2006 Annual Meeting Award Winners

Distinguished Service Award
Michael J. Maggard, Northeastern University

Instructional Innovation Award
Sandra Strasser, Valparaiso University

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award
Michael Naor, George Mason University
Advisors: Roger G. Schroeder; and Kevin Linderman, University of Minnesota

Best Application Paper Award
Mário G. Augusto, University of Coimbra; Elísio F. Brandão, University of Oporto; and Joao V. Lisboa, University of Coimbra

Best Interdisciplinary Paper Award
Manuel Tarrazo, University of San Francisco

Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper Award
Minghe Sun, The University of Texas at San Antonio

Best Case Studies Competition Award
Carol Prahinski, University of Western Ontario; Eric O. Olsen, California Polytechnic State University; and Renée Reid, University of Western Ontario

For more details, please see related articles in the 2006 Annual Meeting section, pages 28-37.
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First, I want to congratulate Mo Mahmood again for the excellent job he did as program chair for this year’s annual meeting in San Antonio. The Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship that he organized was very well received, and we hope to continue it at future DSI conferences. I also would like to thank all of the members of his Program Committee for a job well done.
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Decision Line, January 2007
FROM THE EDITOR

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

W e hope you had an enjoyable holiday season.

We begin this issue of Decision Line with a letter from DSI President Mark M. Davis of Bentley College. He congratulates Program Chair Mo Mahmood, University of Texas-El Paso, for organizing an excellent conference in San Antonio. Professor Davis highlights several changes within DSI which included the formation of the Indian Subcontinent Region, sponsorship of a Miniconference on Service Science at Carnegie Mellon University from May 24-26, 2007, and a redesigned homepage. He encourages DSI members to be more active in shaping the future of the Institute.

In the POM column, the article “What’s on the Business Horizon for Environmental Performance?” by Robert Sroufe of Boston College and Frank Montabon of Iowa State University points out the importance of incorporating environmental metrics into the organization’s key performance indicators. The authors interviewed managers from 10 of the top 90 ranked firms based on the Kinder, Lyndenberg, and Domini social performance rankings and present several interesting findings. They point out that successful implementation of environmental metrics would involve major commitment by top management. They also suggest several future research areas that should include examining both environmental and non-environmental metrics.

Dean Robert Niebuhr of Tennessee Technological University’s College of Business makes the case for having a higher tuition rate for business courses in the Dean’s Issues column. Premium tuition rates are common in professional fields such as medicine and law. He lists several reasons for justifying a price differential in business schools such as “high cost of instruction,” “high demand programs,” “high starting salaries of graduates,” and “business schools increasingly being viewed as ‘professional’ schools.” He also presents several challenges associated with implementation and lessons learned with using the differential fee.

The Doctoral Student Issues article by Varun Grover of Clemson University presents formal and informal approaches to “indoctrinate students to doctoral studies and beyond.” While there are many ways to prepare students to better appreciate the perspective, processes, and challenges of a doctoral program, he proposes using an “Indoctrination Seminar.” The proposed seminar involves disseminating to the students the foundation, evolution, and construction of knowledge. The course also provides students with methods for building knowledge and guidance in conducting and writing up research.

Best wishes for a happy, peaceful, productive, healthy, safe, and prosperous New Year!

G. Keong Leong

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

by Frank Montabon, Iowa State University, and Robert Sroufe, Boston College

Global environmental regulations specific to the production and disposal of electronics present a host of information challenges to manufacturers, distributors, original equipment manufacturers (OEMs), and more specifically to management systems. Within the last year, companies such as Intel have developed country specific recycling and producer responsibility information systems for Germany, Austria, Norway, and Switzerland.

Others such as Lucent Technologies have corporate reports highlighting the management systems in place to accommodate electronic take-back programs since 2004 and are now still trying to figure out how to close the supply chain loop in the EU. So what is this all about and how do management systems bare the burden of more product regulation?

Management systems facilitate the cooperation and mobilization of resources, and the coordination of effort that facilitates the joint survival of an organization and its members. These contributions to survival are accomplished through measurement and the control of information. While all organizations process and channel information through established and continuously evolving systems, some organizations are better at creating standard practices for appropriate behaviors that help to measure, manage, and hold people accountable for their actions. The central themes of performance management systems are decision making and the flow of information within organizations that instructs, informs, and supports decision making processes. But how do companies create and integrate sound measurement systems within ever-changing competitive environments, and how do some firms create successful systems for measuring and managing performance?

Improved environmental performance is increasingly important, yet simultaneously difficult to research since access to internal systems and data is hard to obtain. Managers are aware of the potential offered by improved environmental operations but have difficulty trying to create solutions to new problems, such as the supply chain implications of two recent European Market directives. The first, Waste from Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE), mandates the treatment, recovery and recycling of electric and electronic equipment. The second, the Reduction of Hazardous Substances (RoHS) restricts the use of hazardous materials found in electrical and electronic products. Both WEEE and RoHS impact all applicable products in the EU market after August 2006. After this time, the products need to be compliant and carry compliance documentation and symbols.

Additional, ongoing Sarbanes Oxley initiatives (SOX) will push the corporate world to move from the auditing and process documentation work into rigorous and real-time measurement and management of control points. So how do managers cope with all of these external pressures to reexamine performance measurement and who is pushing for these changes?

Stakeholders such as corporate investors, creditors, customers, regulators, and environmental interest groups are interested in corporate performance since the level of waste produced by the firm affects these groups either directly or indirectly. Researchers interested in the growing field of environmental performance find theory development and the ability to explain or predict phenomena is difficult given the lack of comparable data. As this interest in environmental performance increases,
there is a commensurate increase in the need for performance measurement as delivered by performance measurement systems. The functions provided by performance evaluation include not only measurement, but also clarification and direction, and identification of opportunities for improvement.

The need for improved environmental performance and the accompanying measurement introduces its own set of issues. The first is that these metrics must meet the needs of several diverse groups. The metrics created by governmental regulations become drivers for business managers, which in turn become drivers for shop floor personnel. Metrics will have different implications for stakeholders at all levels of the firm, both internally and externally. Second, there is the issue of how to introduce new metrics into the existing measurement system. If the addition of these metrics makes the resulting set of metrics too large, then the result may be confusion, frustration, and a movement towards doing only enough to meet the minimum requirements of an ever expanding performance dashboard.

Our intentions are to highlight some of the current issues managers face regarding performance measurement and management, discuss a research project we conducted, and suggest future areas of research. For the sake of what we are talking about here, an Environmental Management System (EMS) involves “The formal system and database which integrates procedures and processes for the training of personnel, monitoring, summarizing, and reporting of specialized environmental performance information to internal and external stakeholders of the firm” (Sroufe, 2003). The basis for the information presented here comes from our direct contact with industry managers during several field research projects. We have found several differences in the perceptions of environmental metrics and the barriers facing management when attempting to create change through the introduction of new performance metrics.

Financial and/or versus Nonfinancial Measures

Environmental or other nonfinancial measures can play an important role in measurement systems. The potential value of nonfinancial measures for predicting and interpreting financial performance prompted the Financial Accounting Standards Board to consider the disclosure of these measures to investors in financial statements over six years ago (FASB, 2000). This argument was recently reiterated by the CEOs of the world’s largest accounting firms (DiPiazza, Rake, McDonnell, Samyn, Parrett, & Turley, 2006). Basically, nonfinancial environmental metrics can help auditors understand the risks of the client and make an audit less likely to run the risk of litigation in case of a client’s failure due to mismanagement. Just how environmental metrics can reduce risk or how they are linked to firm performance is not always clear due to a dearth of information regarding frameworks or models for these metrics and a lack of agreed upon standards as to how to report environmental information in corporate environmental reports.

Research has shown that environmental performance and firm performance are positively linked while some research has shown that as an industry grows, environmental performance will have a greater positive impact on firm profitability (Klassen & McLaughlin, 1996; Konar & Cohen, 2001; Pagell, Yang, Krumwiede & Sheu, 2004). Additionally, improved manufacturing performance can occur simultaneously with investments in technology that improve environmental performance (Klassen & Whybark, 1999). What has not been researched to date are the actual environmental metrics that facilitate environmental initiatives, how firms integrate metrics, who uses the metrics, and how this information is reported internally and externally. With the impact of new international environmental initiatives such as WEEE-RoHS, the business horizon for many manufacturing firms includes questions as to how these new initiatives should be measured and managed.

Who Have We Been Talking to?

In order to gain a greater understanding of the issues involved with attempting to implement environmental metrics, we hit the road to interview a number of firms. The Kinder, Lyndenberg and Domini social performance rankings were used to help identify potential firms. (Complete information about these ratings can be found at http://www.kld.com/research/index.html.) The list was sorted by environmental performance and overall social performance. The firms on this list were then contacted by the research team with the objective of visiting 10 of the firms. We were able to visit with 10 of the top 90 ranked firms. Over the course of a day-long visit, multiple people from a variety of functions were to be interviewed individually by two researchers along with a tour of the facilities. A variety of functions was desired so that the researchers could get as complete a picture as possible of the firm’s environmental metrics system and so that the researchers could explore how extensively each function participated in the system.

What We Found

One interesting result of these interviews was the feedback obtained on the research project itself. Many of the managers said they found the interviews to be an occasion for them to re-think some of the things they were doing with their environmental metrics system. In fact, one interviewee got up in the middle of the interview to contact a co-worker about an idea that was brought up. At the end of the visit with this firm, the research team was informed that the new idea (a new measure) had been implemented and reported externally in the future.

Throughout all the firms, the interest and attention top-level management gave to the environmental metrics system had a clear effect on how successful this system was. With WEEE-RoHS on the horizon (at the time of the field studies), top management’s attention increased as the compliance date for these initiatives grew closer. This was especially more
true of firms in technology industries. The perceptions of top management varied for a variety of reasons. Primary among these was not only timing, but the level of environmental impact the firm had which was inherent in its business.

One opportunity to better understand and explain differences in performance can come from how well everyone within a firm understands the metrics system and related procedures. More than a few interviewees indicated something to the effect that “nobody likes to hear from the environmental people, because that meant problems.” This was especially notable in the new product development process. Based on these interviews, a key to a successful environmental metrics system appears to be fully integrating it into the firm’s business processes, so that it is not seen as a “roadblock.” For example, one firm’s environmental, health and safety (EH&S) function took every measure to ensure that their systems and metrics were not considered a hindrance to any existing processes and made sure to always make a strong business case for any changes to existing environmental procedures.

In discussing the gap in perception that existed between upper and lower levels of management, we found that different levels of management need or desire different levels of granularity in the metrics they use. This is not surprising. What seemed frustrating to the people we interviewed, however, was that this could cause conflicting views of what were essentially the same measures. To overcome this gap, many firms spoke of the concepts of communication and “alignment,” though in yet another paradox, alignment was often defined differently by the interviewees. The idea they were trying to get across was to have everybody working toward the same goals by making sure the measurements and related rewards were designed properly.

