum vita
2. Statement of activities and service provided to the Institute
3. Statement of interest and availability to serve a three-year term
4. Statement of qualifications and experience related to the position
5. Description of institutional commitment for the support of the director’s job functions for a three year period.
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
College of Business Administration
James R. Good Chair in Global Strategy
Emphasis in Global Supply Chain Strategy

The College of Business Administration at Bowling Green State University invites applications for the James R. Good Chair in Global Strategy with an emphasis in global supply chain strategy. The specific academic focus includes the following areas: strategic sourcing, logistics, distribution channel management, customer relationships, operations management, demand management, and product development. The college seeks a recognized scholar with demonstrated performance in one or more areas of global supply chain strategy. Emphasis will be placed on demonstrated leadership in integrating supply chain education, research and engagement from a global perspective across the college, university, and business community.

Responsibilities include: (1) teaching undergraduate, graduate, and executive courses with significant global supply chain content; (2) providing leadership to the college and university on global supply chain strategy; (3) initiating significant engagement of the university with the business community and with other universities in the region; (4) research and publication; and (5) involvement in department, college, university, and professional service.

Qualifications include: (1) an earned doctorate in business from an AACSB accredited institution and qualifications for tenure at the rank of senior associate or full professor; (2) a record of excellence in teaching; (3) demonstrated capacity for providing academic leadership in global supply chain strategy; (4) a record of excellence in publishing research; and (5) experience in engaging with the business community. Relevant industry or consulting experience and a record of external funding is desirable but not required. Position is full time starting in August 2006. Salary is competitive with a full benefit package. Review of applications will begin on December 1, 2005, and will continue until the position is filled.

Please send a letter of application, full curriculum vitae, three current and original letters of reference, and transcript(s) to: Janet L. Hartley, PhD, College of Business Administration, Department of Management, 3018 BAA, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403-0269, www.cba.bgsu.edu

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHARLOTTE
The Belk College of Business

The Department of Business Information Systems and Operations Management at UNC-Charlotte invites applications for one assistant/associate professor position in Management Information Systems and one assistant professor position in Operations Management beginning August 2006. The department offers undergraduate degrees in MIS and Operations Management, concentrations in Information Technology Management and Supply Chain Management in the MBA program, and participates in the interdisciplinary MS(IT) and Ph.D.(IT) programs. All Belk College programs are accredited by AACSB International.

These positions require a completed Ph.D. or D.B.A., evidence of research productivity and potential for publishing in leading academic journals. All applicants must submit a letter of application and vita to: Dr. Moutaz Khouja (mjkhouja@email.uncc.edu), Chair, Department of Business Information Systems and Operations Management, The Belk College of Business, UNC-Charlotte, 9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001.

The University of North Carolina-Charlotte is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Women, minorities and individuals with a disability are encouraged to apply. Applications deadline: October 1, 2005, or until the position is filled.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

Assistant Professor: Teach undergraduate/graduate MIS courses within prescribed curriculum; advise students on academic/career curricula; conduct research in E-Business, Supply Chain Management, Enterprise Software; serve on service committees. Req Ph.D. or foreign dgr equiv in Information Systems, Management Sciences or related discipline. Send resume to USM, 118 College Dr., #5178, Hattiesburg, MS 39406.

References
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Publications

Production and Operations Management seeks papers for a special issue on “RFID Applications in Private and Public Sector Operations.” Guest editors are Amitava Dutta, George Mason University, and Seungjin Whang, Stanford University. Submission deadline is September 30, 2005.

http://cricket.gmu.edu/CFP-POM-RFID.pdf


The Encyclopedia of E-Collaboration will be the most comprehensive compilation of short chapters addressing issues in connection with e-collaboration technologies and their impact on users. E-collaboration technologies are broadly defined as electronic technologies that enable collaboration among individuals engaged in a common task. Examples of e-collaboration technologies are web-based chat tools, web-based asynchronous conferencing tools, e-mail, listervs, collaborative writing tools, group decision support systems, teleconferencing suites, workflow automation systems, and document management technologies.

