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Some Thoughts on China

Thomas E. Callarman, Arizona State University

It’s hard to believe that a year has passed. This is my last letter as president of the Decision Sciences Institute, and I will take the opportunity to thank a few people. First, the membership, for having enough confidence in me to elect me as president. In the May issue of Decision Line, we will present the accomplishments of the Board of Directors and the Institute during this past year. Second, I’d like to thank the outgoing Board...
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FROM THE EDITOR

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

S
pring is here and with it another issue of Decision Line filled with several thought provoking articles. In his last message as president of the Decision Sciences Institute, Professor Thomas E. Callarman, Arizona State University, thanks the members of the DSI Board and staff members for their contributions and welcomes Professor Mark Davis, Bentley College, as the incoming president. He also describes his experiences in China both from a research and personal perspective.

Professor T. Grandon Gill, University of South Florida, winner of the 2005 Instructional Innovative Award Competition, has graciously agreed to share his submission entitled “A Learner-Centered Capstone Course for a MIS Master’s Degree Program” in this issue. One of the innovations of the capstone course is the use of Elluminate, an Internet application which enables live discussion and dynamic interaction to engage students, enhance learning, and improve comprehension. The implication is that case discussions and debates can be carried out online relatively easily with the right technology.

In the International Column, David Booth, VMC Consulting, a subsidiary of Volt Information Sciences, presents current trends in offshore outsourcing. We are currently seeing an increasing number of U.S. firms outsourcing to foreign countries where labor is cheaper. A trend he envisions is the use of regional program management desks to help reduce the pressure on those managing the domestic outsourcing relationship. Quite often, business process outsourcing fails because of the poor choice of location. Another trend is the selective use of near-shore locations to provide a high-quality service experience.

As noted in the feature article by David Booth, offshore outsourcing is an issue many organizations have to deal with today. Associated with an increase in off-shoring activities is the need for improved logistics. Professor Michael F. Gorman, University of Dayton, discusses the impact of international transportation on supply chain, production planning, and inventory. He concludes that transportation infrastructure must keep pace with an increase in global trade to avoid port and highway congestion.

Two former students of Professor Rick Hesse, Pepperdine University, approached him regarding a problem common to chip manufacturers. Typically, chip manufacturers are awarded large contracts from several companies for chips that go into several different products. A spreadsheet was developed to forecast cash flow in the future, given the design awards. However, when real data was used, the model surprisingly did not perform well.

Today, a cell phone is more than a cell phone, serving as a wireless device that can send e-mail, browse the Internet, take digital pictures, and make phone calls. Cell phone technology is increasing at a rapid pace. Professor J. P. Shim (Mississippi State University), Julie M. Shim (SoldierDesign, Cambridge, MA), and Professor Kyungmo Ahn (Kyunghee University) discuss Cellevision, the latest innovation in cell phone technology. Cellevision is defined as “a multicast process that captures digital broadcasts and delivers multimedia (text, television images, and videos) to mobile devices in motion, such as cellular phones, PDAs, and in-automobile devices.” The authors provide an overview of digital multi-media broadcasting (DMB) and discuss findings on the users’ perception of DMB cellular phones in Korea.

Professor Ralph F. Mullin, Central Missouri State University, in The Deans’ Perspective column discusses how business schools can achieve quality. He cautions that making improvements to an “obsolete, stable system” is not the solution. Instead, what is needed is a transformational change to a completely
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A Learner-Centered Capstone Course for a MIS Master’s Degree Program

by T. Grandon Gill, Information Systems and Decision Sciences Department, University of South Florida

SM-6155, Enterprise Information Systems, is the capstone course for the University of South Florida’s Master’s in MIS (MsMIS) program. As a capstone, the principal goal of the course is to prepare students for what will come next—either working as an MIS professional or undertaking further study. In the course syllabus, these broad goals are presented in the form of the following course objectives:

1. An appreciation of the complex interaction between individual/organizational forces and technological issues in the development, deployment and use of information systems, with a particular focus on organizational strategy.
2. An understanding of how events in the evolution of MIS have impacted its current form in organizations.
3. The ability to articulate convincing positions with respect to some of the most critical debates in the field of IT today.
4. Familiarity with some of the types of activities that constitute MIS research.

Superimposed upon these specific objectives are a series of more general pedagogical goals. Foremost among these is enhancing each student’s communications skills—in discussion, in presentation and in written form. Additionally, the course attempts to introduce students to a constructivist, active-learning approach to teaching—ubiquitous in some programs (e.g., case-method business schools) but uncommon in the relatively technical MS program. Finally, it acquaints students with a number of technological tools for learning (e.g., infrared response systems, library databases, synchronous online discussions) that have substantial applicability to industry, as well as academia.

Innovative Features

The course is organized into three activity streams (case discussions, debates, and strategic system research) which, collectively, represent 100 percent of the student’s grade. Each stream has a number of innovative elements.

Case discussions. The case discussion pedagogy is widely used in business schools. For the purposes of the course, however, a number of innovations have been introduced. First, because the students have generally had little exposure to the case method, the initial discussion case used in the course is not an MIS case, but rather a case—written by the instructor—about a case method Executive MBA class that went into open rebellion shortly after its first session. Discussion of the case introduces students to case method protocols and clarifies the expectations of the instructor, without resorting to the self-defeating expedient of lecturing students about what a case discussion is like. Another innovation is the use of a classroom response system (CRS) that allows students to register responses using infrared remotes. Each case begins with a five- or six-question multiple-choice quiz on the case facts, with the top scorer being announced to the class and sometimes (based on a coin toss) being given the choice of whether or not to open the case.

A final innovation to the case discussion process is the “online class week.” Towards the middle of the semester three case discussions are conducted over the course of a week, each using a different protocol: (1) an in-class discussion, (2) an asynchronously...
nous online discussion (using Blackboard), and (3) a synchronous online discussion. The last of these takes place using Elluminate, an Internet application providing useful capabilities that include text and voice chat, shared whiteboard (for drawings or slides), online testing and private breakout rooms—all of which are used during the discussion.

**Debates.** Although there are relatively few examples of debating being used as a teaching tool in business education, the instructor was attracted to the technique for three reasons: (1) prior experience had convinced him that conducting more than one case discussion during a 3-hour night class session resulted in a considerable decline in discussion intensity; (2) the analytical skills involved in debating seemed similar to those associated with case discussions; and (3) although debates offered the opportunity for students to make presentations, they were also an activity that could involve the entire class.

The instructor’s protocol begins with creating a list of nine or ten topics each semester. A topic is generally expressed as a short statement, such as:

**Resolved: Within 50 years, we can expect to see information technologies capable of the same type of flexible, common sense reasoning that humans alone are capable of today.**

Each student is required to sign up for two or three topics. Once groups have been formed for each topic, members are assigned—at random—to the pro and con sides, with one student also being assigned to the moderator role. No allowance for student preferences is made when determining these assignments. As a result, students frequently find themselves arguing against a position they passionately favor. After teams and roles have been assigned, debates take place weekly. At least a week before each debate, the moderator uploads a one-to-three-page briefing paper to Blackboard, outlining the topic and identifying specific questions to be addressed. From that point until the day of the debate, the pro and con teams post the references they intend to use on Blackboard, for everyone in the class to see (including the opposing side). Currently, a wiki-style “team site” is used for this purpose, with both pro and con sides being able to edit the reference list or make comments.

In class, each debate begins with a survey of opinions on the topic, conducted using the CRS with summary results displayed to all students. An instructor-developed, five-question multiple-choice test on the contents of the moderator’s briefing paper is then administered to the entire class—not just panelists. The moderator then gives a short introduction (approx. five minutes) to the topic, followed by short presentations by the pro and con sides, after which the moderator (assisted, when needed, by the instructor) leads a discussion between panelists and the class as a whole. At the conclusion of the debate, the opinion survey (conducted at the beginning of the session) is repeated. No attempt to announce a “winning team” is made. The reasoning here is to avoid creating incentives that could lead to “gaming” the system (e.g., withholding key references from the opposing team until minutes before class begins).

During online class day, a synchronous online debate is also conducted—run by a student moderator trained to use Elluminate by the instructor.

**Strategic Systems Research Project.** The strategic systems research project is another exercise developed specifically for the course. The project revolves around fostering a deeper understanding of the nature of “strategic information systems.” To complete the assignment, each student first chooses two or three historical systems (drawn from a list of over 100 systems compiled by the instructor and a doctoral student). The student must then classify each system according to schemes developed in references provided by the instructor and trace its impact to the present day. The form of the project is a long questionnaire that asks both general questions about the nature of the system and requires Likert-style rankings on about 15 questions, each of must which be justified (in essay form) using citations describing the system. Prior to the start of the project, students are given a 75-minute lecture—conducted by a research librarian who has been assisting the class for over two years—that identifies online and paper sources of information previously found to be relevant to the project.

The project differs from a typical masters-level class paper in a number of ways. First, each student submission is intended to be part of a larger research project that will ultimately become an online database made available to the MIS research community, as well as being the principal source for a number of research papers detailing the project’s findings. Second, to ensure rigor, each system is being researched at least three times. The first two projects on a given system are prepared completely independently by students in different semesters. The third project involves taking the two independent reports and reconciling them, to create a final report and a system summary. In situations where the two independent assessments differ significantly in their conclusions, the system is classified as a “problem system,” and is researched in one additional semester.

A third difference between the project and typical papers relates to the grading process. Specifically, the principal grading activity on these reports occurs more than a month before the final drafts are due. The objective here is to get students to respond to comments (a doctoral student and the instructor both review and comment on each submission), much the way an author responds to reviewer comments during the manuscript submission process. The final difference involves how the writing process is monitored. As they conduct their research, students must keep an online journal of their findings and references. These journals are then regularly examined by the instructor over the course of the project.

One interesting implication of the strategic systems project’s design is a continually changing mix of activities. The original project was expected to take five semesters but—owing to a trend of declining MIS enrollments—it will actually take seven semesters. During the early semesters (fall 2003, spring 2004), students necessarily researched individual systems exclusively. As of spring 2006, nearly all projects involve either problem systems or system consolidations. In fall 2006, focus will shift yet again, and the assignment will include a class project to develop an online delivery system to make the reports available to researchers over the Internet. In spring 2007, an entirely new multi-year project—on a different topic—will be initiated.
Organization
The typical semester of ISM-6155 consists of 15 three-hour class blocks. These blocks are broken into two 75-minute segments. Normally the first segment consists of a case discussion, while the second consists of a debate. As shown in Figure 1, cases relating to similar topics are grouped together, and debate topics relating to similar issues are normally scheduled for a week or two after the corresponding case. Lectures, shown in white, take place at the beginning and end of the course. A 90-minute period is also set aside specifically for filling in class-related forms, which include the university’s course evaluation, the department’s exit survey for MS-MIS students, and the instructor’s own data-gathering instrument. Finally, content with strong ethical considerations and global management implications is spread uniformly throughout the semester.

Outcomes
The effectiveness of the course design has been assessed through student reactions, instructor observations and performance assessments. Among the observed outcomes:

- **Student evaluations** of the course and instructor have been far above college averages. For example, the fall 2004 set of evaluations (with a 74 percent response rate), awarded both the course and the instructor perfect (5/5) scores—an event so noteworthy that the department chair circulated a memo to the faculty.

- **High quality of student-prepared work**, with both debate preparation and research papers substantially exceeding the instructor’s original expectations. Anecdotally, it is a rare debate where the instructor does not learn something material about the topic. Also, one manuscript—written by a doctoral student and inspired by observations made in project reports—recently received a “best paper” award at the 2005 AMCIS conference.

- **High levels of effort**, with students reporting spending more time on the course than on their average MS course. These self-reports seem to be confirmed by student journals, with the fall 2004 consolidated research logs of 18 students coming to 309 single-spaced pages (when imported into MS-Word).

- **End-of-semester survey items relating to course design** not only show students are satisfied with each course activity, but also show complete lack of consensus regarding any alternative design direction.

- **Enthusiastic participation in course activities**, such as the online class day—first offered up by the instructor as a possible voluntary activity in late January 2005. (Amazingly, 17 of 19 students surveyed anonymously afterwards opted for a second online day, despite the extra effort required).

Transferability
As a conclusion to this description of the ISM-6155 capstone course, it is useful to consider one further question: would the approach taken in the course work elsewhere? The answer depends mainly upon the degree to which an individual can embrace a discussion-dominated pedagogy. Since such an approach necessarily entails some loss of instructor control over content and topic, it is likely that many instructors would find themselves uncomfortable applying the techniques presented here.

Where a faculty member is willing to place much of the responsibility for learning in student hands, however, the protocols developed for ISM-6155 appear to be highly transferable along two dimensions. First, there is nothing in the protocols devised for the course that is MIS dependent. Thus, any discipline where the case method can be used effectively would seem to be a reasonable candidate. Suitable debate or research topics, specific to the field, can be chosen by the instructor or—even better—identified based upon student input (in the constructivist tradition).

The second dimension of transferability is to distance learning. The initial positive reaction to the online class days (admittedly, only three so far) suggests that case discussions and debates can move online relatively seamlessly—given the proper IT tools. In addition, resources required for research projects are increasingly available online at universities supporting strong research libraries. The implication, then, is that such a design could be implemented online with only modest modifications.

---

Figure 1: Sequence of course topics.
In this article, David Booth provides two compelling insights into offshore outsourcing trends. These trends should help companies better motivate and retain personnel involved in managing offshore outsourcing and ensure a high-quality service experience for all its clients.

Current Trends in Offshore Outsourcing—An Insider’s Perspective

by David Booth, VMC Consulting

Today there is much spirited debate concerning outsourcing and its impact on our economy and prospects for tomorrow’s graduates. One thing is clear—outsourcing of business processes has become typical, if not a mandate, for companies large and small. Setting aside the questions concerning impacts of offshore outsourcing, I would like to discuss key trends within the practice of offshore outsourcing that reflects its increasing maturity and sophistication.

To begin, I would like to clarify a few definitions. “Offshore” is a term which is obviously relative to the location of the speaker; however, it is commonly used to denote industrialized technology centers in such areas in China, Southeast Asia, South Africa and Eastern Europe. A related term is “Near-shore”; for a U.S. speaker, Near-shore represents technology centers in countries such as Canada, Mexico, and Central and Latin American nations. These nations are differentiated from offshore locations by their similar time zones, American cultural influences, and lower trade barriers (both quantitative and qualitative). Finally, “outsourcing” occurs when a segment of a businesses value-chain is performed by an outside company. Understanding this definition is critical, as it presupposes that the sole aim of outsourcing is to expand the value-chain by performing the function at either a lower cost or at a higher quality.

As offshore outsourcing gains greater attention, it has gained greater sophistication as well. The following changes and trends reflect efforts to both selectively increase value to end clients as well as to minimize the appearance of outsourcing where it has produced negative customer reactions.

Trend One: Regional Program Management Desks

Information Technology (IT) outsourcing organizations will begin utilizing regional “program management desks” in order to minimize pressure on those who manage the outsourcing relationship domestically.

Let us begin by looking at the pressures placed on U.S.-based personnel tasked with managing production of IT services and products from an offshore location. Unlike offshore call centers, IT workers typically work during their home country’s business hours. This means that a U.S. manager and his Indian counterpart will have shifts that deviate by around 12 hours. The response to this scenario is that many U.S.-based personnel are forced to work either early in the morning or late at night. Travel to locations such as Bangalore and Hyderabad, India, can be grueling as well. While there are now
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many direct flights to key locations such as Delhi, India—travel times can be as long as 36 hours including all layovers. Lastly, where cost is a factor, many U.S. companies have continually moved their sites in order to take advantage of cost differentials. Companies today doing business in India may, in one year or more, make the decision to relocate some of their outsourcing to lower-cost locations such as Vietnam.

The result is that U.S. managers can be heavily pressured by cultural, time-zone, and travel challenges, as well as by the impacts of relocating their location and, hence, the onsite personnel with whom they work on a regular basis. Threats of Intellectual Property (IP) theft also create fears in the mind of many U.S. companies that their outsourcing may include unrecognized costs. The effect of these combined pressures is to create a non-monetary “qualitative buffer” to outsourcing. A solution that can serve to minimize these buffers is for the outsourcing vendor to create a “program management desk” in a higher cost yet highly stable, culturally compatible, and IP-protection compliant nation. Countries which fit this description include Singapore, Malaysia and Australia.