**Evolution versus Revolution**

Like other initiatives, successfully implementing environmental metrics involves a rather large commitment by management. Successful systems collect and disseminate environmental data internally and externally with the expectation that external reporting will continually grow in demand. The expected growth in reporting by the managers we talk to parallel the findings of KPMG’s 2005 survey of International Corporate Responsibility Reporting, which also claims that corporate environmental reporting will do nothing but increase in the future (KPMG, 2005). With the onset of WEEE-RoHS, some firms may be pushed more quickly up the evolutionary learning curve, and it may feel like a measurement revolution is taking place. What this may in fact be is another difference between innovative firms and laggards. Environmental performance measurement in innovative firms can be normalized to units of product, cost, or quality/waste, while other firms not wanting to cross the environmental metric chasm have embedded environmental metrics that typically do no more than react to problems and help maintain compliance. Thus, new performance indicators for new environmental metrics will need to be determined, tracked, and reported.

Too often, key performance indicators (KPI) have yet to address environmental metrics or how these metrics can be normalized and related to existing KPIs. Many firms are already using enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems and these large integrated systems are a logical place to house new metrics and disseminate information. Through the extended use of an ERP system, we find an already cross functional, integrated system that can be adapted to the use of environmental metrics. For firms and managers to successfully integrate environmental measurement, it is likely that ERP systems will have to evolve to the point of revolution, a point in which the systems “extend the horizon of analysis” as discussed by Corbett and Klassen (2006).

**Opportunities For Further Research**

An understanding of facility-wide and company-wide environmental measurement and management appears to be a relatively undeveloped capability for some of the firms we have been working with. All firms have environmental philosophies, measurement, or practices; some are just more explicit about theirs. For those firms that have well-developed environmental management systems in place, we find they have better performance measurement and management while engaging EH&S personnel. This is not typical of all firms, as compliance with environmental regulations typically falls on the shoulders of the often tactically or strategically neglected EH&S department. The people within this department are often very knowledgeable employees that often communicate with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and managers from other functions within the firm. These EH&S employees may have little power within the organization and lack top level visibility. This lack of top level visibility is more apparent when the responsibility for environmental compliance, environmental championing or an environmental project falls upon only a few individuals. Thus, these people do not know what is going on at the top of the organization at a strategic level. Conversely, top management doesn’t know much about what its EH&S department is doing or how this function can contribute to the tactical or strategic levels of the firm.

After reviewing field visits to firms in very different industries we found an understanding of environmental opportunities and metrics within the EH&S department, but that this understanding could be vastly different between upper management even within and especially outside of the environmental function. Thus, the people at the top either couldn’t see, or didn’t understand the details of their environmental processes and that managers and process level workers only saw their own individual level metrics of any given process. The successful fulfillment of EH&S responsibilities requires a complex mix of overlapping functional responsibilities. A lack of horizontal and vertical understanding can lead to a lack of responsibility in firms that do not have effective performance systems in place. This issue of how to achieve metrics alignment needs further exploration.
Within organizations that have good measurement systems in place, the EH&S personnel have become an integrated part of new product development processes and make sure their involvement in development or production processes do not interrupt operations and production. In those firms that have a formal system in place with management support, communication, and monitoring, there may be an environmental network effect that integrates functions and facilitates product and process improvement. In these firms, compliance is a minimum starting point and the contributions of EH&S personnel can be more closely tied to total quality management and are part of improvement initiatives that have tried to align organizational systems such as ERP implementation teams.

The perception of the costs and benefits of environmental issues may be changing. Certainly, there are some firms who view punishment for non-compliance of environmental regulations as a cost of doing business. Other firms view minimum compliance as an order qualifier. The firms in our study appeared to see a link between proactive environmental policies and competitive advantage. In other words, they saw this proactive stance as an order winner. These firms were actively seeking to integrate environmental measures into their firm’s dashboard.

A key issue is the lack of standardization of measures and reporting. A natural comparison is to accounting and financial measures, many of which are defined by FASB and the SEC, respectively. This makes research using traditional financial measures relatively easy as there are standard definitions and also years of data are available. The situation is much different for environmental measures. Many of the firms we interviewed appeared to be forging ahead with their own measures and definitions. This often leads to comparability problems from division to division for managers and by extension, firm to firm comparability problems for researchers. For researchers, these comparability problems become worse when considering across firm and across industry comparisons. Though there are currently many environmental reporting initiatives for standards (e.g., Measuring the Environmental Performance of Industry, Global Reporting Initiative, and the Global Environmental Management Initiative) until agreement on measures is achieved, it appears researchers will have to overcome measurement challenges for the foreseeable future.

Future research should include examining environmental versus non-environmental metrics, and the extent to which are these metrics reported and disseminated. Other directions for future research include, but are not limited to the following.

- A need for more field based studies to build theory regarding the impacts of WEEE and RoHS.
- The use of corporate reports for data collection and analysis.
- A comparison of the different environmental reporting standards and their relative efficacies.
- Empirical research testing new relationships between environmental metrics and other non-environmental performance metrics
- Modeling of supply chain performance measurement systems that include environmental metrics.
- ERP systems’ effect on performance measurement?
- Measurement of corporate culture based on the depth and breadth of metric penetration within a firm or supply chain.
- Development of a repository of performance metrics from across industries to be able to contrast and compare metrics at different levels of the firm or across industries.

Some managers and firms we have been interviewing are leading the way in the disclosure of environmental information with the objective of being first movers and possibly setting standards for what will be done in the future across industries. According to the managers solicited in this study, the number of firms creating corporate environmental reports is increasing and will continue to do so into the future especially with directives such as WEEE – RoHS impacting manufacturing firms. As demands for environmental performance information keep increasing, it is likely that this will be an important area of research for many years.
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Differentiated tuition rates have been discussed in the academe, on both sides of the Atlantic and elsewhere, as a means of managing options for affordability and increased availability of high-demand programs and classes, differentiating between disciplines, courses, and peak and non-peak class periods. Often differentiated tuition rates are applied to programs offered by professional and graduate schools. In the following article, Dean Robert Niebuhr presents a case for differentiated tuition rate for business programs. He provides a number of arguments to support this proposition, along with suggestions for implementation.

Making the Case for a Higher Tuition Rate for Business Courses!

by Robert E. Niebuhr, Dean, College of Business, Tennessee Technological University

Tuition rates for study in fields such as medicine and law have traditionally warranted a premium because of their costs and “professional” status. Additionally, “Executive” MBA programs charge a premium (often well above the additional program costs) over the standard graduate course tuition at an institution. Most universities, however, have maintained an across-the-board university tuition rate for normal undergraduate and graduate business programs.

The recent lack of increased funding for state institutions, in particular, has created severe difficulties in seeking to maintain competitive salaries, develop new programs, and improve the college’s technology and facilities. Allowing this under-funded situation to continue may lead to low morale, loss of faculty, reduced program quality, and potential loss of accreditation.

Making a case for a higher tuition fee for business courses, versus courses in other programs across campus, means convincing the administration that these fees are not just needed but are justified by a number of factors. Today, many programs at public institutions are under-funded, and salaries have not risen to competitive levels. Provosts and presidents hear this argument from all deans, regardless of the discipline. Consequently, “need” should not be the sole, or even primary, factor for arguing for a differential tuition level.

Justifying in a Differential Fee

Factors that are both relevant to having a differential fee and that can be documented quantitatively are as follows.

The high cost of instruction: The relatively low production of new doctoral-qualified faculty in business combined with the increased demand for undergraduate and graduate business courses has escalated the salaries of business faculty across all disciplines. The primary business school accrediting agency, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), provides data on both doctoral production and annual salary levels. Particularly noteworthy is the more than 30 percent increase in starting salaries over the last five years for new doctorates in most of our business disciplines. Additional support comes from national annual surveys (e.g., Chronicle of Higher Education or CUPA-HR surveys) that indicate much higher salaries at each rank for business faculty when compared to salaries across campus. Tables showing trend data for business salaries versus other disciplines are extremely convincing to the concept of a “higher-cost” program.
High demand programs: In addition to the fee proposal making the argument of being a “high-cost” program due to faculty salaries, it should also make a case for having “high demand” programs. Data from various sources (e.g., surveys of first-time freshmen) indicates approximately 20 to 25 percent of students will choose a business field as their major. This factor indicates continued resources will be needed to fund new faculty and adjuncts as well as provide staff infrastructure and technology/facilities over both the near-term and into the future.

High starting salaries of graduates: Survey data from the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) traditionally indicates that business graduates are in high demand and also command higher starting salaries than graduates in other disciplines, particularly in liberal arts and education. This factor supports the view that business graduates will have the resources to absorb greater student loans than other graduates, thus reducing the negative impact of a higher tuition rate. University administrators are justified in their concern about the impact of more fees on students, so data indicating relative starting salaries across campus majors helps to reduce this concern.

Business schools increasingly being viewed as “professional” schools: Differential fees have been achieved at a number of schools by an alignment with other “professional schools,” such as engineering and nursing. These programs also have some of the same attributes mentioned earlier with respect to the supporting factors for a differential fee. A joint proposal from the professional schools in a university carries a strong negotiating perspective when approaching the university administration. Additionally, for state-supported schools, a joint proposal from a number of the business schools in the system should carry significant influence in seeking administrative approval. This last approach also has the advantage of countering the argument from administrators that the students will leave the university to study at sister universities in the state.

Implementation Issues and Caveats
Creating differential fees for business courses recognizes the need to properly fund high cost/high demand programs. Because not all programs of study cost the same, it is logical that tuition charges reflect these cost factors. Additionally, creating the image of being a “professional” school similar to medicine, law, and engineering provides another rationale for a differential fee structure. A premium of 10 percent or more of tuition is warranted to live within this “high cost/high demand” climate and maintain quality programs over time. It may be wise to only charge the additional credit hour fee on business courses that are delivered primarily for business majors (i.e. charging the fee for economics course taken by all university students could result in adverse reaction/publicity).

Another key issue with regard to differential fees is to assure that the funds generated by these fees go to the business school directly. Universities (particularly state-funded institutions) are under severe funding constraints, and this new revenue stream may be seen as an alternative to the funding normally provided to the business school (i.e. these monies should be additional revenues for the business school, not substitutes for funding sources already being received).

An additional caveat concerning the differential fee for business courses is the need to provide good stewardship over its usage. It is important that numerous college stakeholders should be considered in the potential uses for these new funds and should have “buy-in” so that the proposal has solid support when presented to the administration. Faculty, staff, and students should all be the recipient of some of the benefits from this new revenue stream. Additionally, new program initiatives (e.g. international student exchanges) and facility/technology upgrading should also be addressed. Because students are the ones providing the new funding, it is important that they understand and accept the rationale for the differential fee. Likewise, they should benefit in the use of the funds as well. Surveying students may be a way of determining their greatest perceived needs so that resources from the differential fee can be provided to make a positive impact on those needs (e.g. our surveying resulted in creating a “Student to Career” program of non-credit courses designed more effectively equip our students for that first professional job).

Lessons Learned
After having the fee in place for over three years, there are additional issues that may be gleaned from our experience with a differential fee.

Don’t tie up all the new fee money in reoccurring funding situations. While it is important to respond quickly to show how the new revenue stream is being used, care should be taken to make sure flexibility to meet new financial demands is available.

Publicize and celebrate the success of the new fee within the college but “low-key” its impact across campus. Business faculty salaries already cause internal conflicts in the university, and adding to these perceptions is probably not prudent for long-term relationships.

Use the new funds, where possible, to leverage other initiatives, whether in donor situations or within the university. We began a much-needed renovation effort by using some of the money to match donor gifts in the renovation and naming of classrooms. One advantage of this approach was to “quick-start” the renovation effort but then reduce the use of the fee monies as the donor program gained momentum. The result is that over the three-year period, six rooms have been renovated, and private funds have been received or pledged for another seven (including full funding of an auditorium renovation).