Coverage: The Encyclopedia of E-Collaboration will provide a compendium of terms, definitions and explanations of concepts, processes, and acronyms related to e-collaboration. It will feature short chapters (3,000-3,500 words) authored by leading experts offering an in-depth description of key terms and concepts related to different areas, issues and trends in connection with e-collaboration.

Contact Ned Kock at: nedkock@stx.rr.com or nedkock@tamiu.edu

http://citstamiu.edu/kockencyc Cecollab

International Journal of Manufacturing Technology and Management seeks papers for a special issue on “The Interface Between Manufacturing and Other Fields.” Guest editor is Timothy L. Urban (urbanl@utulsa.edu), The University of Tulsa. Deadline for submission is November 30, 2005.


International Journal of Production Economics seeks papers for a special issue on Operations Management in China. Special issue editors are David Robb, The University of Auckland; Justin Tan, Creighton University; and Kai Reimers, RWTH Aachen University. Submission deadline is December 31, 2005. This special issue provides a focused and timely forum for researchers to explore issues concerning the management of manufacturing and services operations management in China. In line with the objectives of the journal we seek papers that will improve decision making and practice of enterprises with operations in China, or dealing with operations in China. A wide variety of papers in conceptual and strategic theories, empirical research, case studies and analytical models focusing on the key issues of the theme of this special issue will be considered for publication.

http://www1.elsevier.com/homepage/sae/orms/proeco/call5.htm

International Journal of Production Economics seeks papers for a special issue on Research and Applications in E-Commerce and Third-Party Logistics Management. Guest Editors are Angappa Gunasekaran (agunasekaran@umassd.edu), Professor of Operations Management, University of Massachusetts, and Joseph Sarkis (jsarkis@clarku.edu), Professor of Operations and Environmental Management, Graduate School of Management, Clark University. Submission deadline is March 31, 2006.

Seeking to understand the role of network of partners and the implications of knowledge and information technology in the logistics value chain, this special issue of the International Journal of Production Economics (IJPE) also attempts to motivate further research in the areas of ECL and 3PL with the objective of helping companies with their downstream value chain activities and hence to be competitive in the 21st century global market. The objective of this special issue is to generate research that proposes suitable strategies, relevant methods and technologies for the development of ECL and 3PL. Managing logistics in new enterprise environment requires a suitable control system, performance measures and metrics. These issues will be given special emphasis in the special issue.

Contact Professor Angappa Gunasekaran, Department of Management, Charlton College of Business, University of Massachusetts - Dartmouth, 285 Old Westport Road, North Dartmouth, MA 02747-2300 USA, Tel: (508) 999-9187, Fax: (508) 910-6408, agunasekaran@umassd.edu; or Professor Joseph Sarkis, Graduate School of Management, Clark University, 950 Main Street, Worcester, MA 01610-1477 USA, Tel: (508) 793-7659, Fax: (508) 793-8822, jsarkis@clarku.edu

Journal of Operations Management seeks papers for a special issue on Research in Supply Chain Quality. Guest Editor is S. Thomas Foster, Jr., Brigham Young University. Manuscripts must be submitted by August 2006.

The increasing emphasis on supply chain management is causing researchers to rethink models, constructs, and frameworks for quality management that have been developed for the field of operations management. While some work has been done reflecting this reality, more scholarly work in this area is needed. Research in quality management has often focused on internal versus external quality – internal focusing on process and external focusing on the customer. As firms adopt the systems approach implicit in supply chain management this has the effect of internalizing the producer’s processes as well as upstream and downstream processes.

The special issue on Research in Supply Chain Quality aims to publish papers that provide greater insights into how decisions about quality management, quality assurance, and quality control need to be recast to improve supply chain performance. Content-wise, papers may be either conceptual or empirical in nature, and pursue either theory-building or theory-testing.