From the perspective of the U.S. companies outsourcing their work offshore, they have now have gained significant benefits over the traditional outsourcing relationship. Their vendor contacts, overseeing the creation of the IT product, now reside in a more culturally-compatible location, and they straddle their working hours so as to be available during a large portion (> 50 percent) of U.S. business hours. The distribution of IT work is now handled out of a location where IP protection can be better protected. In addition, by utilizing a central location, the outsourcing vendor can continually relocate their client’s outsourced work between locations without impacting the client themselves.

As we can see, the adoption of a regional program management desk can minimize many of the buffers that today impact the outsourcing of information technology work. The coming changes within Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), including call centers, also involve the use of interim locations in order to reduce qualitative costs. However, these changes are primarily focused on impacts to the end customer, rather than the personnel tasked with managing the outsourcing effort.

Trend Two: Selective Use of Near-Shore Locations

The “failures” of BPO that have gained publicity, by and large, stem from work that has been located improperly. This can be caused when high-value client contacts are routed to centers that are designed to handle lower-value clients or interactions. Additionally, clients can be impacted when their contact, whether through phone or email, is transferred between locations. Troubleshooting, or account, histories can be lost in the transfer, and high-value client contact requests can sit in a pool of lower-value contacts.

The resolution to these problems can be delivered by outsourcing vendors capable of providing both service and via customer life-cycle management through a near-shore location. High value contacts can then be segmented and delivered to higher skilled and/or more culturally similar agents. With modern contact center software, customer contacts can be efficiently tracked and monitored in order to meet multiple service-level objectives. With the use of these software programs, a manager at a near-shore provider can track progress and escalate a customer and the transaction- or technical-support resolution history to a near-shore agent while meeting service-level obligations.

We see that the outsourcing function is now segmented in such a way that the lower cost, process-oriented organization can focus on delivering the service to the client, while the higher-cost but customer-service-savvy center can manage the customer experience. Additional benefits are also available through this practice, including the capability to provide low-volume non-English language support through the near-shore location where the skill sets are more easily sourced than in a low cost labor market.

The net result of both of these key strategies is to further lower the barriers to offshore outsourcing by minimizing the friction within the outsourcing relationship, both to the end customer as well as to those who must manage the outsourcing relationship domestically.
In the following article, Professor Mike Gorman of the University of Dayton points out the importance of considering transportation infrastructure for effective global supply chain management. Using a variety of examples, Gorman identifies several challenges facing managers today in coordinating shipments that span multiple regions using multiple modes of transportation. The article ends with suggestions for solving the problems pertaining to the transportation infrastructure such as congestion, security issues long lead times, and excessive working capital requirements from longer pipeline and safety inventories.

Transportation and the World Economy

by Michael F. Gorman, School of Business, University of Dayton

Outsourcing and internationalization are the most dramatic developments in today’s manufacturing environment. Major enablers of this trend are many. First, we witness declining tariffs and protectionist policies world-wide due to agreements such as NAFTA, and formation of groups such as the World Trade Organization, and the European Union. As a result, investment and growth in more stabilized emerging nations such as China has been growing. Second, low cost email and telephony technology for communication and satellite-based tracking of product worldwide enables international coordination and reduces risk of product loss. Finally, a primary enabler of internationalization is the more affordable and reliable international transportation brought on by the evolution of the world transportation infrastructure: roads, rails, ports, and oceanic shipping lanes.

In this essay, we look at how transportation infrastructure decisions have major implications for manufacturers, transportation providers, and government policy makers and how the world’s transportation infrastructure and logistics industry continue to evolve to support these new international logistics patterns.

International Transportation Impacts on Logistics and Production Planning

With the outsourcing and internationalization of production, there is a dramatic impact on calculus surrounding
transportation, inventory, and logistics on production planning and global sourcing decisions. Clearly, a primary driver to internationalization is the desire for lower costs of production. Lower costs of production directly decrease the investment per unit in work in process and finished goods inventory. Meanwhile, these inventories are traveling over dramatically longer distances, dramatically increasing the total transportation cost per unit of finished product. As a result, transportation costs compose a larger percentage of the total product cost of internationally produced goods than their domestic counterparts. This pattern is apparent when observing the steady growth in freight transportation expenditures as a percentage of total manufacturing costs throughout the 1990s. With higher fuel prices spiking up transportation costs, this pattern promises to continue into the future. Savvy manufacturers are heavily weighing these higher transportation costs as they design their international supply chains and develop their strategic production and logistics plans.

Of course, lead times are much longer with internationalization. Transit time through the Pacific is up to two weeks, and this does not include the time in transit both from the production location to the port, nor the time from the domestic port to the final consumer. Growth in South East Asian regions or countries has been predominantly in port cities to avoid costly transit over an underdeveloped transportation infrastructure, but the production growth is spreading inland. In the U.S., average truckload haulage distances have been steadily on the climb, from 370 miles per haul in 1988 to over 450 miles per haul in 2000 (a 26 percent increase) as a larger percentage of freight moves from port cities over longer distances to their final destination (Eno Transportation Foundation, Transportation in America, 1999, p. 51). More time in transit amounts to more “pipeline” inventories between source and demand points. Further, given longer lead times in international transportation, there is typically more variability in demand during lead time giving rise to larger safety stocks.

International shipping is a large-lot phenomenon. To achieve improved economies of scale to overcome the huge distances traveled, ever-growing gargantuan container ships now carrying up to 8,000 containers apiece cycle through the Pacific at regular intervals bringing imports to the U.S. But even domestic freight transportation experiences dramatic economies of scale. Generally, the cost to move a ton of freight one mile for air freight is over two times the cost of “less than truckload” (LTL) per ton mile, which is itself over three times the cost of full truckload per ton mile. While intermodal rail (trailer or container on a rail flatcar) usually offers a twenty-five percent discount to truck, it is still often twice as much per ton mile than box car. The dramatic discounts for larger lots, coupled with the dramatically longer international and domestic distances traveled by freight with internationalization gives strong incentives for larger lot sizes. These larger lots directly impact production, inventory, warehousing and distribution networks for importers.

As described earlier, the numerous handoffs inherent in international transportation create numerous endogenous points of failure due to the sheer number of participants in an international freight shipment. These endogenous risks are dwarfed, however, by the exogenous risks facing international supply chains. The sources of delay in international supply chain include regularly experienced, minor delays due to oceanic weather patterns (storm and winds) as on land (snow). Since 9/11, delays in customs clearance have been a regular nuisance, though with new processes and technologies these delays are abating. Finally international supply chains are more subject to significant, catastrophic events such as severe weather (tsunamis, hurricanes and floods), international supplier bankruptcies, and geopolitical instability as in the Middle East. Overall, considering all these potentially disruptive forces, it would seem these “irregular occurrences” aren’t so irregular at all. The result of all these uncertainties gives rise to yet another form of safety stock—one to account for added uncertainties in when the product might arrive.

**International Transportation Impacts on Inventory**

These trends run opposite of Just-in-Time (JIT) ideals such as suppliers locating close to customers, reducing inventories by shipping in frequent small lots, reducing lead times and variability. JIT inventory practices under internationally sourcing strategies are largely impossible; the economies of scale from large lot shipments far outweigh savings from any inventory reductions. Yet companies often try to maintain inventory reduction programs while they outsource internationally. As a result, firms that claim JIT practices while sourcing from the Far East (e.g., Walmart) are merely “pushing inventory around the supply chain” through Vendor Managed Inventory (VMI) and consignment programs without any real reductions in inventory across the supply chain.

For example, in the U.S, the holiday retail import rush begins in the transportation industry on the west coast in August and completes in early December. In fact, business models have arisen to help reduce the financing costs through third-party financing of this inventory, reducing the cost of inventory through lower interest rates rather than actually lowering inventory levels. Longer pipelines full of larger lot sizes, earlier reorder points to account for higher demand during lead time and uncertainties in shipment times. How can manufacturers afford it? In simplest terms, the cost of inventory is Cost/Unit * Holding costs * quantity of inventory. Let’s see what’s happening to each of these components of inventory costs. First, we must note that the driving force behind internationalization is reducing the cost of production, so while the quantities of inventory in transit is undoubtedly increasing with internation-
alization, the cost per unit has dramatically fallen, thereby reducing the inventory holding cost per unit per unit of time. Second, while interest rates have risen of late, they are still at historic lows, generally making inventory more affordable. Finally, technology solutions such as RFID, satellite tracking, and Internet-based communications standards such as XML may help mitigate some of the upward pressure on inventory levels and reduce some of the non-interest costs of inventory such as shrinkage and administrative costs. It would be interesting to quantify the net impact of these confluences on total inventory holding costs in the international supply chain.

Transportation Infrastructure Impacts on the Supply Chain

Infrastructure capacity has some known “pinch” points which regularly create significant delays for manufacturers. For example, Chinese rail deficiencies hinder transport of freight to its outbound ports. Container ships have been heavily reallocated from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, reducing Atlantic shipping capacity. Western U.S. ports, especially L.A. harbor are often backed up as a result of larger and more frequent container ship deliveries. U.S. rail networks are often congested and facing rail car shortages. Trucking companies regularly face longhaul driver shortages. In a sense, the boom in internationalization was enabled by the improved transportation infrastructure, but the growth in freight far outstrips the rate at which the infrastructure can be continually improved and expanded.

As a result of the susceptibility to international infrastructure deficiencies and supply chain risks, manufacturers are faced with developing modified supply chain strategies which include duplication and contingency plans in their supply chains. For example, importers may employ a port diversification strategy in which primary ports are augmented with backup or secondary ports to allow for product diversions and exposure to port congestion. Alternatively, a mixed domestic and international sourcing strategy allows for avoiding the congested ports altogether when necessary. Both of these strategies create a loss of economies of scale in operations and transportation, and force second best routing and sourcing.

More creative load consolidation and deconsolidation strategies, coupled with distribution centers located closer to the ports, allow for higher velocity product movement in smaller lots while retaining the economies of scale necessary for long distances. However, this strategy requires additional product handling. Further, transloads and merge-in-transit facilities closer to the port may require the additional overhead of multiple distribution centers.

Of course, importers are forced to regularly resort to airfreight shipments to adjust for supply chain shocks on the fly when they are caught running too thin in the supply chain given its uncertainties. This high-cost remedy, along with the supply chain “insurance strategies” described above, diminish the returns to internationalization and outsourcing. The redundancy inefficiencies that result from these strategies are necessary in order to achieve a robust supply chain.

Implications for the International Transportation Infrastructure

As we described above, the world-wide transportation infrastructure accommodates international trade. Infrastructure investment lags and mismatch with demand create pinch points which can be costly for manufacturers and retailers. While China’s production and exports are booming, geographically, the growth has been primarily in coastal areas. For China to continue to grow inland, the production boom will have to move inland, and in order for that product to reach the ports, the infrastructure must be massively improved.

Each capacity shortfall must be addressed in a coordinated fashion. Ports must figure out how to deal with larger container ships effectively and with reduced port congestion. Further, the handoff costs between ocean vessel and domestic transportation modes must be reduced. Finally, the right mix of road and rail capacity must be developed to support import freight traffic patterns.

In the U.S., the vast majority of transportation infrastructure investment is undertaken by the federal government, and the vast majority of that is in the U.S. road network. On the other hand, the rail network is privately owned. These two planning entities face entirely different considerations for their investment decisions. Domestic freight infrastructure coordination between these modes is difficult, leading to suboptimal transportation infrastructure.

When highway congestion reaches unacceptable levels, both because voters are caught in the same congestion as freight, public demand is created for greater road capacity. Because historically freight growth rates are used to predict future needs, the highways expand. Over $100 billion is spent on roads each year in the U.S. on a network that is the single largest asset owned by the public sector and is steadily growing (see U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Bureau of Transportation Statistics: Table 1-A).

On the other hand, although U.S. railroads are as healthy as they have ever been since the Stagger’s Act deregulated them in 1980, they are still financially challenged to create sufficient infrastructure to accommodate rail traffic without significant congestion delays. Approximately $15 billion is spent each year on the U.S. freight rail network by major railroads (see American Association of Railroads, Freight Railroad Capacity Issues), but despite these investments, the network is actually shrinking in terms of total rail miles operated (see BTS Table 1-1: System mileage within the US).

The Department of Transportation predicts that freight transport in the U.S. will increase 55 percent between 2000 and 2020 (see DOT BTS: Freight Analysis Framework). Understanding how that freight will move is critical to build-
ing the infrastructure to support it. Transportation infrastructure planners need to consider changes in production, inventory, and distribution patterns to create an infrastructure which better matches the freight needs of international shippers.

Given earlier observations of the lower product cost, oceanic large lots, long lead time and uncertainty, and longer domestic haul of international freight shipments, total logistics cost modeling would indicate a shift towards lower cost transportation modes in the domestic U.S., if even at the expense of higher inventories. The drive for faster and more reliable domestic transportation deliveries is dampened by the reality that this component represents a smaller component of the inventory pipeline and inventories have already traveled around the world in slower, less reliable modes. Moving fast in the “last (2000) miles” can’t make up for that. The fact that a growing portion of freight is already moving in relatively slow and erratic oceanic vessels suggests that some freight may shift modes from smaller, faster shipments domestically to larger lot shipments with lower cost. Some readers may be surprised that rail still moves over 42 percent of the U.S. freight gross ton miles (see US DOT, BTS: Table 1-41), and is growing roughly as fast as truck, despite the rail network shrinkage.

However, a private market solution for building freight infrastructure may not be achievable. A significant benefit to rail freight transportation accrues to the general public in the form of reduced road congestion and pollution relative to truck freight (an estimated one-third of the benefit is a “public” good). A potential solution to investment misallocation is in public-private partnerships that split the cost of the investment according to how the benefits are accrued.

An example of this type of partnership occurred in the Alameda Corridor project in Los Angeles. Public and private funds financed a rail connection between the Los Angeles harbor, and western railroads reduce the local truck drayage, thereby both reducing road congestion and pollution in Los Angeles, and reducing the cost, complexity, and time for these shipments. Neither public nor private concerns could justify this project on their own, but together the public and private benefits far outweighed the investment costs. In a similar way, the European Union is striving to promote its network of inland waterways that may help alleviate road and rail congestion on that continent.

Conclusion

Transportation and logistics are critical components of any company’s supply chain, and with growing internationalization, this importance is magnified. As a result, transportation infrastructure is critically important to world economy. Effective and sufficient investment enables continued internationalization and continues to lower total cost of living through lowering total landed costs. As internationalization and freight shipments grow, infrastructure must keep pace to avoid pinch points which reduce effectiveness. In order to plan infrastructure effectively, carriers and public entities must develop an understanding of freight shippers’ logistics decisions, and in some cases develop a better partnerships to provide adequate infrastructure.
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USDA’s Economic Research Service Announces Competitive Awards Program

USDA’s Economic Research Service (ERS) Program of Research on the Economics of Invasive Species Management (PREISM) is pleased to announce a competitive awards program for Fiscal 2006. ERS initiated PREISM in 2003 to address economic issues and decision making related to managing invasive species in increasing global agricultural markets. Included are exotic crop pests and foreign livestock, poultry, zoonotic diseases, but also exotic pests or foreign diseases affecting public lands, ecosystems, or urban systems that are addressed by USDA programs. Research under this program concerns economic aspects of space, dynamics, risk, uncertainty, irreversible effects, or institutional frameworks that pertain to invasive species, and has a strong focus on practical applications to government prevention, surveillance (detection and monitoring), and management (control, containment, eradication, and restoration) decisions.

In 2006, ERS is seeking proposals that focus on applied economic research and/or decision support system development that has direct implications for USDA programs, policies, and decision making concerning invasive species. Priority Research Areas include: 1) Institutions and Incentives for Efficient Invasive Species Prevention and Management, 2) Practical Decision Analysis for Invasive Species Management, and 3) International Dimensions of Invasive Species Management.