Even though the extra fee is supposed to supplement the normal operating funds, at times we have used these revenues to substitute for those funds (e.g. currently, we pay all faculty travel from the fee rather than use the university operating budget). While

See DEAN, page 40
DOCTORAL STUDENT ISSUES

MANOJ K. MALHOTRA, Feature Editor, University of South Carolina

Indoctrination to Doctoral Studies: A First Year Seminar

by Varun Grover, Department of Management, Clemson University

Over the years, I have found that doctoral students are doing a lot more leg-work before they enter the program. And this makes sense. Given the level of commitment needed, the opportunity costs, and the particular personality profile that fits the academic career, it would be foolhardy to casually apply to a doctoral program. However, this preparation is obviously from the outside-in. Students can prepare checklists, review faculty qualifications, talk to faculty, browse through program and course information, and even try to navigate some academic papers. While useful, students are often evaluating these programs based upon what they know—which is largely experienced through undergraduate and graduate degree programs that they have completed. So, while the nuanced student would work hard to get the best “feel” for what they are getting into—it is necessarily limited.

It is therefore important for doctoral programs to provide strong exposure to the key aspects of research and pedagogy. After all, these programs (we) are developing “stewards of the field” that will create and disseminate knowledge—we need to make sure that they appreciate the perspective, the processes and the challenges involved. If we do this early, perhaps students can truly understand what is involved, and we can weed out potential failures and catalyze success.

How do we do this? There are many ways, both informal and formal, that can be used to indoctrinate students to doctoral studies and beyond. I have observed some programs that have an orientation session where faculty discuss the program and expectations regarding coursework, teaching, research, comprehensive exams and dissertation. I have seen such sessions conducted in an informal manner where students and faculty interact and get to know each other. Mentoring programs are also prevalent, where doctoral students are assigned mentors or advisors through the program. Ongoing “brown bag” sessions where faculty and students exchange research ideas have been institutionalized at some schools. While these mechanisms are important to introduce students and enable ongoing interactions, I’m not convinced that they achieve consistent impact early enough in the program. One approach that I have seen work is to have a full course indoctrination seminar early in the program, ideally in the first semester. While this may not always be possible, I still think it is beneficial to do this as early as possible.

The term “indoctrination seminar” sounds ominous and awkward and is used here to represent the spirit of what we are trying to accomplish. Many schools have a “general research methods” seminar that could be used for the same purpose. The purpose is to set the student on the path to becoming a “steward of the discipline.” It exposes students to fundamental research concepts, provides an appreciation of various methodologies, and guidance on the research career they have chosen to pursue. In sum, the indoctrination seminar mentally prepares students to undertake the various research challenges through the program. In this article, I provide an example of such a seminar—with the recognition that “mentally prepared” could be interpreted differently and accomplished through many variations of this approach. The point however, is that a general indoctrination seminar early in the program is a useful and powerful way to accelerate doctoral student development.

Varun Grover

is the William S. Lee (Duke Energy) Distinguished Professor of Information Systems at the College of Business & Behavioral Sciences, Clemson University. Previously he was a Business Partnership Foundation Fellow and professor of information systems at the Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina. Dr. Grover has published extensively in the IS field, with over 140 publications in refereed journals. Five recent articles have ranked him among the top five researchers based on publications in major IS journals over the past decade. He currently serves as senior editor of MIS Quarterly, Journal of the AIS and Database and associate editor for JMIS, JOM and IJEC, among others. He is a recipient of the Outstanding Achievement Award from the Decision Sciences Institute, and has also received recognitions for his research from PriceWaterhouse Coopers AIS and Anbar Intelligence. He has also received numerous teaching awards for his courses at the graduate (MBA) and doctoral level. Throughout his career, Dr. Grover has been engaged with the both the administrative and academic aspects of doctoral programs, including working extensively with numerous students. He has a number of articles in Decision Line on doctoral studies including “10 Mistakes Students Make in Managing their Program” May 2001; “Interaction Between a Doctoral Student and Advisor: Making It Work!” January 2003; “A Rough Model for Success in Doctoral Study” October 2004; and “How am I doing? Checklist for Doctoral Students at Various Stages of their Program” March 2006.

vgrover@clemson.edu
http://people.clemson.edu/~vgrover/grover.htm

Decision Line, January 2007
Figure 1 provides a possible structure for the seminar. This could be used for IS and OM students, although it can be tailored to other disciplines, too. Through such a course students will be introduced to the basic tenets of research (what is scientific research?), knowledge (what is knowledge and its major concepts?), methods (what are ways to generate knowledge?), and success (how can they succeed in doing this?). The major components of the course are in three parts. Part I includes scientific research, knowledge evolution, theory, hypotheses, constructs, variables, assumptions. Part II includes gaining familiarity with research philosophies and various methodologies, with particular emphasis on empirical research. Here, students will learn how to read and evaluate research articles. And, finally, Part III focuses on success in research. Here, students will learn about research institutions and how to succeed in a research environment. By the end of the course, doctoral students should have a sound understanding of what they are getting themselves into—including an appreciation of the excitement and the challenges of this career!

The seminar could begin with a session on “pursuing an academic career” or a “research and pedagogical” career. The focus here would be to discuss the various pillars of such a career (like research, teaching, and service) and engage in an exercise with students regarding their expectations regarding their careers. This forces students to think substantively about where they see themselves in the future and to begin planning their program accordingly. Part I could include sessions that begin at the philosophical level and then systematically migrate down to important knowledge constructs. For instance, starting with a session on the foundation and evolution of knowledge (how has knowledge been constructed in the past?) and the definitions of science and the scientific approach (e.g., Kuhnian thinking) would set the foundation for getting into scientific processes.

The next session could focus on construction of knowledge through theory, its components, and processes of induction and deduction. Here, a good understanding of theory, constructs, hypotheses, and variables as building blocks of knowledge would be useful. In fact, this session could benefit from discussion of the many insightful papers in journals like the Academy of Management Journal that describe what is and is not theory. A session that discusses carefully selected papers that present/build theory could help bring the point home regarding the basic building blocks of knowledge. A session on different research assumptions about knowledge (e.g., positivism vs. interpretivism) would be useful to prevent monistic thinking or bias regarding knowledge construction. Simple exercises involving observation of human behavior that allow students to theorize hypothesize and observe (measure) variables are useful. The key take-away from Part I is to help students understand what knowledge is and the basic components that allow us to build and change knowledge.

Part II focuses on the methods for building knowledge. While students will gain in-depth understanding of specific research approaches in their methodology courses, it is important that they appreciate the processes and considerations for conducting good research. Sessions on a variety of research methodologies could be taught by invited faculty with expertise in the method. These could be preceded by a typology of methods including empirical methods like survey, case studies, and experimental and mechanical methods like simulation and math modeling. For instance, basic tenets
of experimental design (threats to validity, controls, factorial designs, etc.) could be discussed along with an exemplar paper that describes a good experimental study. Significant time should be spent on fundamentals of these methods and trade-offs between methods, rather than statistics. Besides gaining a basic understanding of the methods, students should be exposed to common concepts across methods (such as internal and external validity, reliability), pros and cons of using methods, critical success factors and exemplar work. These broader aspects are typically not gleaned in individual courses and can provide a strong understanding of how to build knowledge constructs. Of course, the methodologies and their coverage can be tailored to the disciplines represented by students in the class. Part I and II can be concluded by discussing theory and method together, perhaps by helping students appreciate (or critique) theory-based empirical papers.

Finally, Part III focuses on the student and the institutional context. Sessions here can be devoted to more practical guidance in conducting research from selecting topics to writing up research. Emphasis could also be placed on post-research phases of review and publication processes. Topics could include the research process (from conceptualization to implementation), organizing research, the workings of research institutions (e.g., journals) and evaluating research (review and publication processes). A final session on managing the doctoral program successfully as well as post-program career management in academia would bring various elements of the course together.

Of course, many of the sessions could draw from rich sets of readings that can be opened up for discussion and debate. These readings could traverse disciplines emphasizing the commonalities between areas of social science and even scientific research. Depending on when the course is offered, a research proposal could also be required to start the student thinking formally about investigation of a research area. Figure 2 outlines possible research topics for the seminar.

In conclusion, I would argue that while there might be other institutional mechanisms that enable students to gain exposure to key aspects of research and pedagogy, these are often piece-meal and disjointed. I have also observed that many research methods courses are idiosyncratic to the instructor’s expertise, highly statistically oriented, or strongly overlapping with other courses. Doctoral seminars that focus on research areas tangentially impart this knowledge—but the learning is often incomplete. An indoctrination seminar, regardless of its title, early in the program—would be invaluable in setting doctoral students’ expectations and thinking regarding their purported career choice.
**Decision Sciences Journal Special Topic Forums**

**New Directions for Supply Chain Design**

Associate Editor Team  
Kyle D. Cattani and Vincent A. Maber  
Indiana University

The past two decades have witnessed a proliferation of supply chain designs. In many cases, supply chains have become more global and complex, with vast challenges in the coordination of material, information, and finances. In other cases, supply chains have become more streamlined, with fewer players and much shorter lead times. With more choices available for structuring supply chains, the question of “What is the best design for our supply chain?” remains as important and challenging as ever. Only recently have academics given serious consideration to the question of supply chain design and how to best structure a supply chain to align with other competitive decisions. This Special Topic Forum calls upon researchers to challenge our disciplines to consider new directions for supply chain design research ones that provide critical managerial insights for strategic and operational managers.

Building on the editorial mission of *Decision Sciences*, this Special Topic Forum (STF) seeks manuscripts utilizing diverse research approaches such as theoretical, empirical, and analytical research methods addressing supply chain design decisions. The research should provide better understanding of global supply chains as complex systems, and integrate concepts such as strategic sourcing, effective asset management, appropriate information flows, and incentive structures that coordinate complex relationships in global supply chains. No matter what research approaches are employed, a rigorous application of methodological tools should provide insight into the challenges facing managers as they structure their supply chains. Articles published in this STF must meet *Decision Sciences’* high standards of research rigor and originality, while embracing managerial relevance, not only in the research problem studied, but also in their impact on enhanced decision making.

Topics of Interest include, but are not limited to:

- Global outsourcing strategies: alignment of products and supply chains
- Interaction of supply chain design and product design
- Positioning/repositioning supply chain assets (facilities, inventories, and transportation) in response to business dynamics
- Design of global supply chains for rapid response
- Supply chain design for managing disruption risks

Manuscript preparation and submission instructions can be found on the journal’s Web site (see below). In the cover letter to the Editor-in-Chief, Professor Vicki Smith-Daniels, please indicate that your submission is for the Supply Chain Design Special Topic Forum.

**Submission deadline:** July 31, 2007.  
https://wpcarey.asu.edu/dsjOnline/index.cfm

**Next Frontier in Services Research**

Vicki Smith-Daniels, Department of Supply Chain Management, W.P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University

*Decision Sciences* announces a call for papers for a Special Topic Forum on “The Next Frontier in Services Research.” Associate Editors are Ann Marucheck, University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill; and Richard Metters, Emory University. Deadline for submissions is March 15, 2006.