Contact Professor S. Thomas Foster, Jr., Department of Management, 689 Tanner Building, Marriott School of Management, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602, tom_foster@byu.edu
For reservations at the conference hotel of the Decision Sciences Institute’s 2005 Annual Meeting, please complete the form below and mail it directly to the San Francisco Marriott Hotel. You may also make your reservations online.

The San Francisco Marriott requires a credit card to guarantee reservations or a check for one night’s deposit. We accept the following major credit cards: Visa, Master Card, American Express, Discover, Diners Club, with expiration date, and must be received by October 28, 2005. (Reservations after this date—or after the room block is full—are subject to availability.) Failure to submit a deposit can result in cancellation of your reservation by the hotel.

If for some reason your plans change, you must cancel your reservations with the hotel 72 hours prior to arrival or you will be billed for the first night’s room charge plus tax. Also, should you be making your reservations without this form, it is necessary that you mention the Decision Sciences Institute in order to secure the special room rates and a room being held within our room block.

Check-in time is 4:00 p.m. Check-out time is 12:00 p.m.

MAIL THIS FORM TO:
San Francisco Marriott
Attention: Group Housing Department
55 Fourth Street
San Francisco, CA 94103-3199

Hotel Reservation Form
Decision Sciences Institute
2005 Annual Meeting
November 19-22, 2005
(Group rate available from November 16-26, 2005)

Room type requested: Room requested:
☒ Nonsmoking ☐ $166 (single)
☒ One king-sized ☐ $199 (double)
☒ Double/Double ☐ $219 (triple)
☒ Special needs ☐ $239 (quad)

For registering online:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Code</th>
<th>Guests</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSIDSIA</td>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>$166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSIDSIB</td>
<td>2 people</td>
<td>$199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSIDSIC</td>
<td>3 people</td>
<td>$219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSIDSID</td>
<td>4 people</td>
<td>$239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A check, money order, or major credit card information must be submitted for guaranteed reservations.

Credit Card Name ________________________________
Number ________________________________________
Expiration Date ________________________________
Card Holder’s Name ______________________________
Signature ______________________________________
(please print)

Arrival date: ____________ Departure date: ________
Time: ___________________
Last Name ______________________________________
First Name __________________ M.I. ____________
Sharing with ________________________________
Organization ________________________________

Address ______________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
City ______________________________________
State/Province/Country______________ Zip _____
Phone (work) __________________ Fax ___________
Email ______________________________________
All attendees must register for the meeting. Conference registrations must be postmarked by October 22, 2005, to avoid a late fee of $50. After October 22, requests for cancellation refunds will not be accepted. Mail form and payment for the registration fee to: Decision Sciences Institute, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303, fax 404-651-4008.

1. Where are you staying in San Francisco?
   a. Conference hotel
   b. Other (please specify)

2. Type of accommodation:
   a. Single
   b. Double

3. Date of arrival:
   a. Fri. (11/18)
   b. Sat. (11/19)
   c. Sun. (11/20)
   d. Mon. (11/21)
   e. Tues. (11/22)

4. Do you plan to attend:
   a. Sunday's lunch?
   b. Monday's reception?
   c. Tuesday's luncheon?
   d. All?
   e. None?

5. Interest Area (check one):
   a. Academic Administration
   b. Accounting
   c. Economics
   d. Finance
   e. Health Care Systems
   f. Innovative Education
   g. International Business
   h. Marketing
   i. Microcomputer Systems & Apps.
   j. IS/ITSS
   k. Managerial Problem-Solving
   l. Organizational Behavior
   m. Organizational Theory
   n. Manufacturing/Service Management
   o. Public/Nonprofit Management
   p. Quantitative Techniques & Meth.
   q. Stats, Decisions & Fore.
   r. Strategic Management & Policy
   s. Technology and Innovation
   t. E-commerce
   u. Other
   v. None

6. What is your primary regional affiliation:
   a. Asia-Pacific Region
   b. Midwest Region
   c. Northeast Region
   d. Southeast Region
   e. Southwest Region
   f. Western Region
   g. At-Large
   h. None