Anticipated funding for 2006 competitive awards is approximately $1,000,000. Proposals are due April 28, 2006. Those interested in submitting proposals can find the 2006 request for proposals and other information at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/InvasiveSpecies/preism.htm

To directly view the 2006 competitive awards program RFP, click on: http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/InvasiveSpecies/invasivespecies0206awards.pdf

For more information about PREISM, contact Craig Osteen (costeen@ers.usda.gov) or William Hahn (whahn@ers.usda.gov).
Two MBA graduates of our Pepperdine full-employed program approached me last year with the following problem. It is common for chip manufacturers to win many million dollar contract awards from several companies that go into several different products (cell phones, computers, printers). The cash flow of revenues takes place over the next several quarters for each award after a delay of a quarter or so, as shown in Figure 1. Because each customer simply lumps all their quarterly payments for each particular chip (which may go into several products of theirs), it is difficult to break down which award is responsible for certain dollar amounts. The total quarterly cash flow is known for each chip number, and from that the company assumed the future cash flow from each contract is approximately the same, such as (0%, 15%, 20%, 40%, 25%) for a particular chip design. The company did know that chips used for PCs had a different life cycle (shorter) than for cell phones, but assumed that each product had its own distinct life cycle. What was needed was the ability to determine estimates of these percentages to accurately forecast cash flow in the future, given the design awards.

**Simplified Example**

Let’s use a hypothetical, simplified example, where the Award is distributed over the next four quarters, as shown in Figure 2, along with the Solver setup and Options. The data represents contract awards and the revenue from a single chip from several manufacturers. B2:B9 is the first eight quarters of known contracts, while B10:B13 represents future contracts. F2:F5 are the percentage of the contract for quarters 2, 3, 4, and 5 from the contract quarter. They help build the Revenues in column C. The Forecast in column D uses the estimated percentages in G2:G5 (which must add up to 100% in G1), and column E computes the error and H2 is the

---

**Figure 1. Cash flow from award to successive quarters.**
average mean squared error (Revenue-Forecast).

The Revenue is derived using the percentages given in F2:F5 and the initial values to guess the distribution are 25% each (LaPlace conditions). The Revenue for Q2 is 12%\(\times\)Contract(Q1) and the Forecast for Q2 is 25%\(\times\)Contract(Q1). Q3 Revenue and Forecast use the first two percentages, and so forth. From Q5 on, the formulae are:

\[
C6: =\text{B5}\times\text{F2}+\text{B4}\times\text{F3}+\text{B3}\times\text{F4}+\text{B2}\times\text{F5}
\]

 copied over to C6:D13.

When the Solver is run, it immediately finds the correct percentages with no problem, as shown in Figure 3, even though it is a nonlinear problem.

### Using Realistic Data

When the revenues are generated using the \texttt{RAND()} function to allow a +/- 2% change in the actual percentages, the formulas in column C must be altered.

\[
C3: =\text{B2}\times(\text{F2}+(2-4\times\text{RAND()})/100)
\]

and copied to C4:C13. A Move/Copy of this worksheet is done and then the values in C4:C13 are copied and Paste Valued in the same place, to “freeze” the values. Otherwise, the Solver, won’t budge from its initial values. When the Revenues are “frozen,” then the Solver finds the weights that minimize the error from forecasting Quarters 2→8. These are then used to forecast Quarters 9→12. The average MSE is reduced from $7,325.4 (using 25% initial weights) down to $99.2, as shown in Figure 4 (see next page).

### Using Real Data

But the real surprise came when I used some real data, and the results were not encouraging at all. Even though this model had the lowest MSE of any others that were tried by the company, it still did not do a good job of forecasting the future revenue stream. It became obvious that better data tracking and accounting needed to be employed by the company to break down actual cash flows per contract, and also to detect if the suppositions about these disbursements were correct. What worked well in theory was not bearing out with actual data. What had been a company-wide assumption about the cash flow from contracts was not necessarily correct—a valuable lesson “in the classroom.” ■
Figure 4. Random generated revenues and solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Contract (000)</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
<th>Error = F - R</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
<th>MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>$200.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>$510.0</td>
<td>$23.1</td>
<td>$28.3</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>$590.0</td>
<td>$96.3</td>
<td>$113.4</td>
<td>$17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>$530.0</td>
<td>$344.4</td>
<td>$345.2</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>$490.0</td>
<td>$566.7</td>
<td>$566.0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>$1,100.0</td>
<td>$741.7</td>
<td>$731.0</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>$1,200.0</td>
<td>$645.1</td>
<td>$635.1</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>$1,550.0</td>
<td>$732.6</td>
<td>$719.9</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>$1,370.0</td>
<td>$1,056.0</td>
<td>$1,130.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>$1,060.0</td>
<td>$1,309.9</td>
<td>$1,287.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>$530.0</td>
<td>$1,424.7</td>
<td>$1,412.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>$1,750.0</td>
<td>$1,218.3</td>
<td>$1,203.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Thomas E. Callarman (CEIBS and Arizona State University) chaired the Board of Directors meeting that was held on Saturday, January 14, 2006, in Sarasota, Florida. The following is a report of the actions taken by the Board and matters brought to its attention. The Executive committee also met on Friday, January 13, 2006. Its recommendations to the Board are included in the items reported below.

1. The minutes of the November 2005 Board of Directors meeting were approved.
2. The President-Elect was granted permission to speak with the Institute’s auditor about reporting allocated costs on the Institute’s financial statements.
3. The financial statement for the period ended December 31, 2005 was reviewed and accepted.
4. Reports from the following 2005-06 committees and elected or appointed officials were accepted for review:
   - Case Studies Committee/Award Competition
   - Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences
   - Doctoral Student Affairs Committee
   - Fellows Committee
   - Information Technology Committee
   - Investment Advisory Committee
   - Member Services Committee
   - Programs and Meetings Committee
   - Decision Sciences Journal
   - Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education
   - Decision Line
   - Regional Activities Committee
   - Strategic Planning for International Affairs
   - Ad hoc Committee to Investigate the Development of an India Region
   - Marketing Director
   - 2005 Program Chair
     a) Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition
     b) Doctoral Student Consortium
     c) Instructional Innovation Award Competition
     d) Professional and Faculty Development Program
     e) New Faculty Development Consortium
   - f) Research Methods Miniconference
   - g) Technology in the Classroom Miniconference
   - h) Curricular Issues Program
   - i) Analysis of CIS User Requests
   - IT Systems Report
   - Director of Professional Development Programs
   - Coordinator of Job Placement Services
   - Ad hoc Committee on Job Placement
   - 2006 Annual Meeting Program Chair
   - 2007 Annual Meeting Program Chair “Visionary” Meeting
   - Treasurer
   - Regional Reports: Northeast, Western

5. The Fellows Committee’s Recommendations 1 and 2 that (1) “all documents related to the nomination of a Fellow candidate must be submitted in electronic form and must be received by the Chair of the Fellows Committee by or before October 1 to be considered in that year. Documents arriving after October 1 will be forwarded to the next Chair of the Fellows Com-

See BOD REPORT, page 45
If you could watch TV, view videos, or read text on your cell phone while you’re away from your desk or home (perhaps standing in a queue, or driving in your car), would you? Ubiquitous computing in the form of video-on-the-go services has entered the international marketplace in an engaging and affordable way. Will you, your students, or the companies you research be among the early adopters of this technology in the U.S.? This article by Shim, Shim, and Ahn reports important, original research findings from their Korean studies that examine the critical success factors necessary for the adoption of mobile multimedia services, or “TV-on-the-Go,” also known as digital multimedia broadcasting (DMB), or “cellevision.” Their insightful analysis of the current state of the art for DMB in Korea serves as a prescient preview for users. Additionally, their emerging list of critical success factors in the successful implementation of DMB is a bonus for researchers who want to compare adoption of digital multimedia broadcasting cross-culturally in the years ahead.

“Cellevision” and “Takeout TV”: Literally, TV On-the-Go

by J. P. Shim, Mississippi State University; Julie M. Shim, Cambridge, MA; Kyungmo Ahn, Kyunghee University

Korea’s introduction of digital multimedia broadcasting (DMB), video-on-the-go services that deliver television to cell phones, has marked a milestone in the world of technology. DMB cellular phones (see Figure 1), dubbed as “takeout TV,” or “cellevision,” is a multicast process that captures digital broadcasts and delivers multimedia (text, television images, and videos) to mobile devices in motion, such as cellular phones, PDAs, and in-automobile devices. Several factors will determine the success of mobile multimedia services, including the cost of service, content options, and network coverage.

On December 1, 2005, terrestrial DMB (T-DMB) service launched in Korea. Satellite DMB (S-DMB), T-DMB’s rival technology, began its service seven months before, on May 2005 (Shim, 2005). One of the major differences between the two is the service business model while T-DMB is a free service, S-DMB is a fee-based service (subscribers pay $13 per month and a $20 one-time activation fee). T-DMB providers generate revenue through advertising. This article will present an overview of DMB and findings on users’ perception of DMB cellular phones.

DMB and Current Issues

DMB consists of a set of competing standards that deliver multimedia content to different types of devices. Two major standards are DMB and digital video broadcasting-handheld (DVB-H). DMB, an extension of DAB (based on the Eureka 147 DAB radio standard), was approved in July 2005 by WorldDAB as a standard specification. As mentioned earlier, DMB has two subtypes including satellite-DMB (SDMB) and terrestrial-DMB (TDMB). S-DMB is based on videos beamed from a communication satellite while T-DMB works on over-the-air signals. DVB-H, similar to T-DMB, broadcasts digital mobile TV via ground to handheld terminal devices. The DVB-H technology has been adopted as the standard in Europe, and seems to be gaining popularity as pilot tests are conducted across Europe and
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the U.S. Recently, Qualcomm Inc. designed their own system, MediaFLO, in the U.S. to rival the technology of DMB and DVB-H.

European telecommunication companies are as optimistic as their Asian counterparts that DMB will take off in their markets since digital audio broadcasting (DAB) is already prevalent across Europe. A pilot project of DMB has been launched in Germany with the objective to deliver advanced mobile entertainment. However, the U.S. telecommunications industry is a bit more reserved in its enthusiasm for DMB technology for several reasons. First, since the U.S. has not approved of any standard or specification at this time, it will take quite some time to adopt and implement. Secondly, 77 percent of American consumers commute to work, via a personal vehicle, so the chances of accessing a mobile videophone-related device on the road are slim.

Also, some states in the U.S. have banned the use of any phone device in vehicles. However, in Asia and in Europe, there’s a greater chance of commuters using DMB phones, since more commuters there use mass transit. Thirdly, the geography of the U.S. does not lend itself well to a technology such as DMB. With the volume of space and the distances between major markets, large up-front capital investments would be required in order to create a network with the capability to provide reliable service to its users.

**DMB Service Business Model**

DMB data service is a framework of the following groups: data provider, audio/video contents producer, DMB producer, advertiser, and customer. A schematic view of DMB data service and the components, shown in Figure 1, provides a basic understanding of the general structure of DMB business model. The figure also shows interaction of the DMB producer with other groups of DMB data services. For example, the DMB producer provides a variety of content and programs to customers for a service fee. The DMB producer charges an advertising fee to the advertiser, from whom customers can directly purchase for advertised services via the DMB device. The audio/video content producer and data provider each provide a variety of content to the DMB producer for a fee.

![Figure 1. A schematic view of DMB Data Service Business Model](source: Adapted from KORA Research 2003-10, “A Market Policy Study on DMB,” Research Report of Korea Radio Station Management Agency, May 2004).
Future Outlook and Findings from DMB Two-Phase Study

The authors recently researched DMB service and content providers to gain insight into various age groups and their perceptions. This two-phase study explored users’ reactions to DMB contents and services, pricing of DMB phone handsets, phone usage time, program contents, and DMB carrier services. Findings from the use of qualitative method of existential phenomenology were explored further with quantitative analyses including T-test, ANOVA, and Duncan test. The DMB market strategy will benefit by focusing future decisions on the younger generation, as they will comprise the future trendsetters with their mindset and lifestyle (Shim et al., forthcoming). A market forecast outlook by Electronics and Telecommunications Research Institute (ETRI) in Korea predicts that terrestrial-DMB users by 2010 will be 8.5 million and satellite-DMB users by 2010 will be 4 to 8 million. Instat/MDR (Teng), a high-tech market research firm, expects the Korean DMB market to surpass $800 million in annual revenue by 2010 (Teng, 2004).

Conclusion

The “Cellevision” is the most interactive and ubiquitous mobile multimedia product as of yet, and will continue to have a great impact on us as our personalized digital tool. Given the demand for ubiquitous computing in an impatient, technology-hungry, instant-gratification-seeking population, the desire for “Cellevision” is growing. Once the handheld devices are deemed marketable, they will pose as tremendous competition to the telecommunication and related companies, as they will scramble to introduce more sophisticated devices. The multimedia content creators can utilize this opportunity to create value-added business. The following critical success factors are just some of the factors that will determine the future of “Cellevision”: device price, quality programming content, performance/ reliability, and usage/connection time.

The “Cellevision” phone service industry has very complex issues that span across technical, logistical, social, and cultural issues. Thus, cooperation is required among the cellular and network service providers, service providers, and equipment makers to collaborate with the government and consumers to create growth in the “Cellevision” industry.
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ANNOUNCEMENTS, from page 46

6th Global Conference on Business & Economics, sponsored by the Association for Business & Economics Research and International Journal of Business & Economics, will be held October 15-17, 2006, at Harvard University, USA. Submission deadline is May 30, 2006.

Competitive papers (or abstracts) are invited in all areas of business, including: Management Information Systems; Global Business; Marketing Theory and Applications; Accounting; Economics; Finance & Investment; General Management; General Business Research; Business & Economics Education; Production/Operations Management; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Strategic Management Policy; Labor Relations & Human Resource Management; Business Law; Public Responsibility and Ethics; Technology & Innovation; Public Administration and Small Business Entrepreneurship. Papers are also invited papers on teaching issues such as: curriculum, ethics in higher education, promotion and tenure, accreditation, teaching methods and styles, administration, technology in the classroom, faculty evaluation, and related topics.

Qualified individuals will referee papers submitted through a process of double blind peer review. Accepted papers will be published in Conference Proceedings. Selected completed papers will be considered for publication in the International Journal of Business & Economics (ISSN 1543-1614) (http://www.facultyforum.com/ijbe). All completed papers will be considered for the Best Paper Award in their respective areas.

Electronic Submissions should be sent in MS Word format to: Editorijbe@Yahoo.Com; or hard copy submissions (four (4) copies of your manuscript or abstracts) should be sent to: Dr. Atul Gupta, P.O. Box 11172, Lynchburg, VA 24506, USA, Telephone: (434) 544-8651; Fax: (434) 385-8667; E-mail: Editorijbe@Yahoo.Com
In this thought-provoking essay, Professor Ralph F. Mullin of Central Missouri State University calls for quality improvement through system transformation in the academy. This transformation must be driven by dissatisfaction with the prevailing system and demand a new way of thinking, be goal-driven, apply acquired knowledge, and encourage collaborative development of capabilities. Professor Mullin describes characteristics of transformed systems that manifest quality. Readers will learn how to spot academic quality.

Spotting Quality: A Quality Management View

by Ralph F. Mullin, Harmon College of Business Administration, Central Missouri State University

Spotting Quality by Milton R. Blood (2005) in the July Decision Line describes “how to spot quality in education.” Everything in the article is about incremental improvement. Yet, quality cannot be incrementally added to a system not designed for quality and continuous system improvement. You can’t get there from here! For quality, one must transform the system. It obviously is not the conscious intent of AACSB to preserve and maintain the existing unexamined system while striving to improve it; however, this is exactly the unintended consequence. Improving the existing stable system will not do it (Deming, 1982). Transformational change to a whole new learning system is required to achieve quality.

First, Transform The System

What might an outside expert in quality management search for as indicators of quality on a B-school campus? Dissatisfaction with the Current System. For quality, sincere—perhaps even extreme—dissatisfaction is the essential first step before change can begin to occur. It took American managers over 25 years before they took W. Edwards Deming seriously. Deming’s call for “transformation” of the system was heard only when the Japanese, who had heard in 1950, started threatening the survival of several of America’s most basic industries. Yet today you hear AACSB officials, deans, and faculty claim “we have the best educational system in the world”—echoes of past claims made by General Motors executives. How might an outside expert in quality management “spot quality”? He or she would notice dissatisfaction with . . .

- low level and high variability of students’ capabilities at graduation,
- core learning process, the ancient and perpetual course-credit-completion system,
- grades as means and measure of student competence,
- assessment that provides no meaningful information on how to improve the learning process,
- lack of intellectual honesty to admit that many customers are not delighted,
- leaders with little passion for radically improving student development and learning.