A new frontier for services appears on the horizon. Services now account for more than half of the U.S. economy. Companies with long histories of designing and producing products are increasingly looking to services to distinguish themselves in a world characterized by intense competition and rapid technological change. Multi-national companies are delivering diverse services worldwide and often find themselves challenged with the cultural and social issues germane to the region’s specific service economy. Technology advancements are enabling the design of new complex services across the extended enterprise. Customers have come to expect multiple channels for the purchasing products and services. Businesses are procuring services on an increasing rate through outsourcing arrangements with global service providers.

While academia has made great strides in the past decade to discover, evaluate, and model decisions in the services economy, there is still much work to be done in rigorously developing the “science” of services. Services research, has, and will likely continue, to draw from diverse academic disciplines such as operations management, information systems, marketing, organizational behavior, and technology management.

This Special Topic Forum (STF) focuses on the next frontier of services by publishing rigorous research that stimulates future research on designing and managing services in today’s rapidly changing environment. STFs consist of a collection of three to five articles that are published in a regular issue along with other peer-reviewed articles.

Building on the refocused editorial mission of *Decision Sciences*, this STF seeks manuscripts utilizing diverse research approaches such as theoretical, empirical, and analytical research methods. The STF encourages research examining different types of service decision problems ranging from strategic to operational that occur in various forms including inter-organizational, group-based, and technology-enabled. Articles published in this STF must meet *Decision Sciences* high standards of research rigor and originality, while embracing managerial relevance, not only in the research problem studied, but also in their impact on enhanced decision making.

Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Designing consumer services for global delivery
Looking Ahead to the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting

Marc J. Schniederjans
DSI 2008 Program Chair

The decision sciences are operationalized by the act of decision-making, and decision-making is not limited to a particular type of institution, industry, functional area, or discipline. The Decision Sciences Institute encourages the advancement of decision-making research in many ways, including the sponsoring of its Annual Meeting where scholars and practitioners from all over the world are invited to share the latest decision-making developments.

The Decision Sciences Institute’s 2008 Annual Meeting theme is “Improving Competitiveness Through Information and Decision Sciences.” The DSI 2008 Annual Meeting invites basic, applied, theory, and case study research in the field of decision-making, as well as proposals for panel discussion, symposia, workshops, and tutorials dealing with research or pedagogical issues. This meeting will include invited sessions featuring highly respected researchers, educators, and practitioners who will share their knowledge and experience on decision-making practices. The sessions will be organized into various tracks and mini-conferences. The meeting will also feature curricular issues, technology in the classroom, doctoral student consortium, grantsmanship, and faculty development programs for both new and senior faculty.

The DSI 2008 Annual Meeting offers much more than just a paper presentation conference! The Annual Meeting offers faculty opportunities to renew teaching/technology skills, learn how to use current methodologies to enhance future research efforts, find employment, and establish networks that can last a career lifetime. As a member of DSI for over 25 years, I can attest to the value of these unique opportunities and fellowship available only at DSI Annual Meetings.

The 2008 DSI Annual Meeting will be held in Baltimore, Maryland, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel from November 22nd to 26th. For tourism information visit www.baltimore.org. Detailed information on the hotel and event activities in Baltimore will be made available in the future on the meeting website. In the meantime, if you have any questions, suggestions, or requests, feel free to email me at dsi2008@unl.edu.

You are invited to participate in the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore. Come to present your most recent research and teaching innovations, and attend a number of mini-conferences and consortia scheduled during the meeting. Consistent with the Institute’s commitment to collaboration across academic disciplines, the meeting encourages research and teaching innovations in all areas of information and decision sciences.

NAMES IN THE NEWS

CAROL LATTA, Executive Director, Decision Sciences Institute

George Benson, a Fellow of the Decision Sciences Institute, was recently elected as the new College of Charleston president by the school’s Board of Trustees. For the past eight and a half years, he has been the dean of the Terry College of Business at the University of Georgia. Under his leadership, the Terry College of Business has consistently ranked among the top 20 public business schools by leading college guides and business publications. Previously, he has served from 1993 to 1998 as the dean of the Rutgers Business School at Rutgers University. From 1977 to 1993 he was a faculty member in the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. Benson is the co-author of one of the leading textbooks on business statistics. It has been widely used in the U.S. and abroad for the last 29 years. Prentice Hall published the ninth edition in 2005. His research spans several fields including decision analysis, operations management, statistics, finance and economics.

Barry Render, the Charles Harwood Professor of Operations Management and Management Science at Rollins College’s Graduate School of Business, in Winter Park, Florida, has recently been named to the Board of Directors of Action Products International, Inc.(APII-NASDAQ). Action is the premier manufacturer of educational toys in the US, with such products as I-Dig, Space Explorers, Curiosity Kits, and Jay-Jay the Jet Plane. Render has been appointed chair of the Compensation Committee and serves on Action’s Audit Committee as well. His Prentice Hall text book with Jay Heizer, Operations Management, now in its 8th edition, is the leading OM book in the US and global college markets. His Quantitative Analysis text, with Ralph Stair and Mike Hanna, is entering its 10th edition.

brender@cfll.rr.com

Carol Latta, Feature Editor
Executive Director
Decision Sciences Institute
catta@gsu.edu
The recent explosion of information and the global market expansion provide the central theme for this year’s conference, “Effective Decision Making Through Knowledge Management.” Current areas of particular interest to the coming decades include the effective leveraging of organizational knowledge through tacit knowledge capturing, integration of cross organizational information, as well as a host of other rapidly changing business models.

In general, the main objective and focus of the 9th International DSI Conference, jointly held with the 12th APDSI Conference in 2007, is to provide a venue for discussions, observations, and conclusions regarding collaborative exchanges with respect to knowledge management. Decision Sciences should lead the way in breaking down the functional barriers in academia through our outreaching activities.

Paper reviewers, panel discussants and session chairs are needed for a successful program. Please contact conference academic affairs coordinator at the provided contact address to indicate your interest in participating. All proposals for themes of panel discussions and submissions will be refereed by independent reviewers.

The conference invites researchers and practitioners to submit papers and proposals for themes of panel discussions under the following topics:

- Accounting
- Actuarial Science/Insurance
- Business Administration
- Computer Science/IT
- Decision Support Systems
- e-Business/e-Learning
- Economics
- Finance
- Human Resource Management
- International Business
- Management Information System
- Management of NPO/NGO
- Management of Service Industry
- Manufacturing Practices & Technology
- Marketing Communications
- Operations Management/Operations Research
- Organizational Behavior
- Public Sector Applications
- Quantitative Methods & Statistics
- Regional Development & Demography
- Risk Management
- Strategic Management/Leadership

Instructions for Submission

1. Authors must submit full papers in English for reviewing. To facilitate our blind review process, the submitted paper must not include the author(s)’s name. Instead a separate title page should be included for every submission indicating clearly: 1) author(s), 2) affiliation(s), 3) complete address, telephone/fax number and e-mail address of one author to whom correspondence should be addressed, 4) title of paper, and 5) selected topic area. Full papers are limited to 20 pages (8,000 words), including tables and figures, and to be submitted as an MS Word document. In case of proposals for panel discussions, the submission must include a short summary of the panel, list of the panelists and resumes of all the panelists.

2. All submissions will be blind refereed by independent reviewers on a rolling basis. All submissions are to be sent via e-mail to submission@as.nida.ac.th. All submissions must be received on or before March 30, 2007. Notification of acceptance will be sent by April 30, 2007.


4. Speaker’s online registration and conference payment in full (including authors, panel discussants and session chairs) must be received on or before May 30, 2007, to validate one’s attendance as a speaker at the conference. Speakers who do not remit payment and online registration before May 30, 2007, will not be eligible to present papers and/or speak at the conference. Authors are required to personally attend the conference to present their papers.

5. Each accepted paper must be accompanied by full paid registration which covers a maximum of two accepted papers of the speaker.

6. Accepted papers will be published in the conference proceedings on CD-ROM with an ISBN number.
## Important Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Papers/Panel Proposal Submissions Deadline</td>
<td>March 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of Paper Acceptance</td>
<td>April 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of Camera-Ready Full Papers and Registration of Speakers</td>
<td>May 30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Registration Deadline</td>
<td>June 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Registration Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Rate</td>
<td>310 USD (DSI Member); 350 USD (First-time Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Rate</td>
<td>120 USD (DSI Member); 135 USD (First-time Member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Registration (after June 15, 2007)</td>
<td>Additional 50 USD (Regular Rate); 30 USD (Student Rate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Conference Program (Preliminary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 11, 2007</td>
<td>15:00 - 18:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 12, 2007</td>
<td>08:00 - 09:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09:00 - 10:30</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony/Keynote Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 - 17:30</td>
<td>Concurrent Program Panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:30 - 20:30</td>
<td>Welcome Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13, 2007</td>
<td>09:00 - 17:00</td>
<td>Concurrent Program Panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14, 2007</td>
<td>08:00 - 18:00</td>
<td>Study Visit on The Philosophy of Sufficiency Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2007</td>
<td>08:00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Tour of Traditional Thai Businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Destination Thailand

Thailand is the perfect destination to mix business with pleasure. Come enjoy an unforgettable experience and discover the many enjoyable and exciting things awaiting you—a rich traditional heritage and unique culture, exquisite cuisine, idyllic beaches and pristine mountains, an array of shopping options and dazzling nightlife.

## Venue/Accommodations

The Shangri-la Hotel is the venue and the official hotel for the conference. It offers excellent rates for InterDSI/APDSI participants. Room availability is guaranteed for reservations made before June 15, 2007. Please contact the hotel directly at www.shangri-la.com.

---

**Please submit all correspondence regarding papers and other academic affairs to:**

Siwiga Dusadenoad  
School of Applied Statistics, National Institute of Development Administration  
118 Seri Thai Road, Bangkapi, Bangkok 10240, Thailand  
Fax: (+66) 2374-9000  
E-mail: submission@as.nida.ac.th (Papers & panel submissions only)

Any inquiries other than paper submissions and academic affairs should be directed to:  
interDSI2007@as.nida.ac.th or APDSI2007@as.nida.ac.th.
All attendees must register for the meeting. Conference registration and payment must be completed by fax or online by May 30, 2007 (for speakers) and June 15, 2007 (for participants). See contact information below.

Register by fax
To: Conference Secretariat or Siwiga Dusadenoad
Fax: (+66) 2374-9000

Register online
www.interdsi2007.org

Yellow polo short-sleeve shirt in celebration of His Majesty the King’s 80th Birthday Anniversary will be distributed at the conference. Please select your shirt size (check only one):

- S (chest 34 inches)
- M (chest 36 inches)
- L (chest 40 inches)
- XL (chest 46 inches)

DSI Member registration $310.00
First-time member registration 350.00
(Includes one year membership in DSI)

Additional options and activities for spouses and family members can be purchased on July 11, 2007 during registration.

Student member registration* 120.00
Student first-time member registration* 135.00
(Includes one year membership in DSI)

After July 15, 2007 (LATE FEES)
Regular rate 50.00
Student rate 30.00

TOTAL
* does not include meals and trips

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION: (Please Print)
This note serves as an irrevocable instruction to the National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA) that I agree to use the following credit card to pay the registration fees of the International DSI Conference in conjunction with the APDSI Conference.