7. What is your interest in placement?
   a. As employer and employee
   b. Employee only
   c. Employer only
   d. None

8. What was the primary reason you decided to attend the annual meeting?
   a. Annual Meeting in general
   b. MBA Mini-program
   c. Doctoral Student Consortium
   d. New Faculty Development Consortium
   e. Sunday's Special Program
   f. Saturday's Special Program
   g. Mini-Conferences
   h. Business Ph.D. Program
   i. Professional Devel. Program
   j. Other
   k. None

9. Please check if you are a member of Alpha Iota Delta and would like to be identified as such at the Annual Meeting.

10. Please check if you would like to receive subscription information about the Journal of Business and Management, sponsored by the Western Decision Sciences Institute (WDSI).


The Annual Meeting Proceedings will be produced in CD-ROM format only. No hard copies will be available. The CD-ROM Proceedings is included in the conference registration fee for all registered attendees; however, if you do not wish to receive the Proceedings, please indicate below. Additional CD-ROM Proceedings can be purchased at a cost of $25.00 each, but must be ordered by October 1, 2005 (see form below).

I do not wish to receive the Annual Meeting Proceedings.

Member registration $250.00
2005-06 Member dues renewal
(For the exact amount owed, please refer to the 2005-06 dues renewal notice previously mailed to you.)
   (Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 100.00
(Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 5.00
Non-Member registration
( Please check if you desire membership benefits. This fee entitles you to one year of membership in the Institute.)
   (Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 350.00
(Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 5.00
Student member registration 60.00
2005-06 Student dues renewal
(For the exact amount owed, please refer to the 2005-06 dues renewal notice previously mailed to you.)
   (Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 25.00
(Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 5.00
Student Non-Member registration
(Please check if you desire membership benefits. This fee entitles you to one year of membership in the Institute.)
   (Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 85.00
(Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 5.00
Emeritus Member registration 25.00
Emeritus Non-Member registration 58.00
(Outside U.S. & Canada add $5) 5.00
Extra Sunday's buffet lunch @ $28.50 each
Extra Tuesday's awards luncheon(s) @ $31.50 each
Extra CD-ROM Proceedings @ $25.00 each
After October 21, 2005 (LATE FEE) 50.00

TOTAL

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION:

Visa     MC     American Express
Discovery

Total Amount $_________

Card No. ____________________________ Expires: ___ /___

Card Holder’s Name ____________________________________________________________

(please print)

Signature ______________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
**OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS**

The Institute’s 2005-06 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Secretary, and Vice Presidents elected at-large to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2007.

Your recommendations should include the affiliation of each nominee, the office recommended for the nominee, and a brief statement of qualifications of the nominee. If you would like to recommend persons for the offices of regionally elected Vice Presidents from the Asia-Pacific, Midwest and Northeast regions, please indicate so on the form below. These names will be forwarded to the appropriate regional nominating committee chair.

Please send your recommendations to the Chair of the Nominating Committee, c/o the Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

The Nominating Committee is most appreciative of your assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Nominee’s Name &amp; Affiliation</th>
<th>Statement of Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please send your recommendations to the Chair of the Nominating Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Nominee’s Name &amp; Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FELLOWS’ NOMINATIONS**

The designation of Fellow is awarded to active supporters of the Institute for outstanding contributions in the field of decision sciences. To be eligible, a candidate must have achieved distinction in at least two of the following categories: (1) research and scholarship, (2) teaching and/or administration (3) service to the Decision Sciences Institute.

In order for the nominee to be considered, the nominator must submit a full vita of the nominee along with a letter of nomination which highlights the contributions made by the nominee in research, teaching and/or administration and service to the Institute. Nominations must highlight the nominee’s contributions and provide appropriate supporting information which may not be contained in the vita.