Changed Thinking. For quality, you must change the way you think (Deming, 1982, p. 143). A quality management consultant will begin by changing the way key inside leaders think, from analytic to synthetic. This is doubly hard in academe as faculty
and administrators are thoroughly trained in research methodology and analytic thinking while synthetic thinking is the exact opposite. This step is required so institutional leaders understand the difference between improvement and change. Grafting improvements onto an obsolete, stable system will not do it. Systemic change—whole system transformation—is required.

*Every system is perfectly designed to produce the results it achieves.*

Peter Senge (1990)

Does the AACSB self-study process begin with a critical examination of the existing system, studying it as a whole, guided by outside quality systems experts? If the existing system—the basic technology—is not producing substantial year-to-year improvement in the quality of graduates’ capabilities and increasing employer delight, that is evidence of a stable system. The next logical step, then, is to design a new system to attain those goals. The concept of technological discontinuity explains why a new system is required. Technological discontinuity is the displacement of one technology by another (see Figure 1). It occurs when a new technology cannot simply be used to enhance the current technology but actually substitutes for that technology to yield better performance.

From the quality perspective there are fundamental differences revealed by the language of quality: the whole system is explicit and controlling and the sub-processes are interdependent, the core learning process is cyclical and connected, and assessment, feedback, study, and improvement are integral throughout the continuous learning process. Scholtes explains, in his concept of “transformation’s learning curve,” how “mastering the rhetoric” is only an illusion of learning (Scholtes, 2005, p. 10). In Figure 2, A represents illusion of learning, which includes mastering the rhetoric, grafting programs onto the old organization, knowing enough to be dangerous, and the same old premises at work; B represents sufficient understanding to see that “we don’t know much,” which includes the “aha!” experience, and the beginning of the integration of knowledge and know-how; and C represents the beginning of real learning.

**Goals Drive System Design.** This begins with defining the ends (desired outputs), and the set of goals (the criterion of system design and control) that operationalizes the mission and core process. What are these ends? Forty-six years ago the study funded by Ford and Carnegie Foundations identified “problem-solving, organizational skill, skill in interpersonal relationships, skill in communication, [and the attitude] strong motivation to learn” (Gordon & Howell, 1959, pp. 45, 104-5). B-schools have given little discernable attention to these capabilities as goals of their curricular process and graduation requirements. At best, schools have installed a course in strategic planning (policy), increased use of the case method, and identified some skills to be learned in specified courses—with little or no integration.

In the late 1970s, AACSB sponsored a series of conferences and commissioned a strategic study in 1984, resulting in the Outcomes Measurement Project and the Porter and McKibbin report (1988). The Outcomes Measurement project provided a definition of the knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics (SAPCs) needed for business success and commissioned Development Dimensions International (DDI) to develop measures of these in the mid-1980s. In 1989, the Accounting Education Change Commission, in “Perspectives on Education,” stated, “Without a clear set of capabilities to use as objectives in the curriculum design process, it is unlikely that changes in the current content or teaching methods will be responsive to the needs of the profession” (p. 5). This set of capabilities, defined by the heads of the big accounting firms, is consistent with those of the 1959 Ford and Carnegie study. To their credit, AACSB has defined some learning outcomes (skills and personal characteristics and critical content knowledge), has devel-

---

**Figure 1. Technological discontinuity.**
oped operational definitions and measures for both, and has encouraged schools to develop learning goals as the “first step toward development of a program of assurance of learning” (AACSB Standards, 2005, p. 61). This is not enough.

A goal beyond the capability of the system will not be reached.
W. Edwards Deming (1982, p. 76)

Learning goals must drive the design of an integrated learning system, because a single course can “produce only minor gains in student skill development . . . more development is needed than can be expected in one course” (Mullin, Shaffer & Grelle, 1991, p. 117). Thus, these complex capabilities require reinforcement by repetitive and varied development throughout an integrated learning process. How might an outside expert in quality management “spot quality”? He or she would become aware that:

- The assumptions and principles that guide design of the learning system are explicit.
- The set of capabilities required of students is widely understood and accepted as the criterion of system design and control.
- These student-learning goals are clearly in-use, directing and controlling behavior of students, faculty members, and everyone in the system.

- A process for continuous improvement (i.e., Shewhart cycle) is “designed in.”
- Students develop their knowledge and capabilities systematically and developmentally across the process (connected, interdependent, and integrated).
- Students are required to successfully demonstrate capabilities as a condition of graduation.

Methods: The Basic Learning Technology: The set of goals that control design of the core learning process also determine which methods are most effective in achieving the learning goals. The Ford/Carnegie study, under the heading “Learning to Utilize Knowledge,” states:

Formally acquired knowledge will not be very useful to the future businessman unless he learns how to apply it . . . experience in using these tools (statistics, accounting, economic analysis, etc.) in situations that resemble those he will encounter in the business world. [This] is more than a matter of didactic teaching . . . Systematic knowledge should be the foundations on which ‘clinical teaching’ is then built. (Gordon & Howell, 1959, pp. 107-9)

Thirty years later, the Accounting Education Change Commission in “Perspectives on Education” found little progress and again similarly criticized, the current textbook-based, rule intensive, lecture/problem style should not survive as the primary means of presentation. New methods, both those used in other disciplines and those that are totally new to university education, must be explored. (1989, p. 11)

The reader may judge whether the “textbook-based, rule intensive, lecture/problem style” has survived at their institution. A quality expert, however, will not look favorably on B-schools taking almost 50 years, or even 16 years (dated from the quotes above), to even begin to respond to major customer requirements. Actually, the overall design of the educational system—the course-credit-completion model—dates back 100 years. Learning theory did not drive design, efficiency did: efficiency in pushing students through the system. How might an outside expert in quality management “spot quality”? He or she would see that:

- Faculty members view courses not as discrete packets of disciplinary content knowledge, but as developmental building blocks that are integrated by those “capabilities needed for business success.”
- Faculty members know what is needed for success because they are experienced practitioners and scholars.
- Faculty members design learning experiences that “resemble those [the student] will encounter in the business world.”
- They do not depend on textbooks, lectures, or objective tests.
- They use assessment and feedback as means of learning, require student self-assessment and reflection, and see repeated performance as integral to the learning process.

Student Focus and Motivation: In the existing course-credit-completion system, students are motivated to complete courses at a target GPA. On course completion, students often “erase the disk.” This does not produce durable learning. They also tend to experience general education courses, not as connected in meaningful ways with their major program or as developing capabilities, but as hoops to jump through. The student’s relationship with the instructor is competitive, aimed at achieving the desired grade with minimum

Figure 2. Transformation’s learning curve (adapted from Scholtes, 2005, page 10).
effort. A quality system, by contrast, will encourage a collaborative relationship, where the instructor mentors the student to develop the capabilities he or she must demonstrate in order to graduate. How might an outside expert in quality management “spot quality”? He or she would note that:

• Students are fully aware of the set of capabilities necessary for business success.
• Students clearly understand they must successfully demonstrate these capabilities in multiple disciplines and contexts (assessed developmentally and summatively) as a condition of graduation.
• Students are passionate about learning these capabilities.
• Students demonstrate their ability to self-assess and reflect on their learning.
• Students are focused on improving their capabilities.
• Students believe teachers care about their learning.
• All students, with minimal variation, demonstrate competence on all outcomes by graduation.

AACSB Standards Approach

Three categories provide the organizing structure for AACSB standards. These are strategic management, participants, and assurance of learning. AACSB properly emphasizes that espoused strategy (the written document) is not as important as how the strategy in-use guides implementation and operations. AACSB Standards provide much about the purpose, basis for judgment, and documentation of the school’s mission statement but little on system design (pp. 18-23). The mission is only so many words, however, without the set of goals and design of the system to achieve the goals. Deming stressed over and over “there is only one chance for optimum success . . . quality must be built in at the design stage (1982, p. 49).” System design is the strategic decision.

The implicit assumption of the second AACSB category, participants, is that student learning is predominately influenced by and attributable to individual faculty members; this ignores the overall system’s processes and interdependencies, which are the central emphasis in quality management. AACSB emphasis is on “intellectual contributions” ignoring the problem that many faculty members are not qualified by practice in the profession. In the May 2005 issue of Harvard Business Review, Warren Bennis and James O’Toole (2005) distinguish a profession from a scientific discipline, as did Peter Drucker. Professors may “never have set foot inside a real business except as customers” (p. 101). Bennis and O’Toole further assert “no curricular reforms will work until the scientific model is replaced by a more appropriate model rooted in the special requirements of a profession” (p. 98).

For quality, one must first have a quality system in place. Then, one must measure the right things.
Robert W. Galvin (1991)

The “shift to assurance of learning” sounds good, but all three of the “approaches” (i.e., selection, course-embedded measurement, and demonstration through stand-alone testing or performance) fail to assure integrated development of student learning of critical capabilities. Selection is inspection of inputs. The next two are forms of inspection at-the-end, a control approach condemned by Deming and other quality management authorities.

If you want to improve the product, you should put your attention on the process whereby the product is made, not on inspection at the end of the line. In education, if you want to improve the student’s achievements, put your attention on the teaching/learning process . . . . (Tribus, 1992)

Applying quality principles will mean assessing learning by changing (1) the criterion of student success, (2) graduation requirements, (3) the design of the core learning system, (4) the methods of student learning, (5) use of assessment and feedback to integrate these into a continuous learning cycle, (6) the system of appraising and rewarding faculty (see Martin, 1998; and Kerr, 1995), and (7) leaders’ perspective from short-term to commitment to the long-term. How do you spot quality?

• The people who have the power to change the system have experienced “aha”

Conclusion

While much of the language of the new accreditation standards has been improved, overall the accreditation standards and process continue to have little influence on transformation of the traditional quantity system to a quality system. This failure to recognize the influence of system indicates a lack of understanding of quality management principles. Failure to focus on capabilities to drive design of the core learning process is the most disconcerting aspect of the AACSB standards. Quality improvement initiatives by AACSB may result in marginal improvements, but they will shortly regress toward the norms and rewards of the traditional system, because it remains controlling and stable. The same old premises and assumptions are at work. Peer review will only reinforce these. It is the enemy of change. Review by outside experts (who understand systems, variation, psychology, and theory of knowledge and learning) is needed. AACSB is stuck at point B on Transformation’s Learning Curve (Figure 2), short of the “aha” experience. AACSB Accreditation, therefore, intentionally or not, preserves and maintains the existing system.

Applying quality principles will mean assessing learning by changing (1) the criterion of student success, (2) graduation requirements, (3) the design of the core learning system, (4) the methods of student learning, (5) use of assessment and feedback to integrate these into a continuous learning cycle, (6) the system of appraising and rewarding faculty (see Martin, 1998; and Kerr, 1995), and (7) leaders’ perspective from short-term to commitment to the long-term. How do you spot quality?

• The people who have the power to change the system have experienced “aha”
Real learning has begun—integration of knowledge and know-how.
The B-school has decided to lead, not follow, AACSB.
A new learning system, based on capabilities, has been designed and is being implemented.
Supplier/producer/customer relationships are becoming intense and pervasive.
The leadership shows patience and is committed to the necessary long-term strategy.

W. Edwards Deming, the prophet of quality, was not popular with American management for over 20 years because he steadfastly held that quality was the responsibility of management. B-school deans (and university presidents and provosts) must accept responsibility for system change. AACSB, despite its good intentions, has not led change so essential for quality. Spotting quality will be evident when people who have the power to change the system step forward and lead.
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How Am I Doing? Checklist for Doctoral Students at Various Stages of Their Program

by Varun Grover, Department of Management, Clemson University

Most doctoral programs inherently have a lack of structure associated with them. It’s the nature of the business. While there might be course requirements and program guidelines, the process of developing competent candidates for the doctoral market is not well defined and is highly idiosyncratic for every student. Faculty are often asked by doctoral students, “How am I doing.” Their response usually stems around the administrative components of doctoral study. “You seem to have your coursework in order,” or “You are on schedule for your comprehensive exams,” or “Why don’t you consider doing this course?” Such responses are necessary, but incomplete. They do not reflect how doctoral students are doing as budding researchers (or teachers) at their current stage of the program.

I came across this amusing analogy between stages of doctoral study and the seven dwarfs (in the Snow White fairy tale). Doctoral students are like all seven dwarfs at different stages of their program. At first they are Dopey and Bashful. In the middle, they are usually sick (Sneezy), tired (Sleepy), and irritable (Grumpy). But at the end, they’re called Doc, and then they are Happy (http://www.cs.unc.edu/~azuma/hitch4.html). While this may get a chuckle, I think the idea of stages of development in a doctoral program has merit. I have had the delightful experience of working with dozens of doctoral students in various capacities and in various stages of their program. And I have observed students go through a maturity cycle of sorts as they develop their research and teaching skills. The pace and acuity of development might vary by student based on their capability, motivation, ability to manage their program (see “10 Mistakes Students Make in Managing their Program,” Decision Line, May 2001) or manage their advisor (see “Interaction Between a Doctoral Student and Advisor: Making It Work!”, Decision Line, January 2003). But the stages generally remain the same.

In my observations, students go through four stages, roughly reflecting the four years of typical doctoral study: Exploration, Engagement, Consolidation, and Entry.

The Stage of Exploration epitomizes first-year students. Despite the plethora of voluminous research many students do when searching for the right program, it doesn’t really hit them until they are actually in the program. Here’s when they hear their seniors tell them how hard they need to work, the battles of the job market, comprehensive exam pressures, and the importance of working on research outside the classroom. Many of these concepts are new to the students and they have to battle this noise as they deal with seminars and research articles not written for the common man, and statistical techniques that they never knew existed. It’s tough—and to succeed they need to take a deep breath and explore, question and learn about where they are, what are
they doing there, and where they are going.

The Stage of Engagement is further up the value-added axis. This is exploration with a purpose. Students begin to have a sense of doctoral study and their position in their institution and (perhaps) their chosen profession. This is the stage where students engage with faculty, with published work, and with research ideas. They also begin to sense their path of success through the program—the colleagues and faculty they will need to interact with, and a sense of research areas and methods they particularly enjoy. Of course, it’s still a struggle for many to prioritize—opportunities are increasing and time is becoming increasingly scarce as students navigate between the broad view and the more narrow personal view of research.

The Stage of Consolidation is when ideas crystallize. Students in this stage are engaged tighter. They are committed. The institution is committed—irreversibly if the students pass their comprehensive examinations. By now, students should have a very good sense of their field and its structure, and the ability to position research within that structure. The student should be able to traverse up and down between the supra-system (the broad field) and the sub-system (individual research). Dissertation ideas should be developed in this stage, as the personal view of research dominates the latter part of this stage. Students should also develop their engagement with the broader profession as they package themselves for the job market.

Finally, the Stage of Entry is the final thrust before the student formally enters the profession as a peer. This could be a particularly challenging stage as the student has one foot in the home institution and another foot trying to move outside it. Broader notions of career, research stream, and tenure enter the student’s consciousness, as do family, location, and job satisfaction. The “light at the end of the tunnel” keeps the student going as the process culminates with a doctoral degree.

Below, I have put together a quick checklist of the four stages that might be useful for students and faculty to respond to that tricky question—how am I doing? The stages roughly correspond to the four years of a typical program—although there could be variance in the nature of the programs themselves, the student’s acumen and approach, and the alignment between time and stages. It’s important to note that motivation is critical to keep going through these unstructured processes—and much of this stems from the excitement of a knowledge-centric career.

Finally, I would like to add that while the maturity cycle might be complete within the administrative framework of the doctoral program, it is far from complete when one considers that we continue to evolve and learn as we mature as researchers and in our respective careers.

Checklist for Doctoral Students at Various Stages of their Program

End of Year 0 (Just Before Entering the Program):

❑ Are You Motivated to Do This . . . .
  Does a research and teaching career appeal to you?
  Does the idea of generating and disseminating knowledge excite you?

DIAGNOSTICS - If you answered NO to these, QUIT NOW!

End of First Year in the Program

❑ Are You Motivated to Do This . . .
  ❑ Does a research and teaching career appeal to you?
  ❑ Does the idea of generating and disseminating knowledge excite you?
  ❑ Do you have a sense of research in your area by reading articles in major journals in your field?
  ❑ Have you tried to write an original proposal or engage in a research project?