- Visa
- MC
- American Express

Total Amount US$_________
Card No. ___________________________ Expires: ___ /___
Card Holder’s Name ___________________________
Signature ___________________________

Receipts will be provided at registration July 11-12, 2007.
In an effort to continue to develop Service Science as a new academic discipline, IBM and Bentley College are sponsoring a total of eight (8) student travel scholarships of $500 each to attend the DSI Miniconference on Service Science which will be held at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, PA on May 25 and 26. In addition to the scholarships, students will be charged a reduced registration fee to attend the conference.

In order to be eligible for this scholarship the following conditions must be met:

- The student must currently be full working towards either a master’s degree or doctorate.
- The extended abstract that is submitted must be written by the student requesting the scholarship. If there is more than one author, then the student must be the primary author indicating that he/she is responsible for the majority of the submission.
- The topic of the paper must have a service science orientation. That is, it must be focused on some aspect of service management and reflect a transdisciplinary perspective.
- The student must present the paper/abstract at the DSI Miniconference.

The extended abstract must be submitted through the regular submission process which is accessed through the conference website at http://atc3.bentley.edu/site/dsiminiconference/

The deadline for all abstracts, including those being submitted for a scholarship is March 15.

In addition to submitting the extended abstract through the conference website, each student must submit the following to Dr. Rohit Verma at the address below: (a) a letter from his/her faculty advisor that states that the author is a full-time student, and that the above eligibility requirements have been met (the faculty letter should also include the title of the paper, the institution where the student is studying, and the student’s expected graduation date), (b) the student’s current CV, and (c) a copy of the extended abstract.

These should be sent to:

Dr. Rohit Verma
DSI Miniconference
Cornell University - School of Hotel Administration
338 Statler Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-6902
rv54@cornell.edu
ANNOUNCEMENTS (see more info & updates at http://www.decisionsciences.org/announce.htm)

Institute Meetings

The 38th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 17-20, 2007, in Phoenix, Arizona. The submission deadlines are: Refereed papers, April 1, 2007; abstracts and proposals, May 1, 2007. Contact Program Chair Janelle Heineke, Boston University, School of Management, 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, (617) 353-2919, fax: (617) 353-4098, jheineke@bu.edu.
http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

9th Decision Sciences Institute International Meeting, in conjunction with the 12th Annual Meeting of the Asia Pacific Region will be held July 11-15, 2007, in Bangkok, Thailand. Submission deadline is March 30, 2007. Contact Program Chair Somboonwan Satyarakwit, Dhurakijpundit University, 110/1-4 Prachachuen Road, Lak Si, Bangkok 10210, THAILAND, (662) 954-7300, fax: (662) 954-7910, sboonwan@dpu.ac.th.
http://www.interdsi2007.org

Asia Pacific Region will hold its 2007 Annual Meeting (in conjunction with the 9th Decision Sciences Institute International Meeting) on July 11-15, 2007, in Bangkok, Thailand. Submission deadline is March 30, 2007. Contact Program Chair Somboonwan Satyarakwit, Dhurakijpundit University, 110/1-4 Prachachuen Road, Lak Si, Bangkok 10210, THAILAND, (662) 954-7300, fax: (662) 954-7910, sboonwan@dpu.ac.th.
http://www.interdsi2007.org

Mexico Region tba

Midwest Region will hold its 2007 Annual Meeting on April 12-14, 2007, at the Hilton Garden Inn (www.hiltongardenchicago.com) in Chicago, Illinois. Deadline for submissions was February 16, 2007. Contact Program Chair Charles Petersen, Operations Management and Information Systems Department, College of Business, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, IL 60115, cpetersen@niu.edu.
http://www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

Northeast Region will hold its 2007 Annual Meeting on March 28-30, 2007, at the Renaissance Harbor Place Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. Submission deadline was October 12, 2006. Contact Program Chair Rhonda Aull-Hyde, University of Delaware, rhyde@udel.edu.
http://www.nedsi.org

Southeast Region will hold its 2007 (37th) Annual Meeting on February 21-23, 2007, at the Marriott Savannah Riverfront Hotel in Savannah, GA. Submission Deadline for Regular Papers and Abstracts was September 25, 2006. Submission Deadline for Student Papers was October 30, 2006. Contact Program Chair Amrit J. Shah, College of Business, Frostburg State University, 101 Braddock Road, Frostburg, MD 21532, shah@frostburg.edu, (301) 687-4408. http://www.sedsi.org

Southwest Region will hold its 2007 (28th) Annual Meeting on March 13-17, 2007, in San Diego, California. Submission deadline was September 29, 2006. Contact Program Chair Bonnie F. Daily, Management Department, College of Business, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001, bdaily@nmsu.edu, 505.646.2015, Fax 505.646.1372.
http://www.swdsi.org

Western Region will hold its 2007 (36th) Annual Meeting on April 3-7, 2007, at the Inverness Hotel and Conference Centre in Denver, Colorado. Submission deadline was October 1, 2006. Contact: Program Chair G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada Las Vegas, 702-895-1762, WDSI2007@unlv.edu.
http://www.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers

Conferences

http://id.tamu.edu/undergrad/news/idea.htm


First European Research Conference on Continuous Improvement and Lean Six Sigma will be held June 6, 2007, in Glasgow, Scotland. Conference host is The Centre for Research in Six Sigma and Process Improvement (CRISSPI) at Glasgow Caledonian University. Conference theme is “Achieving Business Excellence Through Continuous Improvement and Lean Six Sigma Strategy.”
http://www.inderscience.com/mapper.php?id=51905


Academy of Business & Administrative Sciences, which pioneered International Conferencing on the theme of Emerging Economies over the last 8 years, is pleased to announce three conferences (Troyes, France; Cluj-Napoca, Romania and Vilnius, Lithuania) in summer 2007 at international destinations.

The XVII International Conference of the Academy of Business & Administrative Sciences (ABAS), to be held June 9-11, 2007, will be hosted by Groupe ESC Troyes, one of France’s leading Institutions of Higher Education in Management.

See ANNOUNCEMENTS, page 41
2007 Program Chair’s Message

Janelle Heineke, Boston University

To be successful, every organization—large or small, public or private, for-profit or not-for-profit—needs to serve its customers. Traditionally, we have thought about managing goods-producing organizations differently than service-producing organizations, but it is becoming increasingly clear that, in the end, it’s all about service.

As the world becomes smaller and customers’ expectations continue to rise, making decisions that will enable us to serve customers efficiently and effectively becomes increasingly important. We need to discover how organizations can use what they know about their customers, operations, and workforce to make decisions that will enable them to serve their customers better and gain strategic advantage in the marketplace.

The 2007 DSI Annual Meeting invites basic, applied, and case study research in the field of decision sciences, as well as proposals for panel discussion, symposia, workshops, and tutorials dealing with research or pedagogical issues. The conference will include invited sessions featuring highly respected researchers, educators, and practitioners to share their knowledge and experience on decision-making practices. These will be organized in 22 tracks including a separate track for DSI Fellows. The conference will also feature the curricular issues miniconference, technology in the classroom miniconference, doctoral student consortium, and faculty development programs. A meeting highlight will be a Sunday evening family barbecue: a great way to mix and mingle and enjoy the company of colleagues and friends. Bookmark the 2007 Annual Meeting website at www.dsi2007.org and watch for updates!

2007 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) hard-copies of their dissertation in the required format directly to the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator by April 1, 2007. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Rohit Verma, Cornell University, School of Hospitality Administration, rv54@cornell.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 is April 3, 2007. For information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Peter M. Arnold, Boston University, parnold@bu.edu

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 33nd 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).

Kathleen McKone-Sweet, Babson College, kmckonesweet@babson.edu
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 38th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute held in Phoenix. 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 2007 Annual Meeting (see below).

The Top Three Finalists will be announced at the Awards luncheon. 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 2007 Annual Meeting (see below).

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 is April 1, 2007.

Please send submission (following the “Instruction for Electronic Submissions”) directly to the miniconference coordinators by May 1, 2007.

**Keong Leong**, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, keong.leong@unlv.edu

**Professional 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 chang-
Instructions/Checklist for Contributors

The Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) invites contributions to the 2007 Annual Meeting in the following categories: Refereed Research Paper, Non-Refereed Research Abstract, and proposals for a Workshop, Tutorial, Panel, Symposium, or Colloquio. Authors can choose between submitting a refereed research paper that will receive reviews from at least two referees or of submitting a non-refereed research abstract of 50 words or less (500 characters maximum). If accepted, refereed research papers will be published in the Proceedings (available in CD-ROM format only), as well as scheduled for presentation during the annual meeting.

An author elects to submit a non-refereed research abstract, it will be scheduled for presentation during the annual meeting but will not be published in the Proceedings. Acceptance of abstracts and papers are subject to final approval by the track chairs. Proposals for a workshop, tutorial, panel, symposium, or colloquio will be evaluated for possible inclusion in the annual meeting by the appropriate track chairs or program chair.

Authors are required to submit all contributions online using the instructions provided in the following section and updated on the DSI Web site. When using the Web site for submission, contributors of refereed research papers and proposals for a workshop, tutorial, panel, symposium, and colloquium will be evaluated for possible inclusion in the annual meeting by the appropriate track chairs or program chair.

Instructions for Electronic Submissions

The 2007 DSI Annual Meeting will use the existing conference information system (CIS) owned by the Institute. The authors must do all submissions electronically only using this system available on the DSI Annual Meeting Web site. All of the following information must be provided for the submission to be accepted.

a. Title of submission (title changes will not be allowed at a later date)

b. Type of submission (must select one of the following):
   • Refereed Research Paper - treat as an abstract for presentation if the paper is not accepted for publication in the Proceedings
   • Refereed Research Paper - withdraw if rejected
   • Non-Refereed Research Abstract
   • Workshop Proposal
   • Tutorial Proposal
   • Panel Discussion Proposal
   • Symposium Proposal
   • Colloquium Proposal
   • Award Competition Entry

c. Track that best fits the submission (to determine the proper track for your submission, see the track list along with descriptions and contacts of the track chairs)

d. Abstract of 50 words or less, which must accompany all types of submissions

e. Stage of your research as of today and by the time of the conference

2007 DSI Annual Meeting Coordinators

Program Chair
Janelle Heineke
Boston University
School of Management
595 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
(617) 353-2919/fax: (617) 353-4098
dsi2007@bu.edu

Associate Program Chair
Larry Meile
Boston College
Carroll School of Management
140 Commonwealth Avenue/Fulton Hall
Chesnut Hill, MA 02467
(617) 552-0158/fax: (617) 552-0433
dsi2007@bu.edu

Proceedings Coordinator
Robert J. Pavur
University of North Texas
BCIS Department
P.O. Box 305249
Denton, TX 76203-5249
(940) 565-3107/fax: (940) 565-4935
pavur@unt.edu
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660 TNRB
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arijit.sengupta@wright.edu

Local Arrangements Coordinator
Kevin Dooley
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Dept. of Supply Chain Management
P. O. Box 874706
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kevin.dooley@asu.edu

The submission deadline for refereed research papers is April 1, 2007. The submission deadline for non-refereed research abstracts and proposals for workshops, tutorials, panels, symposia, and colloquia is May 1, 2007. (Please refer to specific competitive awards for their respective submission deadlines.) Submitting authors will be acknowledged through a reference number right at the conclusion of the submission process.
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 2007 Annual Meeting, the 29th 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 or across 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.