This information should be sent to the Chair of the Fellows Committee, Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

For your reference, the names of previously elected Fellows are listed in the next column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Sciences Institute Fellows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Everett E., Jr., University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, John C., University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, P. George, University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beranek, William, University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry, William L., The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonis, Charles P., Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buza, Elwood S., University of California-Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cangello, Vincent J. (deceased), University of Southwest Louisiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Philip L., Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase, Richard B., University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chervany, Norman L., University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapper, James M., Belmont University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Rodney D., Drexel University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couger, J. Daniel (deceased), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings, Larry L. (deceased), University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darden, William R. (deceased), Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, K. Roscoe, University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Mark M., Bentley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Ralph L. (deceased), Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digman, Lester A., University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock, V. Thomas, Maui, Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebert, Ronald J., University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Ward, University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, James R., University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetters, Robert B., Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Benito E., Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn, Barbara B., Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz, Lori S., University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover, Fred W., University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravonia, Dennis E. (deceased), Boulder City, Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Paul E., University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groff, Gene K., Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta, Jatinder N.D., University of Alabama in Huntsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, Chan K., Bowling Green State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamner, W. Clay, Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershauer, James C., Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honowitz, Ira, University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houck, Ernest C., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber, George P., University of Texas-Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs, F. Robert, Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall, Kenneth E., Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keown, Arthur J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khumawala, Basheer M., University of Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Kee Young, Yonsei University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, William R., University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koehler, Anne B., Miami University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krajewski, Les J., Notre Dame University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaForge, Lawrence, Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latta, Carol J., Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Sang M., University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luthans, Fred, University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabert, William B., Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malhotra, Naresh K., Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markland, Robert E., University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Jeffrey G., Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Kent B., University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Laurence J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskovitz, Herbert, Purdue University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narasimhan, Ram, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neter, John, University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutt, Paul C., The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, David L., Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins, William C., Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, William S., University of New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippatos, George C., University of Tennessee-Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raiffa, Howard, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimneth, James R., University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaal, Lawrence L., University of Texas at Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitter, Thomas J., University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Roger C., University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shocum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobol, Marion G., Southern Methodist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorensen, James E., University of Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprague, Linda C., China Europe International Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinberg, Earle, Teche Ross &amp; Company, Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summers, George W. (deceased), University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Bernard W. III, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout, Marvin D., Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhl, Kenneth P. (deceased), University of Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vazsonyi, Andrew, University of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasserman, William, Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wemmerlov, Urban, University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeleright, Steven C., Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitten, Betty J., University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whybark, D. Clay, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicklend, Gary A., University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkler, Robert L., Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woosley, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortman, Max S., Jr., Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zumd, Robert W., Florida State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision Line, July 2005
Decision Sciences Institute
Application for Membership

Name, Institution or Firm

Address (Home/Business)

Phone Number

Dues Schedule: ___ Renewal ___ First Time ___ Lapsed
(circle one) U.S./Can. International
Regular Membership $100 ......... $100
Student Membership $25 ......... $25
(Student membership requires signature of sponsoring member.)
Emeritus Membership $33 ......... $37
(Emeritus membership requires signature of member as a declaration of emeritus status.)
Institutional Membership $100 ......... $100
(You have been designated to receive all publications and special announcements of the Institute.)

Please send your payment (in U.S. dollars) and application to:
Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303. For more information, call 404-651-4073 or email dsi@gsu.edu.

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION: ☐ Visa ☐ MC ☐ AmEx ☐ Disc.
Total amount $__________________
Card No. ______________________________ Expires: ___ /___
Card Holder’s Name ___________________________________________
Signature ____________________________________________________
(Please Print)

CALENDAR

SEPTEMBER 2005

September 15 Submission deadline for the New Faculty Development Consortium, dealing with research, teaching, publishing and other professional development issues for new faculty. See page 29.


OCTOBER


NOVEMBER
November 19-22 36th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held at the San Francisco Marriott in downtown San Francisco. See page 25.

MARCH 2006
March 1 The Southwest Region will hold its 2006 (27th) Annual Meeting on March 1-4, 2006, at the Sheraton New Orleans Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana. See page 24 or http://www.swdsi.org

March 30 Northeast Region will hold its 2006 Annual Meeting on March 30-April 1, 2006, at the Caribe Hilton, San Juan, Puerto Rico. See page 24 or http://www.nedsi.org

FEBRUARY