❑ Are you getting a sense of the variety of research methods, and getting in-depth knowledge in a few?
❑ Are you beginning to develop a local network of faculty and students with whom you think you can collaborate?
❑ Are you drifting toward areas that are more exciting to you?
❑ Are you organizing your program and developing plans of action for each year of doctoral study?

DIAGNOSTICS – Work on the tendency toward NO responses

End of Second Year in the Program

❑ Are You Motivated to Do This . . .
  ❑ Does a research and teaching career appeal to you?
  ❑ Does the idea of generating and disseminating knowledge excite you?

❑ Have you completed a research paper for submission to a conference (or a journal)?
❑ Have you had the opportunity to present your ideas in a group setting?
❑ Are you getting a good understanding of a variety of research methods and tools?
❑ Can you see the integration of articles that you read as you begin to create your schema (structure) of the field?
❑ Have you established a small portfolio of projects with peers and faculty that are important to you?
❑ Are you converging through your readings and topics on an area that could be the foundation for a dissertation?
❑ Are you prioritizing your time and managing your various activities well?

DIAGNOSTICS – Work on the tendency toward NO responses
End of Third Year in the Program

❑ Are You Motivated to Do This . . .
  ❑ Does a research and teaching career appeal to you?
  ❑ Does the idea of generating and disseminating knowledge excite you?
❑ Have you experienced a review process with your submissions?
❑ Have you had the opportunity to present your ideas at a regional/national conference?
❑ Have you had the opportunity to review a submission to a conference or a journal?
❑ Can you read articles more efficiently and rapidly integrate them into your stable schema?
❑ Have you passed your comprehensive examination?
❑ Have you developed an idea for your dissertation and defended your proposal?
❑ Are you very comfortable with your proposed methodology?
❑ Have you honed your presentation skills, particularly for the proposal?
❑ Have you entered the job market?
❑ Have you identified your dissertation chair/committee that is on-board with your topic?
❑ Have you had the responsibility for teaching a course?

DIAGNOSTICS – Work on the tendency toward NO responses

End of Fourth Year in the Program

❑ Are You Motivated to CONTINUE Doing This . . .
  ❑ Does a research and teaching career appeal to you?
  ❑ Does the idea of generating and disseminating knowledge excite you?
❑ Have your articles been accepted in conferences or journals?
❑ Have you attended a national conference in your field?
❑ Have you defended your dissertation?
❑ Have you structured a research program from your projects and dissertation?
❑ Have you developed a set of competencies that you can bring to collaborative efforts?
❑ Have you interacted with peers outside your institution that share your interests?
❑ Have you got a job?

DIAGNOSTICS – Work on the tendency toward NO responses ●
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**FROM THE BOOKSHELF**

In the following article Dr. Wei Zhang compares texts that may be suitable for a course in Knowledge Management. Members of DSI are invited to suggest books that should be reviewed in this column and reviewers to review them. Send suggestions to the Feature Editor.

**Textbook for an Undergraduate Knowledge Management Course**

by Wei Zhang, University of Massachusetts, Boston

Knowledge Management (KM) concerns identifying and leveraging what an organization knows to gain sustainable competitive advantages. It has become a hot topic for researchers and practitioners in recent years. There are many graduate-level KM courses offered in business schools across the country, but KM courses for undergraduate students are rare. Understandably, I was hesitant when I was asked to develop a KM course for undergraduate students. On the one hand, it is important for undergraduate students to be exposed to the subject given the popularity of KM practices in organizations. As new knowledge workers, they will be involved in KM projects sooner or later, though more likely as individual contributors rather than managers. On the other hand, undergraduate students, with their limited business experience, could have a difficult time understanding the high-level business aspects of KM. Moreover, topics discussed in KM are far more intangible and fuzzier than those typically discussed in other IS courses such as data management and computer networks. Undergraduate students who
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**Knowledge Management**

by Elias M Awad, Hassan M. Ghaziri
Prentice Hall, 2003
480 pages, $132.20


by Amrit Tiwana
Prentice Hall, 2004
416 pages, $42.24
are used to define answers to well-defined questions could be frustrated by the inherent complexities surrounding knowledge and KM. To succeed, the new course had to take a more detailed and technical perspective than the graduate-level courses in KM.

Many graduate-level KM courses use Davenport and Prusak’s classic book *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know* (Harvard Business School Press, 1998) as the required textbook and complement it with a customized course package of journal articles and cases. This combination works fine for graduate students, but probably not for undergraduate students who may have too little business experience to resonate to the insights offered by the book. While cases are invaluable teaching tools for business students, journal articles may be too theoretical and less attractive to many, if not most, undergraduate students. In addition, good textbooks always offer a good framework of the subject domain, which is important for a young field like KM. They also offer a focus of learning and a sense of security. The perception that they always have a textbook to fall back on is invaluable for undergraduate students.

There are not many KM textbooks for undergraduate students. My search eventually led me to decide between two textbooks: *Knowledge Management*, by Elias M. Awad and Hassan M. Ghaziri (Prentice Hall, priced at $132.20 on the publisher’s Website), or *The Knowledge Management Toolkit*, by Amrit Tiwana (2nd ed., Prentice Hall PTR, priced at $59.99 on the publisher’s Website). Following the comparison framework used in a previous review (see “Project Management: Comparison of Two Popular Textbooks,” J. E. Humble, *Decision Line*, October 2005), this review focuses on two aspects: general approach/contents and additional resources for instructors and students.

**Approach and Contents**

The general approach of the two books is quite different. Awad and Ghaziri’s treatment of the subject appears more traditional. Their text is organized into five parts, with each part concentrating on an aspect of KM: Part 1 presents the (theoretical) fundamentals of knowledge and KM; Part 2 focuses on knowledge creation and capture; Part 3 examines knowledge codification and system implementation; Part 4 is dedicated to KM system tools and portals; ethical, legal, and managerial issues are discussed in Part V. The topics covered and the organization of the book live up to the authors’ statement in the preface that the book “is process oriented. It strikes a balance between the behavioral aspects of knowledge and KM and refers to technology as a medium for knowledge transfer, especially in the e-world.”

Students should be familiar with the way the chapters are written and find the book easy to read. Each chapter starts with a preview (In a Nutshell), followed by well-organized discussions of a few topics. Following the discussions, a section titled “Implications of KM” relates chapter material to “knowledge management or management decision making,” which should intrigue undergraduate students. Each chapter also ends with sections such as “Terms to Know” and “Knowledge Exercises” that help students to review what they have learned. The writing of Awad and Ghaziri’s text is smooth and at a level that is appropriate for undergraduate students. The authors also make an effort to relate the new materials in KM to what the students should have learned in Information Management. For example, in Chapter 3, they compare the development life cycle of a KM system to that of a conventional information system.

Tiwana’s text “seeks to bridge the gap between KM theory and practice.” The focus of the book is the 10-step KM road map, which provides a “tool,” a “mechanism,” and an “enabler” that helps to actually implement KM in a company. The road map covers a complete life cycle of KM implementation, from pre-system infrastructure evaluation and leverage to post-system performance analysis. The book and the road map are of great practical value, as indicated by the praises printed at the first page of the book and the four-and-a-half star rating it received on Amazon.com.

Content-wise, the Tiwana text starts with three chapters that discuss the concepts of knowledge and KM, building foundations for introducing the road map. The other 11 chapters are dedicated to the 10-step road map, with each step explained in detail in one chapter. Although the book is heavily practitioner oriented, Tiwana integrates theoretical discussions throughout the book and makes the book much richer. While some may be concerned by the unorthodox perspective of the Tiwana text, I find it refreshing and valuable. As KM researchers, we agree that “learning often does not happen best through explicit knowledge... but through practice and learning-in-action” (see *Knowledge and People; Course Syllabi*, S. D. Talisayon, retrieved from http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/news/hits/030121bw.htm on Feb. 2, 2006). Many KM courses require students to work on KM projects. The 10-step road map provides the students with a fine framework to organize their projects, allowing them to learn KM by practicing KM.

The Tiwana text does lack some essential elements of a textbook such as exercises, which may make some students uncomfortable and add some extra workload for instructors who must generate exercise questions by themselves. The writing of the book is not as good as the Awad and Ghaziri text. For example, the use of terminology could be more consistent and concise. I found myself sometimes confused by how KM platform, KM system, KM road-map, KM architecture, and KM blueprint relate to and differ from each other. While each step of the road map is well-defined, the theories underlying the steps are sometimes not clearly explained or are not at a level that is easy to understand by undergraduate students, particularly in Chapter 6, “Aligning Knowledge Management and Business Strategy.”
Additional Resources for Instructors and Students

The two books offer different additional resources for instructors and students. The companion website of the Awad and Ghaziri text (http://www.prenhall.com/awad/) provides students and instructors with a set of downloadable PowerPoint slides. Instructors can also access instructor’s manuals and test item files for the chapters. These resources can be of great help when an instructor prepares for the classes.

The Tiwana text comes with a companion CD which includes, among other items, a KM platform deployment case and a set of software tools. Judging from the date of the files, the case and the tools have not changed since 1999 when the first edition of the book was published. Nevertheless, a few software tools ran smoothly on my laptop with Windows XP Professional, even though they were designed for Windows 98 or Windows NT, ancient platforms in computer years. Being able to demonstrate these software tools should be a huge plus for adopting the Tiwana text for undergraduate KM courses since undergraduate students in general respond much better to concrete and tangible systems/tools than abstract concepts.

Conclusions

The two textbooks differ from each other greatly, yet both seem valuable for teaching KM to undergraduate students, which makes the decision to choose one difficult. On one side, the Awad and Ghaziri text offers the familiar and comforting structure of a typical textbook. It is better written, easier to read and understand, but with less supporting materials and additional resources. It should be a good choice for courses that are geared more toward theoretical explorations. On the other hand, the Tiwana text provides excellent practical value and complements the text with interesting software tools. It is also considerably cheaper, costing less than half of the Awad and Ghaziri text. Instructors who incorporate KM projects into their syllabi might find the Tiwana book more suitable for their courses.

NAMEs IN THE NEWS

CAROL LATTA, Executive Director, Decision Sciences Institute

James Bookbinder, University of Waterloo, was recently guest editor of a special issue (Vol. 41, No. 6, 2005) of Transportation Research E on “Global Logistics.” The special issue includes papers specifically about Europe and NAFTA, as well as articles that treat international logistics questions not confined to particular regions. For the past few years, Bookbinder has been working on various topics concerning International Supply Chains. These include a comparison of Logistics Systems in the European Community with those in Asia, as well as his ongoing research concerning NAFTA.

jbookbinder@uwaterloo.ca
www.mansci.uwaterloo.ca
Special issue: www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/13665545
(follow links to Vol. 41, no. 6)

William Tallon, Western Kentucky University, has accepted the position as dean of the Gordon Ford College of Business. After 16 years as part of the faculty and administration of the NIU College of Business, he will assume the role of dean on July 1, 2006. “It’s kind of bittersweet,” says Tallon of leaving behind NIU. “I have spent so much of my life here and worked with so many wonderful people. On the other hand, the Gordon Ford College of Business is well positioned to become the premier provider of business education in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and I am very proud of the opportunity to have a major role in leading the school to new levels of excellence.”

BTallon@wpo.cso.niu.edu

Attention International Empirical Researchers

Assessing global competitiveness of manufacturing supply chains through an international alliance of leading universities

The GMRG is an all inclusive group that provides cooperative research with scholars from around the world. We need additional data gatherers. The GMRG has been gathering data for almost 20 years with three previous versions of the questionnaire. The current fourth version of the questionnaire is GMRG 4.0.

The questionnaire is divided into separate modules: one required module and four optional that researchers choose according to their interests. The required module has 3 sections: 1) demographics (for sample control), 2) competitive goals (outcome variables), and 3) internal performance measures. All these sections are needed for researchers that wish to publish in top journals. There are four optional modules: (1) Manufacturing planning and control; (2) Purchasing; (3) Outsourcing (transaction cost analysis based); and (4) Forecasting. Each module was developed by a team of well-published scholars from around the world. Each optional module has a suggested model that directly ties to each question (and supporting literature). Currently, there are over 25 countries that have completed, are gathering, or will be gathering data. The questionnaire is sanctioned by APICS and CAPS. GMRG needs more USA and international data gatherers.

Data will be only shared with GMRG academic data gatherers that have gathered a representative sample. Any questions can be sent to Professors Chwen Sheu, Kansas State University (csheu@ksu.edu) or John G. Wacker (j.wacker@cox.net). The questionnaires may be viewed on the GMRG official web site: www.gmr.org
Information Technology Crunch: Alpha Iota Delta Can Help

by Madjid Tavana, La Salle University

The Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California at Los Angeles reports that popularity of Information Technology (IT) as a major among incoming freshmen has dropped significantly in the past five years. The percentage of incoming undergraduate students indicating an interest in IT has declined by over 60 percent since 1998 and is now 70 percent lower than its peak in the early 1980s.

As the impact of the technology bust continues to settle in, enrollment in IT programs continues to decline. Many in academia are becoming increasingly alarmed and expect the decrease in IT enrollment will cause a skills shortage that could hit the industry hard. As the industry starts reinvesting in the neglected infrastructure, the IT unemployment will get absorbed. Absorption of IT unemployment will result in a higher demand for a skilled labor force and create growth in enrollment.

How can we attract potential students to study IT? When students feel their talents are being nurtured, they are more likely to feel satisfied. When they are more satisfied, they are more likely to stick with their chosen course of study. That said, the availability of student organizations that support coursework has benefits extending beyond classroom learning. Students are more likely to feel their talents are being developed if they are involved not just in academic coursework but also in college life. Student organizations serve a purpose in connecting the student to the school and thus promoting the major and increasing the chances of retention. Alpha Iota Delta, the national honor society in decision sciences and information systems, can be a force in improving enrollment and retention in IT programs nationwide.

Participation in Alpha Iota Delta can cultivate a student’s sense of satisfaction with the college experience and increase participation and involvement within campus and community. Some of the many benefits to be gained from establishing an Alpha Iota Delta chapter for students include:

- improve students’ self-confidence and the quality of their interpersonal relationships
- learn how to work efficiently with others
- learn how to prioritize their time
- learn how to be involved in a team effort
- acquire group skills and understand group dynamics
- learn group decision-making skills such as brainstorming and consensus building
- learn effective planning and organizational skills as well as dedication to a task or cause
- learn about the social aspect of group involvement by working with others whose personalities may be totally different from their own
- expands upon, and bridges gaps in, the classroom curriculum
- learn about the resources and learning opportunities available to help them meet academic demands
- develop communication skills on a face-to-face basis as well as at the public speaking level
- develop employment skills and career plans through “real world” experiences and organizational activities.

Good grades are no longer enough to secure a job or a seat in a highly competitive graduate program. Those students who have been socialized and matured through involvement in campus groups and student organizations are more likely to succeed in their future endeavors. To maximize educational and developmental impact, IT students must connect with their program and major in a special way. Involvement in Alpha Iota Delta provides one of the most effective means of developing this special bond.
Institute Meetings
The 37th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 18-21, 2006, in San Antonio, Texas. The submission deadlines are: Refereed papers, April 14, 2006; abstracts and proposals, May 3, 2006. Contact: Program Chair M. “Mo” Adam Mahmood, University of Texas at El Paso, College of Business Administration, Department of Information and Decision Sciences, 500 W. University Avenue, El Paso, Texas 79968, (915) 747 7754 / fax: (915) 747 5126, DSI2006@utep.edu.

http://www.dsi-2006.org/

The Asia Pacific Region will hold its 2006 Annual Meeting on June 14-18, 2006, Sheraton Hong Kong Hotel and Towers, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Conference theme is Innovation & Service Excellence for Competitive Advantage in the Global Environment. Submission deadline is April 18, 2006. Program Chair: Xiande Zhao, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Department of DSE, Leung Kau Kui Building, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, 852-2609-7650/ Fax: 852-2603-6840, Email: xiande@baf.msmail.cuhk.edu.hk. Contact: Ms. Rosita Chan, APDSI 2006 Conference Secretariat, Department of Decision Sciences and Managerial Economics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, Tel: +852-26098556; Fax: +852-26036840, dse@cuhk.edu.hk.

http://dse.baf.cuhk.edu.hk/apdsi/

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


http://www.nedsi.org

The Southeast Region will hold its 2007 (37th) Annual Meeting on February 21-23, 2007, at the Marriott Savannah Riverfront Hotel in Savannah, GA. Check back for details.

http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region will hold its 2007 (28th) Annual Meeting on March 13-17, 2007, in San Diego, California.