Please do not resubmit previous finalist entries. Submissions not selected for the final round of the competition will be considered for presentation in a regular session associated with the conference’s Innovative Education track. Therefore, competition participants should not submit a condensed version of their submission to a regular track.

All submissions must adhere to the following guidelines and must be received no later than April 2, 2007.

Instructions


Electronic Submission Notes

1. Number of documents and their format: The electronic submission must consist of one document, in 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.

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 your 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. It is essential to 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:

- List experiential exercises, handouts, etc. (if any), which are part of your innovative approach and explain where they fit in your approach.
- Add any other discussion or material that you feel is essential to an understanding of your submission.
- 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Page</th>
<th>1 page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Summary</td>
<td>1 page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Section</td>
<td>3-7 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Section</td>
<td>less than or equal to 21 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUBMISSION</td>
<td>less than or equal to 30 pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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, 2007. If you are one of the finalists, you will be required to attend the Instructional Innovation Award Session at the annual meeting in Phoenix. 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 2, 2007.

**Instructional Innovation Award Competition Coordinator**

Peter Arnold
Operations and Technology Management
Boston University School of Management
595 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
parnold@bu.edu

**PROGRAMS, from page 21**

ning 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; the role of grading and assessment; obtaining research funding; career path strategies; meeting increasing demands in teaching, service, and research; and the challenges 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, 2007.

Joy Field, Boston College Carroll School of Management, fieldjo@bc.edu
M
cGraw-Hill/Irwin and the De
cision Sciences Institute are co-spon
soring the Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dis
sertation Competition. The purpose of
the competition is to identify and recog
nize outstanding doctoral research in
the development of theory or applications of
the decision sciences completed during
2006. A monetary award of $1,500 will be
presented at the 2007 Annual Meeting.
Submission deadline is April 1, 2007.

Instructions
1. The dissertation must deal with the develop
ment of methodology for, or application of,
the decision sciences.
2. The dissertation must have been accepted
by the degree-granting institution within
the 2006 calendar year. It is not necessary for
the degree to have been awarded by the end
of 2006. Also, the dissertation may not have
been submitted previously to a Decision Sci
ences 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 time frame. 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.
   d. A PDF file of the complete dissertation.
      This should be a single file—separate files
      for individual chapters or appendices are
      NOT acceptable. Please send this file in a
      ZIP format to conserve space.
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 dis
   -sertation and all accompanying documents
   except the nominating letter.
5. Supervising professor and student materi
   als 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:
Rohit Verma
School of Hotel Administration
Cornell University
338 Statler Hall
Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 255-2688
rv54@cornell.edu

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference
An expanded forum for exchanging ideas at the 2007 Annual Meeting

The Technology in the Classroom Miniconference provides a forum for
participants to share novel or innovative applications of technology in the class
room that enhance the student’s learning experience. Submissions should be
limited to creative approaches and best practices for using course support soft
ware, 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 time-frame. 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 coordinator by May 1, 2007.

Classroom Technology Coordinator
G. Keong Leong
University of Nevada Las Vegas
Department of Management
4505 Maryland Pkwy Box 456009
Las Vegas, NV 89154-6009
(702) 895-1762
keong.leong@unlv.edu
2007 DSI 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 25th 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 17, 2007, at the 2007 DSI Annual Meeting in Phoenix, Arizona.

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, it 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 2007. 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 Reviewers. 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 2007-2008, 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 par-
ticular), 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, 2007. 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.

---

**2007 Track Chairs**

**Accounting: Theory Applications and Practice**
Ashley Burrowes, University of Wisconsin - Lacrosse
Nihel Chabrak, Institut National des Telecommunications

**Case Studies**
Larry Meile, Boston College

**DSS/AI/Expert Systems**
Binshan Lin, Louisiana State University - Shreveport

**E-Commerce**
Tim Laseter, University of Virginia
Elliot Rabinovich, Arizona State University

**Ethics and Sustainability**
Shirley Hopkins, California State University, Chico

**Finance/Financial Management**
Barbara Poole, Roger Williams University

**Information Security**
Chao-Hsien Chu, Pennsylvania State University
Robert Deng, Singapore Management University, Singapore

**Information Systems**
J.P. Shim, Mississippi State University

**Innovative Education**
Jo Ann Duffy, Sam Houston State University
Kellie Keeling, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

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

**Knowledge Management**
Dianne Hall, Auburn University

**Manufacturing Management and Practice**
Nada Sanders, Wright State University
Greg Graman, Michigan Technological University

**Marketing/OM/IS Interface**
Michael Pangburn, University of Oregon
Effie Stavrulaki, Bentley College

**Marketing: Theory Applications and Practice**
Bruce Weinberg, Bentley College

**MS/OR: Techniques, Models and Applications**
Jennifer V. Blackhurst, Iowa State University

**MS/OR: Techniques, Models and Applications**
Scott Webster, Syracuse University

**New Product Development and Project Management**
William H. A. Johnson, Bentley College
Rupak Rauniar, Jackson State University

**Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory**
Thomas Callahan, University of Michigan - Dearborn

**Quality**
Stephan Vachon, HEC - Montreal

**Service Management**
Steven Yourstone, University of New Mexico

**Statistics and Decision Analysis**
Philip Mizzi, Arizona State University

**Strategy and Policy**
Scott Latham, Bentley College

**Supply Chain Management**
Anthony Ross, Michigan State University
Dan Conway, Indiana University

---

**Doctoral Consortium Co-Coordinators**
Powell Robinson
Information and Operations Management Department
Mays Business School
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas 77843-4217
p-robinson@mays.tamu.edu
(979) 845-1148

Funda Sahin
Department of Marketing and Logistics
310 Stokely Management Center
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-0530
fsahin@utk.edu
(865) 974-8809
By all indications the 2006 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting in San Antonio was a resounding success. We had about 1300 registered participants from around the world including Brazil, Canada, China, India, Japan, New Zealand, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom who participated in this year’s national conference.

First, I want to thank the over 2200 scholars and practitioners who authored or co-authored submissions to the annual conference. Altogether we had close to 1000 refereed and invited papers, panel discussions, workshops, symposia, and tutorials dealing with research and pedagogical issues from 20 tracks, 6 miniconferences and consortia scheduled in over 350 sessions.

Second, my thanks go to the many reviewers who read and evaluated submissions to the conference. Their comments were immensely helpful in selecting quality manuscripts for the conference. Third, I would like to thank 43 track chairs, professional activities and competitions coordinators who helped in the development of an excellent program that matched the theme of the conference. My special thanks go to Steve Clarke, associate program chair, and Melinda Cline, proceedings, coordinator for their assistance with the program.

The DSI San Antonio Meeting hosted two CEO/CTO keynote speakers—Ricardo Romo, president of the University of Texas at San Antonio and Larry Olson, chief technology officer of Texas. President Romo spoke on how he led strategic efforts at UTSA to enhance both students access to education and excellence in scholarship and service. He also elaborated on new student support programs he had designed and implemented to help students succeed at earning a university degree.

Mr. Olson explained how he re-engineered the Texas Department of Information Resources since joining the state in May 2004 as CTO, creating a matrix-based organization with a stronger focus on information and communications technology planning, security, and service delivery. Mr. Olson also spoke on efforts he had led to create a shared vision for technology by working across organizational boundaries to promote common interests, champion business and technological innovation, and support the core missions of Texas state agencies.

The audience immensely enjoyed these keynote speeches and actively participated in these sessions. My special thanks go to these keynote speakers for taking time to speak at the conference.

One of the most popular sessions at the conference was the DSI Senior Journal Editors and Scholars Forum. The session included editors from some of the most rigorous and well-regarded research journals and scholars from some of most prestigious conferences. The editors focused on how to write publishable manuscripts and how to guide these through the review process, in their
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respective areas. Information Systems was represented by V. Sambamurthy of Michigan State University; Management Science was represented by Barrie R. Nault of University of Calgary; Operations Research was represented by Brian Lehaney of Coventry University, UK; and the Production and Operations Management area was represented by Aleda Roth of Clemson University. Two former DSI presidents, Thomas Jones of University of Arkansas and Gary Ragatz of Michigan State University, also participated in the forum and focused on how to successfully convert research conference papers to research journal papers. My special thanks go to Steve Clarke of University of Hull, UK, and Melinda Cline of Texas Wesleyan University for facilitating the forum.

I am happy to let you know that, for the first time in DSI history, we hosted a Fellows Appreciation Luncheon to honor the DSI Fellows. Two newly minted 2006 DSI Fellows, Gary Klein of the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, and Marc Schniederjans of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, were recognized during the luncheon for their lifetime achievement.

The DSI 2006 Annual Conference hosted two Deans Forums, one on Sunday and one on Monday. These were some of the most popular and well-attended sessions. The panelists in the Sunday Forum included David Christy of California Polytechnic State University, Maling Ebrahimipour of Roger Williams University, Robert Nachtmann of the University of Texas at El Paso, Susan E. Pariseau of Merrimack College, and Brian Reithel of the University of Mississippi. The panelists in the Monday Forum included Robert Markland from the University of South Carolina, and William J. Tallon from Northern Illinois University. The deans discussed promotion and tenure, the future of tenure, the accreditation process and its impact on colleges of business, among others. My special thanks go to Steve Clarke of University of Hull, UK, and Jimmie Joseph of the University of Texas at El Paso for facilitating these sessions.

The DSI Annual Meeting hosted a miniconference, again for the first time in DSI recent history, on successful grantsmanship that provided participants with opportunities to enhance their skills in writing successful grant proposals. The miniconference was very successful considering the caliber of the presenters, the quality of the presentations and the number of attendees. A free luncheon was provided which helped keep the participants for the entire duration of the miniconference. I thank Dan Genden-dasy of the National Institute of Health, Robert O’Conner of the National Science Foundation, and Basil J. Whiting of Workforce, Community, and Economic Development for participating in the miniconference. I also want to thank a number of grant writers and grant reviewers for taking part in the miniconference. My special thanks go to Q.B. Chung and Godwin Udo for coordinating the miniconference.

The 2006 winners of the Instructional Award Competition, Best Case Studies Award, and Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award were Victor J. Massad and Joanne Tucker of Shippenburg University; Carol Prahniski of University of Western Ontario, Eric O. Olsen of California Polytechnic University; and Michael Naor of George Mason University, respectively. My special thanks go to Nada Sandars of Wright State University, Janelle Heineke of Boston University, and Kenneth K. Boyer of Michigan State University for managing their respective competition.

The 2006 DSI Awards for the Best Application Paper, Best Interdisciplinary paper, and Best Theoretical/Empirical paper went to Mario G. Augusto and Joao V. Lisboa of University of Coimbra and Elisio Brandao of University of Oporto; Manuel Tarrazo of University of San Francisco; and Minghe Sun of the University of Texas at San Antonio. My special thanks go to Melinda Cline of Texas Wesleyan University for chairing the Best Papers Award Committee.

The 2006 DSI Annual Meeting featured a welcome reception on Saturday evening and a president’s reception on Monday evening. Both receptions were held in the Grand Ballroom at the Marriott Rivercenter. Southern Bent, one of the Southwest’s most popular classic country western bands, played both evenings from 6:00 to 8:00 pm. They played traditional country, southern rock, and a touch of Cajun music. There was a dance floor in the front of the Ballroom. All three Salons (G, H, and I) were full of conference attendees and their guests singing and dancing to the music.

Aside from the committee participants who worked very hard to make the 2006 DSI Annual Meeting a success, I must thank a number of other folks who also played a critical role in making this year’s conference as one of the best ever: first, I want to thank DSI Past President Tom Callarman and DSI President Mark Davis for their help and advice. I want to thank Andrea Williams, Jack Vaughan, and Gilbert Cortez for their help with the Conference Information Systems (CIS) used for managing the manuscript review process and scheduling the conference paper sessions. Everything functioned very smoothly. We encountered no problems whatsoever with the CIS software. Third, I want to thank Hal Jacobs and Sandra Storrod from the DSI home office for getting the final program ready and managing the registration process, respectively. Fourth, I want to thank DSI executive director Carol Latta for always being there and for being so helpful with her comments and assistance. Finally, I want to thank all of you who by your participation alone immensely contributed to the success of this year’s conference. It was a well designed, well managed, and well attended DSI conference and I thank you for it. It has been a pleasure serving you and the Decision Sciences Institute in my role as your 2006 Program Chair. I look forward to working with you in other capacities and seeing you again at future DSI Annual Meetings.
2006 DSI Doctoral Student Consortium

Participants included 79 students and 28 faculty, representing more than 50 different universities and numerous academic disciplines.

The 2006 Doctoral Student Consortium of the Decision Sciences Institute was held on Saturday, November 18, at the San Antonio Marriott. By all accounts the event was a huge success. Seventy-nine students and 28 faculty representing more than 50 different universities participated. The Consortium was sponsored by the generous contributions of Alpha Iota Delta, McGraw-Hill/Irwin Publishing Company and the Decision Sciences Institute.

Co-coordinators Robb Dixon and Janelle Heineke welcomed the students after a continental breakfast, and provided a brief overview of the program, stressing the many opportunities for networking as well as professional development. The program included seven sessions and concluded with a reception.

Secrets to Success

The first session was a panel of faculty at various stages in their careers who shared their secrets to success (and happiness). Christopher Craighead, Auburn University; Sanjay Ahire, University of Dayton; and Powell Robinson, Texas A&M University, offered their unique perspectives on academic life, offering useful and often humorous insights. Their candid and very practical suggestions covered areas such as work practices, collegiality, priorities, and work-life balance issues.

Publishable Articles and Navigating the Review Process

The second session focused on managing the publishing process. Robb Dixon and Janelle Heineke started the session with some basic tips for preparing a manuscript and working with journal editors. Decision Sciences editor Vicki Smith-Daniels of Arizona State University and Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education editor Barbara Flynn of Indiana University – Indianapolis, provided a detailed step-by-step approach for publishing success.

Strategic Research Planning Breakout Sessions

A key component of the Consortium was the Strategic Research Planning breakout session. Participants worked in small groups using problem-solving exercises and the guidance of breakout session leaders to learn how to establish a strategic research plan for the short and long terms. Student participants appreciated the opportunity to spend focused time with established faculty working in their fields. Many thanks to session leaders:

- Paul Bobrowski, Auburn University
- Paul Cronan, University of Arkansas
- Fred Davis, University of Arkansas
- Joy Field, Boston College
- Barbara Flynn, Indiana University – Indianapolis
- Jim Flynn, Indiana University – Indianapolis
- Laura Forker, University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth
- Clyde Holsapple, University of Kentucky
- Gary Klein, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
- Robert Jacobs, Indiana University
- Robert Markland, University of South Carolina
- Ram Narasimhan, Michigan State University
- Powell Robinson, Texas A&M University
- Funda Sahin, University of Tennessee
- Morgan Swink, Michigan State University
- Srinivas Talluri, Michigan State University
- Viswanath Venkatesh, University of Arkansas

Working Lunch

A working lunch was held jointly with the New Faculty Development Program participants. During lunch, Mark Davis (DSI President) and Adam Mahmood (2006 Program Chair) welcomed students to DSI and discussed the importance of participation in DSI activities. Stephen Lunce (President, Alpha Iota Delta), and Jim Viehland (Executive Director, Beta Gamma Sigma) discussed the lifelong benefits of joining a premier professional society. Janelle Heineke (2007 Program Chair) invited Consortia participants to the meeting in Phoenix.

How to Interview for a Job

After lunch Christopher Craighead (Auburn University), Christine Kydd (University of Delaware) and Joy Field (Boston College) shared their insights from both sides of the job interview table on a topic of great importance to Consortium participants.

Deans’ Panel

Deans Paul M. Bobrowski (College of Business, Auburn University), Dave Christy (Orfalea College of Business, California Polytechnic State University) and Krishna Dhir (Campbell School of Business, Berry College) offered insights on the following topics for new faculty beginning their academic careers:

- Expectations during the recruiting process
- Understanding differences in business schools/universities
- Getting off to a good start
- Teaching and research – first-year, third-year, and tenure reviews
- Service to the organization and the discipline

Participants very much appreciated hearing the deans’ perspectives on these topics.
An Overview of DSI Placement Service
Arijit Sengupta (Wright State University), DSI Placement Services Coordinator, provided an overview of the DSI placement process as well as a summary of this year’s market conditions by discipline.

Teaching Best Practices
The Consortium concluded with Harvey Brightman in a session entitled, “Becoming an Excellent Teacher.” This year marked the 23rd consecutive time that Professor Brightman has shared his research and insights on teaching performance—and he did not disappoint. In this session, Professor Brightman engaged the participants by describing his research findings on effective teaching attributes and by sharing his experiences in teaching and in helping others to teach better. He provided valuable tips on organization and presentation of content. The information he shared gave those in attendance some concrete means to quickly improve their teaching. As always, Professor Brightman’s enthusiasm and quick wit kept the session lively and interesting.

Social Hour
By the end of the day, the participants were ready to relax and de-brief over food and drinks provided by Beta Gamma Sigma and Alpha Iota Delta. A good time was had by all!

Janelle Heineke and Robb Dixon are the co-coordinators of the 2006 Doctoral Student Consortium. If you are a doctoral student preparing a dissertation in anticipation of entering the job market in 2006, you will benefit immeasurably from participating in the DSI Doctoral Student Consortium. We urge all doctoral dissertation advisors to encourage their students to take advantage of this very valuable opportunity provided by DSI.

Doctoral Student Consortium Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayman Abdallah</th>
<th>Byoung-Chun Ha</th>
<th>Hasan Mohammad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Abebe</td>
<td>Fang (Helga) He</td>
<td>Robert Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arfin Angriawan</td>
<td>Xuli He</td>
<td>Sriram Narayanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramakrishna Ayagari</td>
<td>Christian Hofer</td>
<td>Gufru Ozcan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Baker</td>
<td>Adriana (Rossiter) Hofer</td>
<td>ChongWoo Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karim Ben Boubaker</td>
<td>Carolyn Holton</td>
<td>Anh Chi Phan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laird Burns</td>
<td>Manpreet Hora</td>
<td>Brandis Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinead Carey</td>
<td>Mark Jacobs</td>
<td>Kiattisak Phongkusolchit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Cavazos</td>
<td>Sunran Jeon</td>
<td>Luckrawan Pimsawadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongyi Chen</td>
<td>Olga Kaminer</td>
<td>Praveen Pinjani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Chen</td>
<td>Kihwan Kim</td>
<td>Tobin Porferfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Cho</td>
<td>James Krees</td>
<td>Sriram Ramachandran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge A. Colazo</td>
<td>H. Dharma Kwon</td>
<td>Tom Rienzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry DeHondt</td>
<td>Kun Liao</td>
<td>Desiree Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parag Dhimal</td>
<td>Lauren Lu</td>
<td>Pamela Rogers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Edwards</td>
<td>Arun Madapusi</td>
<td>Claudia Rosales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard W. Egan</td>
<td>Andrew Manikas</td>
<td>Janine Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Fan</td>
<td>Ila Manuj</td>
<td>Jollean Sinclaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana Rosado Feger</td>
<td>Vishal Midha</td>
<td>Tracey D. Stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Feller</td>
<td>Richard Miller</td>
<td>Nazim Taskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelina Gnanlet</td>
<td>Tarun Mital</td>
<td>Konstantin Taskov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheelaa Thiruvadi
Gregg Thomas
Patricia Thomas
Zhongjun Tian
Vikram Tiwari
Miguel I. Aguirre Urreta
Bo van der Rhe
Liana Victorino
Vishnu Vinekar
Daisy Wang
Jocelyn Wang
David (Xueqi) Wei
Shenghan Xu
Shilei Yang
Liangjun (Ben) You
Shu (Vicki) Zhou
2006 Technology in the Classroom Miniconference

The 2006 Technology in the Classroom Miniconference took place on Sunday, November 19th, from 10:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in San Antonio, Texas. The focus of the miniconference was on technological tools available for use in the classroom and on techniques for using various tools for efficiency in the classroom.

The first session included two paper presentations. Jay Heizer (Texas Lutheran University) and Kevin Watson (University of New Orleans) discussed how a large database of algorithmically generated homework and exam problems can be assigned and graded online with little or no instructor interference. The presenters provided an online demonstration of how to create an assignment and how the students would go about completing the assignment. They demonstrated how the assignment would be graded and the grades placed in the grade book automatically. The advantages and disadvantages of giving students multiple attempts for homework and/or quizzes were discussed. The second paper in the first session was presented by James Fugate (Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi). This paper discussed an automated system for grading Excel projects. The system consisted of eight Excel projects and two tests as well as the software (written in Visual Basic for Applications within the framework of Excel.) This software automatically grades the projects and posts grades in a roster. Features have been included which makes it essentially impossible to copy someone else’s work and submit it as your own. The second session included one paper entitled Managing Complex Development Projects: Implications for Organizational Learning.

Melinda Cline of Wesleyan College followed with a presentation on the challenges of offering IS security courses online. Recommendations were suggested based on an analysis of Hands-On Information Security Lab Manual (Whitman, et al., 2006.)

Concurrently, Dr. Randy Bradley of the University of Tennessee presented on the use of multimedia case studies in the classroom and the benefits to students. The focus of the study was on team and dynamic decision-making skills and practical advice was given for the implementation of such an approach.

Dr. Sandra Strasser of Valparaiso University prepared a presentation on the creation of a statistics textbook created by the students using Wiki Technology. The miniconference ended with a presentation by Randall Chapman of Chapman and Associates that provided guidelines and a template for successful distance-learning experiences with large-scale, team-based management simulations. Results from six distance-learning and seven traditional classroom-based executions of an executive education seminar demonstrated the performance and viability of the program.

The sessions were informative and stimulating and many thanks to all the presenters!

2006 Best Case Award Competition

Congratulations to the winners of the 2006 DSI Best Case Award Competition, Carol Prahinski (University of Western Ontario), Eric Olsen (California Polytechnic State University) and Renée Reid (University of Western Ontario) for their case, “Wilkins: A Zurn Company: Materials Requirements Planning.

The honorable mentions in this year’s competition were Bin Jiang and Patrick Murphy of DePaul University for “Should I Stay or Should I Go” and Filip Goeman (Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School) and Ann E. Vereecke (Ghent University) for their case, “Barco Case: Manufacturing Strategy of Printed Circuit Assembly.”

The three finalists were determined by a panel of judges in a blind-review process. Final judging took place at the annual meeting in San Antonio. “The Institute has a long history of encouraging the development and teaching of high quality case studies,” said Janelle Heineke, Boston University, coordinator of this year’s competition. “Each of the three finalist papers exemplified solid, practical research in the decision sciences and a strong emphasis on teaching excellence.”