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.hiltonwaikoloavillage.com), in Waikoloa, Hawaii. Submission deadline was 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.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers

Conferences


http://www.eBRF.fi


http://www.iabe.org

40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS-40) minitrack on Cultural Issues in Collaboration Technology (part of the Collaboration Systems and Technology Track, co-chaired by Bob Briggs and Jay F. Nunamaker) will be held January 3-6, 2007, at the Hilton Waikoloa Village Resort, Waikoloa, Big Island, Hawaii. Minitrack leaders are Dongsong Zhang, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, zhangd@umbc.edu; Doug Vogel, City University of Hong Kong, isdoug@cityu.edu.hk; Paul Benjamin Lowry, Brigham Young University, Paul.Lowry@BYU.edu. Submission deadline is June 15, 2006.

http://www.hicss.hawaii.edu/

Publications

Handbook of Computational Intelligence in Manufacturing and Production Management seeks chapter proposals for a book to be published in 2007 by Idea Group Inc. Editors: Dipak Laha, Jadavpur University, India and Purnendu Mandal, Lamar University, USA. Submission Deadline: May 15, 2006. Inquiries and submissions can be forwarded electronically (Word document) or by mail to (1) Dr. Dipak Laha, Mechanical Engineering Department, Jadavpur University, Kolkata 700032, India. E-mail- dipaklaha_jume@yahoo.com or (2) Dr. Purnendu Mandal, College of Business, Lamar University, P.O. Box 10033, Beaumont, Texas, 77710, USA. E-mail-purnendu.mandal@lamar.edu.


http://www.inderscience.com/browse/
The Decision Sciences Institute’s 2006 Annual Meeting theme focuses on decision making at all levels that leads to organizational strategic and competitive effectiveness and increased business value. We are in the “Information Age” and the complexity of making effective decisions has increased significantly, in part because most managers suffer from information overload. The 2006 Annual Meeting is planned around examining the tools that are used to collect, summarize, and disseminate this information.

The four-day conference also scrutinizes some of the new business value generating tools such as e-supply chains, e-commerce, e-procurement systems, collaborative commerce, mobile commerce, geographic information systems, global positioning systems, intranets, and extranets. In addition, it carefully examines some of the old and well-known decision making tools such as decision support systems, group decision support systems, and executive support systems with the intent to make them more effective for supporting decisions that generate business value. A number of exciting programs, sessions, and activities are planned around the conference theme, some of which are highlighted below.

I am pleased to inform you that two CEO keynote speakers have accepted our invitation to attend and will speak on the conference theme of generating business value. Diana Natalicio, president of the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), will speak on how she has generated business value, using information technology for the state in general and the Texas Department of Information Resources in particular. Over his professional career, he has focused on bringing business value through organizational transformation, which has included over $4 billion of successfully negotiated contracts. He has also worked for Governor Tom Ridge as the first chief information officer for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It will also be interesting to hear from him.

I am also pleased to tell you that, for the first time, we will have a DSI Fellows appreciation luncheon on Sunday to recognize the DSI Fellows. I invite all DSI Fellows to come to the Sunday luncheon and allow us to honor them by recognizing their contribution to their field in general and DSI in particular. The 2006 Annual Meeting also has an Invited Fellows Track, chaired by Jack Hayya of The Pennsylvania State University, to encourage more involvement from DSI Fellows and to take advantage of their plethora of expertise.

The 2006 DSI Annual Conference will also host a Deans’ Forum. Deans of business schools from around the world will discuss topics of interest to conference attendees from multiple disciplines. More specifically, the deans will address promotion and tenure in general, the future of tenure in particular; the accreditation process, and its impact on colleges of business; multiculturalism and the role of the college of business; and multilingualism and its impact on teaching. It will be interesting to hear from this powerful group—after all they decide on our promotion and tenure, control resources we need for research and instructional projects, and fund our travel.

Another highlight of the conference is the newly minted Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship, which will provide DSI members with the opportunity to develop interests and sharpen their skills in writing successful grant proposals. The Miniconference will showcase panelists from major funding organizations such as NSF/CISE, NSF/DRMS, and NIH as they discuss the traits of successful proposals. It will also present additional perspectives from the viewpoint of successful proposal writers as well as those of experienced proposal reviewers.

In addition to presentations on groundbreaking research, the major activities will include the following (listed by day).

**Saturday, November 18.** The Doctoral Student Consortium, New Faculty Development Consortium, and Curricular Issues Miniconference will take place. The first keynote speaker will address the conference attendees on that day. The Welcome Reception, featuring classic country western music band Southern Bent, will end the day.

**Sunday, November 19.** The Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference will take place in conjunction with the Technology in the Classroom Miniconference and the Professional Development Miniconference. The Fellows Appreciation Luncheon will also take place, as will the address from the second keynote speaker.

See CHAIR’S MESSAGE, page 46
Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship

Applying for and securing research grants is a valuable experience and even a necessary step when the members of DSI engage in research projects that can be significantly enhanced by external research funds. The “Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship” is designed to provide the DSI members with an opportunity to develop interests and to sharpen their skills to write successful grant proposals.

The miniconference will be a one-day event to be held on Sunday (November 19, 2006). In the morning, Common Session 1 will showcase the panelists representing major funding organizations including NSF (both DRMS in SBE and IIS in CISE) and NIH. The panel session will be followed by a networking luncheon, where the attendants will join a pre-assigned small group.

In the afternoon, the perspectives of successful grant writers will be presented in three Breakout Sessions. The breakout sessions will be contextualized (by discipline and type of funding organization) so that their relevance can be maximized for each attendant.

The miniconference will end with Common Session 2 in which experienced grant proposal reviewers will describe what good proposals are from the reviewer’s point of view.

For any inquiries about the miniconference, please contact either of the coordinators, Godwin Udo or Q Chung.

No separate registration fee is required for this miniconference other than the registration fee for the Annual Meeting. However, you must register to attend the miniconference either by contacting the coordinators directly, or by simply checking the “Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship” box in the main conference registration form.

Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship Coordinators
Godwin Udo
University of Texas at El Paso
gudo@utep.edu
Q B. Chung
Villanova University
q.chung@villanova.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. Submissions should be limited to creative approaches and best practices for using course support software, multimedia, spreadsheet software, simulation software, online tutorials, or other applications of technology, and be capable of being demonstrated and discussed within a 20-30 minute timeframe. Submissions will be competitively reviewed and selected for their creativity, novelty, and contribution to pedagogy, and should not be duplications of material found in existing textbooks. Please send submission (following the “Instruction for Electronic Submissions”) directly to the miniconference coordinators by May 1, 2006.

Classroom Technology Co-Coordinators
Laura L. Hall, University of Texas at El Paso, lhall@utep.edu
Ceyhun Ozgur, Valparaiso University, ceyhun.ozgur@valpo.edu

2006 Annual Meeting Coordinators
Program Chair
M. “Mo” Adam Mahmood
University of Texas at El Paso
College of Business Administration
Department of Information and Decision Sciences
500 W. University Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79968
(915) 747 7754 / fax: (915) 747 5126
dsi2006@utep.edu

Associate Program Chair
Steve Clarke
The University of Hull
Business School
Hull HU6 7RX
United Kingdom
+44 (0)1482 463488
fax: +44 (0)1482 463484
S.Clarke@hull.ac.uk

Proceedings Co-Coordinators
Melinda Cline
Texas Wesleyan University
School of Business
1201 Wesleyan
Ft. Worth, Texas 76105-1536
(817) 531 4838 / fax: (817) 531 6585
mcline@txwes.edu

Erin Baca
University of Texas at El Paso
College of Business Administration
Department of Marketing and Management
500 W. University Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79968
(915) 747 7776 / fax: (915) 747 5348
erinbaca@utep.edu

Web Site Coordinator
Jack Vaughn
University of Texas at El Paso
College of Business Administration
Department of Information and Decision Sciences
500 W. University Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79968
(915) 747 7750 / fax: (915) 747 5126
jvaughn@utep.edu

Local Arrangements Coordinator
Vivek Shah
Texas State University
College of Business
Department of CIS and Quantitative Methods
601 University Drive
San Marcos, Texas 78666-4616
(512) 245 2049 / fax: (512) 245 1452
vss01@txst.edu
2006 Competitions

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

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 prize, 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 April 3, 2006. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Kenneth K. Boyer, Michigan State University, boyerk@bus.msu.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 on 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 site. The due date for submissions was April 3, 2006. For information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Nada R. Sanders, Wright State University, nadia.sanders@wright.edu

Best Paper Awards Competition
Best Paper Awards will be presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting. Categories include Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper, Best Application Paper, and Best Interdisciplinary Paper. At the discretion of the program chair and track chairs, outstanding scholarship may be recognized through a distinguished paper award in a given 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.

Best Case Studies Award Competition
The Case Studies Workshop serves an active role in the dissemination of new ideas with respect to case studies topics. The Best Case Studies Award will be presented in conjunction with the 32nd annual DSI Case Studies Workshop on “Case Techniques in the Decision Sciences.” Cases may be methodological in nature (i.e., crafted to support the learning of a specific technical skill) or integrative (i.e., designed to foster the integration of scientific approaches and analyses with real-world decision making).

Janelle Heineke, Boston University, jheineke@bu.edu

2006 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 institutions. Separate tracks will explore issues of interest to those who design, run, and contribute to programs at the undergraduate, MBA, and Ph.D. levels.

Hope M. Baker, Kennesaw State University, hbaker@kennesaw.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.

Janelle Heineke, Boston University, jheineke@bu.edu

J. Robb Dixon, Boston University, jrdixon@bu.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 a Ph.D. degree and are in the first two years of their teaching career.

James R. Burns, Texas Tech University, jburns@ba.ttu.edu

See 2006 ACTIVITIES, next page
The Decision Sciences Institute has a tradition of promoting case-based teaching and the development of new instructional case studies. The Best Case Studies Award will be awarded based primarily on the following criteria:

**Worthy Focus:** Does the case address an important and timely business or managerial issue?

**Learning Challenge:** Does the case engage the student in an appropriate and intellectually challenging way?

**Clarity:** Does the case present the facts, data, and decision(s) to be made in a clear and concise way, consistent with its focus and objectives?

**Professional Appearance:** Does the case and teaching note present a well-written and complete teaching package?

**Potential for Use:** Is the case and teaching note likely to receive widespread and effective use?

**Comprehensive Analysis:** Does the teaching note provide a complete analysis of the qualitative and quantitative issues raised in the case? Are the theoretical linkages appropriate to the course and the topic?

**Well-defined Pedagogy:** Does the teaching note provide adequate guidance regarding how to teach the case, position the case in the course, and outline key learning points?

The top three contestants, selected by a panel of case experts, will present their case studies and analysis at a regular session at the 36th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute held in San Antonio. The case study must be presented at this regular session to be eligible to win the Best Case Studies Award. The panel of judges will then select the winner from among the finalists, based both on the written material and the presentation. The winner will be announced at the Awards luncheon.

Cases not selected as finalists may be presented at the Annual Case Writer’s Workshop to be held at the 2006 Annual Meeting (see below).

**32nd Annual Case Workshop**

The 31st Annual Case Workshop for members engaged in developing new instructional cases will be held at the 2006 DSI Annual Meeting in San Antonio. Members are invited to submit completed case studies along with an appropriate instructor’s note to the DSI program chair.

The format this year will include critiques of the individual cases by case writers in appropriate fields. The purpose of these discussions is to help the case writer further develop their case studies so that they can be shared with other faculty using the case method. Attendance at the Case Writers’ Workshop is open to all conference attendees.

Submission deadline was April 1, 2006.

**Best Case Studies Award Competition Coordinator**

Janelle Heineke, Boston University, jheineke@bu.edu

---

**Profession and Faculty Development Program**

The Professional and Faculty Development Program is for Institute members in all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. The content of the sessions is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing environment. Topics include, but are not constrained to, the following: new instructional and research methodologies; professional service and counseling; balancing the needs of different stakeholders (students, corporations, alumni, etc.) in the educational process; globalization of business education; role of grading and assessment; obtaining research funding; career path strategies; meeting increasing demands in teaching, service, and research; and challenge and opportunities of new technologies. In addition, the program will include a series of sessions related to research, teaching, publishing, and other professional development issues for faculty who are beginning their academic careers. Please submit proposals for workshops, tutorials, and other special sessions directly to the professional development program coordinator by May 1, 2006.

**Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference**

This newly designed miniconference will provide DSI members with the opportunity to develop interests and sharpen their skills to write successful grant proposals. It will be a one-day event to be held on Saturday, the first day of the meeting. The morning session (“Successful Proposals: The Funding Source Perspectives”) will showcase panelists representing major funding organizations such as NSF/CISE, NSF/DRMS, and NIH, who will discuss the...
2006 Doctoral Dissertation Competition

Searching for the best 2005 dissertation in the decision sciences

Co-sponsored by McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute

McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute are co-sponsoring the Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition. 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 2005. A monetary award of $1,500 will be presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting. Submission deadline was April 1, 2006.

Instructions

1. The dissertation must deal with the development of methodology for, or application of, the decision sciences.
2. The dissertation must have been accepted by the degree-granting institution within the 2005 calendar year. It is not necessary for the degree to have been awarded by the end of 2005. Also, the dissertation may not have been submitted previously to a Decision Sciences Institute dissertation competition.
3. The submission materials consist of the following:
   a. A nominating letter on university letterhead stationery submitted by the student’s major professor. This letter introduces the student, the supervisor of the dissertation, and the degree-granting institution. It also certifies the acceptance of the dissertation by the institution within the required timeframe. All contact information for both the author and the major professor should also be stated in the letter. This letter should be sent as a PDF file to the e-mail address given below.
   b. A separate statement by the major professor about why the dissertation deserves special recognition. This statement should be sent as a PDF file to the e-mail address given below.
   c. A summary of the dissertation. This five-to-ten page double-spaced overview should include a description of the problem, the methodology, and the major findings/conclusions. At the top of the first page, the dissertation’s major and minor fields should be identified. Major fields typically are accounting, economics, finance, information systems, organizational behavior/design/theory, operations management, and strategy/policy. Minor fields are often simulation, optimization, service sector, quality, quantitative analysis, artificial intelligence/expert systems, experimental design, and so on. The summary should include a 250-word abstract. This summary should be sent as a PDF file to the e-mail address given below.
4. Because of the blind-review process, it is essential that the author, degree-granting institution, and supervising professor not be identified in items 3b, 3c, and 3d. All acknowledgments or other references that would identify the author, institution, or professors must be removed from the dissertation and all accompanying documents except the nominating letter.
5. Supervising professor and student materials may be submitted together or separately. If the latter is done, the student will also need to include an identifying cover letter or e-mail.

Direct all inquiries and applications to:
Kenneth K. Boyer
Department of Marketing & Supply Chain Management
Eli Broad Graduate School of Management
Michigan State University
N361 North Business Complex
East Lansing, MI 48824-1122
(517) 432-5535 x268
boyerk@msu.edu

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, from previous page

traits of successful proposals. In the afternoon, there will be a series of breakout sessions. Various additional perspectives will be represented in the breakout sessions, including those of successful proposal writers as well as those of experienced proposal reviewers.

Godwin Udo, The University of Texas at El Paso, gudo@utep.edu
Q B. Chung, Villanova University, q.chung@villanova.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. Submissions should be limited to creative approaches and best practices for using course support software, multimedia, spreadsheet software, simulation software, online tutorials, or other applications of technology, and be capable of being demonstrated and discussed within a 20-30 minute timeframe. Submissions will be competitively reviewed and selected for their creativity, novelty, and contribution to pedagogy, and should not be duplications of material found in existing textbooks. Please send submission (following the “Instruction for Electronic Submissions”) directly to the miniconference coordinators by May 1, 2006.

Laura L. Hall, University of Texas at El Paso, lhall@utep.edu
Ceyhun Ozgur, Valparaiso University, Ceyhun.Ozgur@valpo.edu
2006 DSI Annual Meeting

2006 Doctoral Student Consortium

Creating successful career paths for students
Co-sponsored by McGraw Hill/Irwin, Baruch College (CUNY), Beta Gamma Sigma, and DSI

DSI’s 24rd annual Doctoral Student Consortium is an engaging, interactive professional experience designed to help participants successfully launch their academic careers. We are pleased to have the sponsorship of McGraw Hill/Irwin and Beta Gamma Sigma for this important event. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 18, 2006, at the 2006 DSI Annual Meeting in San Antonio, Texas.

Who Should Attend?
The Doctoral Consortium is offered to individuals who are well into their doctoral studies. 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.

Why Should You Attend?
There are several important reasons why you should attend.

1. Networking—getting a job, finding collaborators, and gaining advantages in the career you are about to enter are all related to “who you know.” This is your chance to meet and get to know some of the leading researchers and educators in the field.

2. Skill development—excellent teaching and research require practical skills in addition to content knowledge. You will learn from veterans who will share their secrets to success.

3. Furthering your research—the research incubator will give you a chance to engage in a discussion of your research ideas with your peers and with outstanding researchers.

4. Learn about DSI—this is a chance to “test-drive” DSI, learn about its people, its processes (such as placement services), and its opportunities.

5. Fun!—come socialize with your current and future colleagues in a city that has retained its sense of history and tradition, while carefully blending in cosmopolitan progress.

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 discussions in the following sessions:

Teaching Effectiveness. Harvey Brightman will return to the Doctoral Consortium for another post-retirement workshop in 2006. His sessions are simply not to be missed – even experienced faculty members sit in on these dynamic and inspiring sessions.

Research Strategy Workshop. In this hands-on workshop, tenured faculty mentors help participants to develop a strategic research plan for moving from the dissertation to a research program that will put them on a strong trajectory for tenure. Working in small breakout groups and with the advice and guidance of the faculty mentor, participants will identify their areas of expertise, target appropriate journals, find suitable co-authors, and plan a mix of publications.

Meet the Editors and Academic Reviewing. Editors from journals in the decision sciences and related fields will describe the missions of their publications and will discuss how to craft strong manuscript submissions, how to improve the chances of getting a journal article accepted, and how to respond to reviews. Participants will also learn about how to be a constructive reviewer of manuscripts.

Job Search Seminar. Should I target my job search on research-oriented 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 participants answer these questions through insights drawn from a panel of faculty experts.

Join Us
The Doctoral Consortium does more than prepare individual students, it creates a community of colleagues you’ll know throughout your career. Please plan to attend the Consortium and also encourage your student colleagues to participate in this important program. Although many participants will be entering the job market for 2006-2007, others will appreciate the opportunity to get a better understanding of an academic career and how to approach the job market the following 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 Robb Dixon & Janelle Heineke, Doctoral Consortium Co-Coordinators, by July 30, 2006. 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.

Participants must pay the regular student registration fee of $45 for the annual meeting, but there will be no additional charge for the Consortium. This fee includes the luncheon and reception on Saturday, the networking luncheon on Sunday, and the CD-ROM of the proceedings. Although students will be responsible for all of their own travel and accommodation expenses, it is customary for participants’ schools to provide monetary support for these purposes.

Consortium participants will be recognized in Decision Line, the Institute’s news publication. They also receive special recognition in the placement system, special designation on their name badges, and an introduction to the larger DSI community at the breakfast and plenary session.

Doctoral Consortium Co-Coordinators
J. Robb Dixon and Janelle Heineke
Operations and Technology Management Department
Boston University School of Management
595 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
jrdixon@bu.edu; 617-353-5243
jheineke@bu.edu; 617-353-2919

2006 Track Chairs

Accounting: Theory, Applications, and Practice
Srini Ragothaman, University of South Dakota

Business Value Generating Innovative Technologies and Methods
Nigel Melville, University of Michigan

Case Studies
Chandra Shekar Challa, Virginia State University

DSS/IA/Expert Systems
Peter Mykytyn, Southern Illinois University

John Windsor, University of North Texas

E-commerce
Huseyin Cavusoglu, Tulane University

Finance/Financial Management
Paul Swanson, University of Cincinnati
Manual J. Tarrazo, University of San Francisco

Information Systems
Nathalie Mitev, London School of Economics
Lyneth Kvansy, Pennsylvania State University

Innovative Education
Jo Ann Duffy, Sam Houston State University

International Business
André M. Everett, University of Otago, New Zealand

Invited DSI Fellows Papers
Jack C. Hayya, Pennsylvania State University

Knowledge Management
James R. Courtney, University of Central Florida
Brian Lehaney, Coventry University, UK

Manufacturing Management and Practice
Binshan Lin, Louisiana State University

Marketing: Theory Models and Applications
M. B. Myers, University of Tennessee

MS/OR: Techniques Models and Applications
William E. Stein, Texas A&M University

Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory
Thomas Callahan, University of Michigan

Quality
Don G. Wardell, University of Utah

Service Management
Steven Yourstone, University of New Mexico

Statistics and Decision Analysis
Philip J. Mizzi, Arizona State University

Strategy and Policy
Sid Das, George Mason University

Supply Chain Management
E. Powell Robinson, Texas A&M University

Tim Butcher, University of Hull, UK
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 18, 2006. It will include interactive and panel sessions with faculty at varying stages of their careers. Also, the journal editors of Decision Sciences, 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, 2006. Participation is limited to the first 50 qualified applicants. Each participant will be expected to register for the Institute’s 2006 Annual Meeting in San Antonio. No additional fees are charged for the consortium.

Direct all inquiries and applications to:
James R. Burns
University of San Diego
School of Business Administration
KIPJ-272
San Diego, CA  92110
(619) 260-4854
jburns@sandiego.edu

---

Application for
New Faculty Development Consortium
November 18, 2006 • San Antonio, Texas

Send in this form and a current copy of your vita to either one of the consortium coordinators (see above) by September 15, 2006.

Name: ____________________________________________  Research interests: ____________________________________________

Current institution and year of appointment: ________________________________________________________________

Mailing address: ____________________________________________________________  Teaching interests: ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Year doctorate earned: ____________________________________________________________

Phone: ____________________________________________________________

Fax: ____________________________________________________________

E-mail: ____________________________________________________________

Have you attended a previous DSJ Doctoral Student Consortium?

_____ yes  _____ no

If so, when? ____________________________________________________________
2006 Instructional Innovation Award Competition

Recognizing outstanding contributions that advance instructional approaches within the decision sciences

Co-Sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta, Prentice Hall, and the Decision Sciences Institute

The advancement and promotion of innovative teaching and pedagogy in the decision sciences are key elements of the mission of the Decision Sciences Institute. At the President’s luncheon during the 2006 Annual Meeting, the 28th presentation of this prestigious award, co-sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta (the national honorary in the decision sciences), Prentice Hall, and the Institute, will be made.

The Instructional Innovation Award is presented to recognize outstanding creative instructional approaches within the decision sciences. Its focus is innovation in college- or university-level teaching, either quantitative systems and/or behavioral methodology in its own right, or within functional/disciplinary areas such as finance, marketing, management information systems, operations, and human resources.

The award brings national recognition for the winner’s institution and a cash prize of $1,500 to be split among the authors of the winning submission. Authors of each of the remaining finalist entries share $750. Author(s) of the winning submission will be encouraged to prepare a paper for possible publication in Decision Line.

All submissions must adhere to the following guidelines and must be received no later than April 3, 2006.

Instructions

Applications must be submitted in electronic form using instructions on the conference Web site at www.dsi-2006.org. A tentative summary of instructions appears below; however, applicants should consult the Web site instructions before submitting. Submissions will consist of one document electronically submitted using the conference Web site, and one supplemental letter sent via US mail.

Electronic Submission Notes

1. Number of documents and their format: The electronic submission must consist of one document, in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format, completely contained in one file. Graphics and images may be integrated into this one document, but no separate or attached files of any kind are permitted. No audio, video, or other multimedia of any form can be included. Nothing may be separately submitted by any other means, including disks, videotapes, notebooks, etc. Further information about maximum file size, etc. can be found on the electronic submission form.

2. Anonymity: Include no applicant names, school names, Web sites, or other identifying information in your document. This information is captured separately on the electronic submission form. Applicants not adhering to this policy will be ineligible for consideration.

Document Format

Competition finalists will closely adhere to these format requirements.

1. Length: Your one electronically submitted document can be no more than 30 total pages when formatted for printing.

2. Title Page: On the first page, provide the title of the submission and a table of contents. Number all pages in your submission in the upper right-hand corner.

3. Innovation Summary: On the second page, explain why your submission provides a new innovative approach to teaching. You may also incorporate this into the abstract to be entered separately on the electronic submission form.

4. Summary Section: On the next 3 to 7 pages, present a double-spaced summary of your submission, with the following headings:
   a. Topic or Problem toward which your approach is focused.
   b. Level of students toward which your approach is focused.
   c. Number of students with whom the approach has been used.
   d. Major educational objectives of your approach.
   e. Innovative and unique features of your approach.
   f. Content: Describe the content or substance of the material addressed with your approach. Indicate why you focused your innovative efforts on this material or content.
   g. Organization: Explain how you structured the material or content, unique features of your approach, and how your approach contributes to student learning.
   h. Presentation: Discuss how you designed the explanation and illustration of the material or content, what is unique about your approach, and how its use makes learning more effective.
   i. Effectiveness and specific benefits of your approach to the learning process: Indicate how your major educational objectives were met, benefits derived from the presentation, students’ reactions to the presentation, and how you evaluated the effectiveness or benefits derived. Include measures of the success of the approach, which may include, but should not be limited to, instructor or course evaluations.
   j. Transferability: Explain how this innovation could be used by other institutions, professors, or courses.
The Summary Section will be used for the first round of reviews and may also serve as the Proceedings version for both finalists and papers accepted for presentation in regular sessions.

5. Expanded Section: This is the complete, full version of the submission that should stand alone without the summary section. The expanded section may not exceed 21 pages, including exhibits. This document is used in the second round of reviews and permits you to describe the content, organization, presentation, and effectiveness in more detail. In addition to the same information provided in the Summary Section, you may:
   a. List experiential exercises, handouts, etc. (if any), which are part of your innovative approach and explain where they fit in your approach.
   b. Add any other discussion or material that you feel is essential to an understanding of your submission.
   c. Appendix. Attach copies of illustrative material, especially any that you have developed, and a copy of the most recent course syllabus in which the innovative activity was used.

The total length of your electronically submitted document, including appendices, must not exceed 30 pages. The text must be double-spaced, using 11-12 point characters, and a minimum of one-inch margins.

Page Counts
Title Page = 1 page
Innovation Summary = 1 page
Summary Section = 3-7 pages
Expanded Section = less than or equal to 21 pages
TOTAL SUBMISSION = less than or equal to 30 pages

Supplemental Letter
In addition to the document submitted electronically, send a letter via US mail to the competition coordinator (address given below) from your department chair, head, or dean attesting to the submission’s authenticity. Include a self-addressed, stamped postcard or envelope that will be returned to confirm receipt of the supplemental letter.

Evaluation
The materials will be evaluated by the Institute’s Innovative Education Committee. All submissions will be blind reviewed. Therefore, it is important that all references to the author(s) and institutional affiliation are entered only on the electronic submission form and do not appear anywhere in the submitted document itself.

The submissions will be evaluated in two phases. All submissions will be evaluated for (1) content, (2) organization, (3) presentation to students, (4) transferability to other institutions, professors, courses, etc., and (5) innovation. Consideration will be given to the clarity of the presentation of the innovative features of the submission and the demonstrated effect it has had. Phase two will be the finalists’ presentation at the annual meeting. Both the written submission and presentation will be considered in the final voting for the award.

All applicants, including the finalists, will be notified by June 15, 2006. If you are one of the finalists, you will be required to attend the Instructional Innovation Award Session at the annual meeting in San Antonio. At that session, each finalist will do the following: (1) present a review or summary of the submission, (2) conduct an in-depth presentation or a discussion of a specific component of the submission (selected by the finalist), and (3) respond to questions from the audience.

This session has two purposes: to provide an avenue for the Institute’s members to see and discuss innovative approaches to education which could be used in their classes, and to enable the authors of the innovative packages to “bring their approaches to life” and add another dimension to the evaluation process.

The Committee invites your participation in this competition to recognize excellence in innovative instruction.

Please remember that all submissions must be received by April 3, 2006.
Newly Elected 2006-2007 Decision Sciences Institute Officers

President-Elect
Kenneth E. Kendall

Is a professor in the School of Business – Camden at Rutgers University. He holds a B.S. in mathematics from Canisius College, and both an MBA and PhD in management systems (MIS) from State University of New York at Buffalo. He is the author or co-author of Systems Analysis and Design (6th ed.), Project Planning and Requirements Analysis for IT Systems Development (2nd ed.), Emerging Information Technologies: Improving Decisions, Cooperation, and Infrastructure (Ed.), The Impact of Computer Supported Technologies on Information Systems Development (Ed.) and Needs Assessment and Project Planning. He has published articles in Decision Sciences, Decision Support Systems, Information and Management, Management Science, Operations Research, and MIS Quarterly. He is also a member of Association for Information Systems, INFORMS, Production/Operations Management Society, International Federation for Information Processing WG 8.2 (Chair), and Information Resource Management Association.

Treasurer
Janelle Heineke


At-Large Vice President
Vijay R. Kannan

Is a professor of operations management in the Department of Business Administration at Utah State University. He holds a BSc (Hons) in management sciences from the University of London (UK), an MBA in finance & decision sciences from Indiana University, Bloomington, and a PhD in operations management from Michigan State University. He is the author of articles in Decision Sciences, International Journal of Operations and Productions Management, International Journal of Production Research, Journal of Supply Chain Management, Omega, and Production Planning and Control. He is also a member of the Institute for Supply Management and Phi Kappa Phi.

At-Large Vice President
Robert Klassen


At-Large Vice President
G. Keong Leong

Is a professor and chair of the Management Department at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He holds a Bachelor of Engineering (Honors) from Universiti Malaya, an MBA from the University of South Carolina, and a PhD from the University of South Carolina. He is the co-author of Principles of Supply Chain Management: A Balanced Approach (with Joel Wisner and Keah-Choon Tan, Thomson-Southwestern, 2005); Cases on International Management: A Focus on Emerging Markets (with Steven Hills and Roberto Garcia, West Publishing Company, 1996); and Operations Strategy: Focusing Competitive Excellence (with Peter Stonebraker, Allyn & Bacon, 1994). He has published articles in Decision Sciences, European Journal of Operational Research, Interfaces, International Journal of Production Research, Journal of Management, and Journal of Operations Management. He is also a member of the Academy of Management, Production/Operations Management Society, and Beta Gamma Sigma.

At-Large Vice President
E. Powell Robinson

Is a professor and Mays Research Fellow in the Department of Information and Operations Management at Texas A&M University. He holds both an undergraduate degree and PhD in operations management from the University of Texas. He is the author of articles in Decision Sciences, European Journal of Operational Research, Interfaces, International Journal of Production Research, Journal of Operations Management, and Management Science. He is also a member of INFORMS and Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals.

Asia-Pacific Regionally-Elected Vice President
Manus (Johnny) Rungtusanatham


continued on next page
of Directors for their patience, hard work, and dedication to the Institute. The Board was very active, and I think very productive. We had enjoyable, lively discussions, and everyone was willing to participate positively and to inject constructive criticism where necessary. Finally, I’d like to thank the DSI staff, Carol, Sandra, Hal, Andrea, and all of the others who do the “heavy lifting” when it comes to implementing the desires and needs of the membership through the recommendations of the Board. Thanks to all, and good luck to Mark Davis, the incoming president!

In an earlier President’s Letter, I promised to provide you with more thoughts on my experiences in China. Thankfully, I waited six months before I began to write these: my reactions to what I see and learn change daily. From 2000-2005, I traveled to China more than 20 times (if you include Hong Kong, more than 20 since 1999). Most of my stays were of one week or less, some as much as two weeks. I traveled primarily to Beijing and Shanghai, with a few side trips to smaller cities and small villages. I was doing research on the auto industry’s supply chain in China and felt that I was beginning to know something about China.

Wrong! China, especially in the eastern cities, is rapidly changing and therefore a dynamic and exciting place. Every day I learn more than I thought I could ever learn about this extraordinary place. Much of my accelerated learning has come from numerous discussions with Professor Linda Sprague (many of them at our research laboratory, the Blue Frog, a local expatriate watering hole) about her experiences in China since she began management education here in 1980. As she describes it, before 1980 there was no management education because, under a Marxist Socialist centrally planned economy, topics such as marketing and comparative economics were not acceptable. Through the state planning system the government told the State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) what to do, and they did it. Management decision making . . . forget about it! The job was execution of The Plan.

Today, there are significantly fewer SOEs, and the State Planning Commission no longer exists. In the decades since Deng Xiaoping initiated his Reform and Opening Up policy, thousands of Multi National Corporations (MNC’s) have arrived, mostly through joint ventures. Many have succeeded, many have failed, but the opportunities are still here. Since China’s acceptance into the World Trade Organization, the number of Wholly Owned Foreign Enterprises (WOFE’s) is growing. Most MNCs and WOFEs are in manufacturing, with financial and other services beginning to start up. Because most of the factories have been built in the past decade, the MNCs and WOFEs that I have visited have the most up-to-date processes. Many also use the most recent supply chain (and other fields’) practices—as best they can given the state of the country’s supply chain infrastructure. Touring one of these factories is much like touring an American, European, or Australian factory: the people are different, but the processes are similar. Chinese manufacturing companies hesitate to let foreigners visit their factories, but after six months in the country and with the help of others, doors are beginning to open.

An interesting characteristic of the MNCs is that they have established their own supply chains in China, often through what amounts to coercion by customers: “We are going to China and will be sourcing locally: you, Ms. Tier 1 Supplier, will locate in China or we will find a substitute.” This is both good and bad. It is good in that it has helped the
MNCs become more successful more quickly—or allowed the MNC and its Tier 1 suppliers to fail more quickly—but it is bad because it can inhibit development of local Chinese companies as suppliers to the MNCs.

Finally, don’t believe everything you read—in the Western press or in the local press. And don’t believe everything you read in the academic literature. Those who conduct surveys in China have to understand that, first, things are changing so rapidly that what you hear today may not be true tomorrow. Second, the people who answer the surveys may tell you what they think you want to hear, rather than what they really believe. Some suggestions: read the latest books and articles written by people who have been in China for a number of years, but realize that things are changing so fast that the time lag between the writing and publication may cause the information to be out of date. Read the latest books like One Billion Customers, published in 2005, keeping in mind that some things have changed. Read publications like the series “Building Political Democracy in China” in the Beijing Review (2005). Most of all, come see for yourself. If you have the opportunity to travel to China, do it! But be willing to admit that your short-term visits can only lead to impressions and will not make you an expert on China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanks to 2005-2006 Committee Chairs and Coordinators . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Case Studies Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey S. Harper, Indiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara B. Flynn, Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doctoral Student Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. James Flynn, Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L. Ragatz, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fellows Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information Technology Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subhashish (Sub) Samaddar, Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Innovative Education Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Thomas Foster, Jr., Brigham Young University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investment Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff T. Ragsdale, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Member Services Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Hack Barth, Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nominating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L. Ragatz, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programs and Meetings Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine E. Pullman, Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publications Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda G. Sprague, CEIBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Activities Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark M. Davis, Bentley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas E. Callarman, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benito E. Flores, Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ad hoc Committee to Investigate the Development of an India Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jatinder (Jeet) N.D. Gupta, University of Alabama in Huntsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ad hoc Committee on Job Placement Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff T. Ragsdale, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ad hoc Committee to Redesign the DSI Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas E. Callarman, Arizona State University and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary L. Ragatz, Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ad hoc Committee on a Research Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara B. Flynn, Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. . . and Thanks to 2004-06 Outgoing Board Members

| • Past President                                           |
| Gary L. Ragatz, Michigan State University                  |
| • Treasurer                                                |
| Cliff T. Ragsdale, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University |
| • Vice President                                           |
| Arnoud DeMeyer, INSEAD-Singapore-Campus                    |
| • Vice President                                           |
| Janet L. Hartley, Bowling Green State University           |
| • Vice President                                           |
| Janelle Heineke, Boston University                         |
| • Vice President                                           |
| Nada R. Sanders, Wright State University                   |
| • Vice President                                           |
| Timothy L. Smunt, Wake Forest University                   |
| • Vice President                                           |
| Charles A. Watts, John Carroll University                  |
12. The Board accepted a recommendation to include a standing charge for the Fellows Committee and Program Chair to coordinate with each other to organize, develop, coordinate and promote Fellows session was accepted.

7. The Board approved the engagement of a graphic designer to complete Phase I—the redesign of the Institute’s website and to include a budget of up to $5,000 for its completion.

8. The Board accepted a recommendation that the Home Office: 1) inquire if existing hotel contracts can be renegotiated; 2) provide the Board with an Annual Summary on hotel contracts on a five year rolling basis to be presented at the April Board meetings; 3) provide a report on cancellation policies and determine if any bargaining power exists; and 4) include wireless access, if applicable, in future contracts beyond 2011.

9. The Information Technology Committee’s recommendation to implement a fully functional and bug-free CIS was accepted by the Board.

10. The Investment Advisory Committee’s recommendation to adjust the allocation of the DSI stock funds to more closely match the allocation of the U.S. stock market by transferring $40,000 from the Vanguard 500 Index fund to the Vanguard Extended Market Index fund in increments of $10,000 per month for four months was accepted by the Board.

11. The Investment Advisory Committee’s recommendation to reduce the Institute’s current cash balance to $100,000 and transfer the excess funds to the Vanguard Money Market account was accepted.

12. The Board accepted a recommendation that the Member Services Coordinator forward the actual raw data from the survey to the Home Office so that an additional cross tab analysis can be conducted as part of the strategic planning effort.

13. The Board accepted the Programs and Meetings Committee’s recommendation to change the number of recommended candidates for the Professional Faculty Development Program Coordinator position from “six to eight” to “three to five”.

14. The Programs and Meetings Committee’s criteria used for selecting nominees for the Professional Faculty Development Program Coordinator and the New Faculty Development Consortium Coordinator was accepted with one minor addition.

15. The Programs and Meetings Committee’s recommendation to use the same list of candidates for the Professional Faculty Development Program Coordinator and the New Faculty Development Consortium Coordinator positions in the future (rather than proposing two separate lists) was accepted.

16. The Board accepted a recommendation to charge the Publications Committee with synergizing a standard process for transferring relevant information—the issues and how the transition will take place—to new editors of the DSJ and DSJIE journals.

17. The Board accepted a recommendation to develop a committee to study how to enhance the reputation of the DSJ.

18. The Board approved the Decision Line Editor’s recommendation for developing a transition plan for the next change of editor.

19. The Board rejected the Regional Activities Committee’s recommendation to reduce the membership fee by perhaps adding $20 to regional membership and providing a year’s trial membership for new Institute members.

20. The Board accepted the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee’s recommendation that the Institute’s 2007 International Meeting (jointly with the 2007 APDSI meeting) be held in Bangkok, Thailand.

21. The Board accepted the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee’s recommendation that a request be made of the dean of the business school of Roger Williams University to submit a proposal for Nancy, France to be the venue for the 2009 International meeting.

22. The Board accepted the recommendation that Norma Harrison be appointed to serve as the incoming Global Development Coordinator.
Monday, November 20. The day will start with the Meet the Editors (Decision Sciences, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, Decision Line) breakfast. The Deans’ Forum will also take place, and the day will end with the President’s Reception honoring DSI President Tom Callarman and featuring the country western music of Southern Bent.

Tuesday, November 21. The 2006 DSI Annual Meeting will end with the President’s luncheon. During the luncheon, we will recognize Distinguished Paper recipients, Doctoral Dissertation Competition winners, and the Instructional Innovation Award Competition finalists, among others.

Aside from CEO keynote speeches and other activities, the conference is organized into 20 tracks. In addition to having research paper sessions, each track will feature panel discussion, symposia, workshops, and tutorials on issues that will involve academic experts and industry leaders. As you can see from the aforementioned, the planning and execution of the 37th annual meeting is in full swing. The deadline for the refereed research papers is April 14, 2006. The deadline for abstracts and proposals is May 3, 2006. We continue to receive submissions from both categories on a daily basis. Please submit your research paper, proposal, and abstract by these deadlines and be a part of this exciting conference. Visit our online submission site at http://dsi-2006.org.

And if you think the DSI annual meeting is all work and no play, you are dead wrong. On the entertainment side, it is going to be a big hit! As started earlier, Southern Bent, one of the Southwest’s most popular classic country western bands, will play on two evenings: Saturday and Monday from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. They will bring classic country to the forefront with their approach to the old country masters. Bring your dancing shoes and enjoy these two evenings of dancing and singing to traditional country, southern rock, and a touch of Cajun. Cowboy hats are recommended but not mandatory.

As you can tell, the 37th National Conference of the Decision Sciences Institute in November 2006 is going to be a memorable event that you are going to remember for a long time, we hope! Please plan ahead of time, register early for the conference, and make hotel reservations early at one of the San Antonio Marriott hotels. I look forward to welcoming each and every one of you to San Antonio in November.

---

ANNOUNCEMENTS, from page 31

callpaper.php?callID=392


http://cits.tamu.edu/ieeetpc/

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. Manuscripts will be reviewed in a double-blind fashion and according to JOM review procedures. The guest editors in consultation with the Editor-in-Chief of JOM will make all final decisions as to the suitability of manuscripts for the special issue. Papers should be submitted to: Professor S. Thomas Foster, Jr., Brigham Young University, tom_foster@byu.edu.

International Journal of Six Sigma and Competitive Advantage (IJSSCA) seeks papers for a special issue on “Issues and Influences of Six Sigma in Emerging Markets.” Guest Editors are Chris Seow, University of East London, United Kingdom; Min Xie, National University of Singapore, Singapore; and Shirley Coleman, University of Newcastle, United Kingdom. Submission deadline for prospective papers is August 13, 2006. The purpose of this special issue is to provide an opportunity for the participants of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology (http://www.icmit.net/) to be held in Singapore in June 2006 to publish their papers that address the spirit of this call for papers in IJSSCA. However, people who are working in similar areas and not participating in the conference but wish to contribute to this call for papers are also encouraged to submit their papers for consideration.

OMEGA journal seeks papers for a special issue on “Management Science Research in China: A Special Issue Dedicated to the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games.” Guest Editor is Joe Zhu (jzhu@wpi.edu), Department of Management, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA 01609, USA. Submission deadline is December 31, 2006.

http://www.omegajournal.org/specialissues.html

International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research seeks papers for a special issue on “Responsible Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Development (RESD).” Guest Editors are Chris Seow, Senior Lecturer in Quality, University of East London, Business School, United Kingdom; and Nigel Roome, Daniel Janssen Chair of Corporate Social Responsibility, Solvay Business School, Free University of Brussels, Belgium, and Chair of Sustainable Enterprise and Transformation, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands. This call for papers seeks to highlight issues and practices surrounding how organisations practice responsible entrepreneurship for sustainable development. Papers that are conceptual or empirical, and case-study-based or industry-wide-based are welcome. Prospective authors should email their article to the Guest Editor Chris Seow, c.seow@uel.ac.uk by 14 February 2007.

See ANNOUNCEMENTS, page 18

---
OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS

The Institute’s 2006-07 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Treasurer, and Vice Presidents elected at-large to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2008.

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, Mexico, 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.

Office __________________________________________________________
Nominee’s Name & Affiliation ____________________________________
Statement of Qualifications ________________________________________
Nominator’s Name & Affiliation __________________________________

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 and (3) service to the Decision Sciences Institute. (See the current list of DSI Fellows on this page.)

In order for the nominee to be considered, the nominator must submit in electronic form 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. A candidate cannot be considered for two consecutive years.

This information should be sent by no later than October 1st to the Chair of the Fellows Committee, Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

Decision Sciences Institute Fellows

Adam, Everett E., Jr., University of Missouri-Columbia
Anderson, John C., University of Minnesota
Benson, P. George, University of Georgia
Beranek, William, University of Georgia
Berry, William L., The Ohio State University
Bonini, Charles P., Stanford University
Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia State University
Buffa, Elwood S., University of California-Los Angeles
Cangialosi, Vincent (deceased), University of Southwest Louisiana
Carter, Phillip L., Arizona State University
Chase, Richard B., University of Southern California
Chervany, Norman L., University of Minnesota
Clapp, James M., Belmont University
Collins, Rodney D., Drexel University
Cougier, J. Daniel (deceased), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummins, Larry J. (deceased), University of Minnesota
Darden, William R. (deceased), Louisiana State University
Davis, K. Roscoe, University of Georgia
Davis, Mark M., Bentley College
Day, Ralph L. (deceased), Indiana University
Digman, Lester A., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Dock, V. Thomas, Maui, Hawaii
Ebert, Ronald J., University of Missouri-Columbia
Edwards, Ward, University of Southern California
Evans, James R., University of Cincinnati
Fetter, Robert B., Yale University
Flores, Benito E., Texas A&M University
Flynn, Barbara B., Wake Forest University
Franz, Lori S., University of Missouri-Columbia
Glover, Fred W., University of Colorado at Boulder
Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State University
Gravois, Dennis E. (deceased), Boulder City, Nevada
Green, Paul E., University of Pennsylvania
Groff, Gene K., Georgia State University
Gupta, Jatinder N.D., University of Alabama at Huntsville
Hahn, Chan K., Bowling Green State University
Hammer, W. Clay, Duke University
Hayya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State University
Hershauer, James C., Arizona State University
Horowitz, Ira, University of Florida
Houch, Ernest C., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Huber, George P., University of Texas-Austin
Jacobs, P. Robert, Indiana University
Kendall, Kenneth E., Rutgers University
Keown, Arthur J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Khumawala, Basheer M., University of Houston
Kim, Kee Young, Yonsei University
King, William R., University of Pithsburgh
Koehler, Anne B., Miami University
Krajewski, Lee J., Notre Dame University
LaForge, Lawrence, Clemson University
Latta, Carol J., Georgia State University
Lee, Sang M., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Luthans, Fred, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Mabert, Vincent A., Indiana University
Malhotra, Narash K., Georgia Institute of Technology
Markland, Robert E., University of South Carolina
McMillan, Claude, University of Colorado at Boulder
Miller, Jeffrey C., Boston University
Monroe, Kent B., University of Illinois
Moore, Laurence J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Moskowitz, Herbert, Purdue University
Narasimhan, Ram, Michigan State University
Neter, John, University of Georgia
Nutt, Paul C., The Ohio State University
Ols, David L., Texas A&M University
Perkins, William C., Indiana University
Peters, William S., University of New Mexico
Philippos, George C., University of Tennessee-Knoxville
Raiffa, Howard, Harvard University
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Reimnuth, James R., University of Oregon
Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College
Roth, Aleda V., Arizona State University
Schkade, Lawrence L., University of Texas at Arlington
Schrader, Roger G., University of Minnesota
Simone, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology
Slonum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist University
Sobol, Marion G., Southern Methodist University
Sorensen, James E., University of Denver
Sprague, Linda G., China Europe International Business School
Stenberg, Earle, Teche Rose & Company, Houston, TX
Summers, George W. (deceased), University of Arizona
Taylor, Bernard W., III, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Troutt, Marvin D., Kent State University
Uhl, Kenneth P. (deceased), University of Illinois
Vazsonyi, Andrew (deceased), University of San Francisco
Voss, Christopher A., London Business School
 Wasserman, William, Syracuse University
Weinstein, Urban, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Wheelwright, Steven C., Harvard University
Whitten, Betty J., University of Georgia
Whybark, D. Clay, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wicklund, Gary A., University of Iowa
Winkler, Robert L., Duke University
Woolsey, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines
Wortman, Max S., Jr. (deceased), Iowa State University
Zmud, Robert W., Florida State University

Decision Line, March 2006
April

April 14

May

May 1
Submission deadline for the Technology in the Classroom Miniconference (see page 33), Professional and Faculty Development Program (see page 35) at the 2006 DSI Annual Meeting.

May 3
Submission deadline for non-refereed research abstracts and proposals for workshops, tutorials, panels, symposia, and colloquia for the 2006 DSI Annual Meeting (see above).

June

June 14
Asia Pacific Region will hold its 2006 Annual Meeting on June 14-18, 2006, Sheraton Hong Kong Hotel and Towers, Hong Kong, China. See page 31 or http://dse.baf.cuhk.edu.hk/apdsi

July

July 30
Submission deadline for the Doctoral Student Consortium, providing a unique opportunity for doctoral students to interact with one another and with distinguished scholars. See page 37.

September

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 39.

For current news and activities, visit the DSI Web site at http://www.decisionsciences.org