Authors are encouraged to submit their complete cases and teaching notes for the 2007 Case Studies Competition, coordinated by Kate McKone-Sweet, Babson College (kmckonesweet@babson.edu.) Further information on the Competition can be found in this issue of Decision Line or online at www.decision-sciences.org.
2006 Instructional Innovation Award

Sandra Strasser (Valparaiso University) wins prestigious competition

Sandra Strasser of Valparaiso University won the 2006 Instructional Innovation Award for her teaching innovation titled “Statistics Students Create Their Own Textbook Using Wiki Technology.” The other finalists were Grandon Gill of the University of South Florida for “Teaching with Technology: A Case Based Approach,” and Joanne Tucker of Shippensburg University and Victor J Massad of Shippensburg University for “A Hands-On Approach to Learning Business Processes.”

The competition was conducted in two phases. In the first phase the competition committee received and reviewed applications during two rounds of reviews. When evaluating submissions, the committee focused on the following five criteria for the innovative education award:

1. Content
2. Organization
3. Written presentation
4. Transferability
5. Innovation

All the received submissions were scored based on the above five criteria and three finalists were chosen. During the second phase of selection the three finalists presented summaries of their innovations during a well-attended session of the DSI Annual Meeting in San Antonio. Following these presentations the committee deliberated and chose the winner. The winner and other finalists were recognized at the President’s luncheon.

Our congratulations go to the winner and finalists. The DSI Innovative Education award is a symbolic victory for the classroom as students are the real beneficiaries of these efforts. The Institute has sponsored this award since 1979 in an effort to promote and improve innovation in pedagogy and classroom instruction. A complete listing of winners can be found at http://www.decisionsciences.org/ii_past.htm. Recent winners have published articles outlining their pedagogical approaches in Decision Line and the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education.

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. Winning and finalist abstracts are included below.

WINNER

“Statistics Students Create Their Own Textbook Using Wiki Technology”
Sandra Strasser (Valparaiso University)

In an effort to clarify the content of my course, I substituted the statistics textbook I had been using with a custom text the students produced using wiki technology. Instead of assigning a statistics textbook, I required my students to write a textbook for the class using class notes, supplemental handouts and their own research. The wiki format encouraged collaboration in an uncontrolled and unstructured environment and forced students to use and teach themselves to use a new and powerful technology.

FINALISTS

“Teaching with Technology: A Case Based Approach”
Grandon Gill (University of South Florida)
The innovation being described involves a new, integrative approach for teaching business doctoral students (and other faculty members) how to use technology to enhance the effectiveness of their teaching. The approach has been applied in two separate venues: i) as the core of a semester-long doctoral seminar on teaching with technology, taught principally to business doctoral students, and ii) in the context of a week-long workshop on teaching for faculty participants from many disciplines.

Joanne Tucker and Victor J. Massad (Shippensburg University)

Many education researchers have demonstrated that there is no substitute for direct experience in facilitating learning, particularly in the applied sciences (see, for example, Kays, Kays and Kolb, 2005). This paper highlights a recent curriculum innovation in which groups of business students create and manage their own online retail businesses. The faculty member directs and supervises students as they develop fully-functional business units from idea stage through full implementation.

2006 Instructional Innovation Award Competition Committee

Nadia R. Sanders, Wright State University
Peter Arnold, Boston University
Hope Baker, Kennesaw State University
Karen A. Brown, University of Washington, Bothell
Lori Cook, DePaul University
Jo Ann M. Duffy, Sam Houston State University
Janet L. Hartley, Bowling Green State University
Nancy Lea Hyer, Vanderbilt University
Ronald Klimberg, Saint Joseph's University
David M. Levine, Baruch College-CUNY
Tom Foster, Brigham Young University
Natalie Simpson, University at Buffalo-SUNY
Gregory W. Ulferts, University of Detroit-Mercy
2006 Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition

Michael Naor won the 2006 Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition, jointly sponsored by McGraw-Hill/Irwin and DSI. The award was given at the 2006 Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute in San Antonio, on November 21, 2006. Naor, who is currently on the faculty of George Mason University, received his degree from the University of Minnesota with Roger Schroeder and Kevin Linderman as advisors. He received a $1500 check and a plaque. Three honorable mention prizes were also awarded.

Seventeen (17) submissions were received and entered into a two stage review process. Each dissertation was subject to an initial screening by two reviewers. This round resulted in the selection of 8 dissertations for further reviews. In the second round each of the remaining dissertations was reviewed by 3 reviewers, each of whom reviewed 2 dissertations and voted for the “best” one.

I wish to thank the many reviewers who assisted me in this process and congratulate the winners. In addition, each of the authors that submitted a thesis should be proud because the reviewers were generally very complimentary of the research contained.

WINNER

Michael Naor, George Mason University
The Relationship between Culture, Quality Management Practices, and Manufacturing Performance
Advisors: Roger G. Schroeder and Kevin Linderman, University of Minnesota

HONORABLE MENTIONS

Enno Siemsen, University of Illinois
(Thesis Completed at University of North Carolina)
Essays on Knowledge Sharing
Advisor: Aleda Roth, Clemson University

Yiling Chen, Yahoo! Research
Title: Markets as an Informational Aggregation Mechanism for Decision Support
Advisor: Tracy Mullen & Chao-Hsien Chu, Pennsylvania State University

Adrian Done, IESE Business School, University of Navarra
Title: The Evolving Supply Chain: An Empirical Investigation of the Impact of Knowledge Dimensions in Manufacturing and Service Supply Chains
Advisor: Chris Voss, London Business School & Mark Frohlich, Indiana University - Indianapolis

2006 Best Paper Awards

BEST APPLICATION PAPER
Dividends Policy and Capital Structure: An Empirical Application in the Portuguese Corporate Context
Mário G. Augusto, University of Coimbra
Elísio F. Brandão, University of Oporto
Joao V. Lisboa, University of Coimbra

BEST INTERDISCIPLINARY PAPER
Identifying Securities to Buy: The Heuristic Model
Manuel Tarrazo, University of San Francisco

BEST THEORETICAL/EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PAPER
A Multiple-Class Support Vector Machine, Theory and Model
Minghe Sun, The University of Texas at San Antonio

DECISION SCIENCES JOURNAL BEST PAPER
IS Project Continuation in Escalation Situations: A Real Options Approach
Amit Tiwana, Iowa State University
Mark Keil, Georgia State University
Robert G. Fichman, Boston College

DECISION SCIENCES JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE EDUCATION BEST PAPERS
Virtual and Traditional Feedback-Seeking Behaviors: Underlying Competitive Attitudes and Consequent Grade Performance
Alvin Hwang, Pace University
J.B. Arbaugh, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
Robert G. Fichman, Boston College

Examining Drivers of Course Performance: An Exploratory Examination of an Introductory CIS Applications Course
Rhonda Syler, University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Casey G. Cegielski, Sharon L. Oswald and R. Kelley Rainer, Jr., Auburn University

The Determinants of Students’ Perceived Learning Outcomes and Satisfaction in University Online Education: An Empirical Investigation
Sean B. Eom, Southeast Missouri State University, Nicholas Ashill, School of Marketing and International Business, New Zealand
H. Joseph Wen, Southeast Missouri State University

DSI President Mark Davis and Minghe Sun, winner of the 2006 DSI Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Award
The Professional Development Program was coordinated by Paul Cronan (University of Arkansas) in consultation with the Institute’s Professional Development Program Director Robert E. Markland (University of South Carolina).

Sessions were generally well attended at this year’s Professional Development Program for the Decision Sciences Institute Conference. The sessions were developed to accomplish this year’s program objectives by appealing to the Institute’s members in all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields and introducing new ideas. The content of the mini-conferences, sessions, panels, and workshops were designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities related to professional service, teaching, and research. This year’s program consisted of nine (9) sessions held on the first and third days of the conference:

The use of BI Integrated Planning in the SAP BW Data Warehouse Environment
(Peter Jones) Reviewing the functionality and business use of the new BI Integrated Planning available in the NetWeaver 2004S BW environment. This presentation will go through the process of the set up of BI integrated planning and the use and integration of this with BW functionality. I will be using a business case scenario to demonstrate this functionality. The business case scenario will look at Sales and Financial Planning and the integration between them.

An Introduction to Radio Frequency Identification (RFID): Technology, Data, and Business Value
(Bill C. Hardgrave) This session will (1) explore RFID technology (with hands-on demonstrations) including an in-depth look at its uses and limitations (2) illustrate and analyze the data produced by RFID, and (3) examine how the technology is used to create business value.

Building and Managing a Research Program
(Fred D. Davis and Viswanath Venkatesh) A strong research program in a focused stream of research is one approach to achieving success in academics. The presenters will share their trials and tribulations, lessons learned, tips and tricks, and best practices in crafting and building research.

Program Assessment: Letting the Dog Wag the Tail
(Gail Corbitt and Lorraine R. Gardiner) Program assessment may create a “tail that wags the dog” via measurements that are not congruent with learning goals. The authors share insights gained from goal-aligned evaluation of student work by various stakeholder groups. They describe a web application (STEPS) that enables a sustainable process providing meaningful assessment data.

What Makes for a Successful Submission to DSJ?
(Jeanne Elliott and Vicki Smith-Daniels) This workshop discusses how to prepare your DSJ submission to improve the chances of getting it accepted and how to respond to reviews. Topics include the review process, journal’s editorial mission, managerial relevance, writing style, and targeted areas of opportunity.

Decision Sciences Journal: Is it an OM, IS, or Irrelevant Journal?
(Vicki Smith-Daniels) Increasingly functional journals are being recognized as the very best in academic research. Yet, business executives and functional managers continue to stress the importance of decision making at the interfaces of business functions. This session reviews the impact of DSJ on academic research over the past 36 years, and discusses targeted areas of research for the journal.

Integrated Global Planning Exercises
(Lorraine R. Gardiner, George A. Hachev, and Bernhard Van Dijk) Integrated business planning software offers rich opportunities for virtual team activities. The authors built a planning environment in SAP-BPS based on a Harvard Business School case, supplemented with current data. They describe their experiences over two semesters as well as coursework they have made available through the SAP Educational Alliance.

IBM Academic Initiative and Teradata University Network Opportunities
(David E. Douglas) Cases, examples and exercises related to IBM's Academic Initiative and Teradata University Network. The cases, examples and exercises utilize large datasets and include the topics of creating data warehouse cubes, analysis and data mining as well as other academic possibilities related to IBM and Teradata.

Case-Based Instruction Using Large-Scale, Real Datasets
(Christine Davis, Lorraine R. Gardiner, and James Mensching) Industry partners of the Enterprise Resource Planning/Enterprise Systems program at the Sam M. Walton College of Business (University of Arkansas) have donated multiple, large-scale datasets for instructional use. The authors describe cases and data warehouse infrastructure built using these datasets and their use in a variety of business courses.
Schniederjans and Klein Named DSI Fellows

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

At the 2006 Annual Meeting in San Antonio, Marc J. Schniederjans of University of Nebraska-Lincoln and Gary Klein of University of Colorado at Colorado Springs were named DSI Fellows (see citations below).

Marc J. Schniederjans,
C. Wheaton Battey Distinguished Professor of Business, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. For his many distinguished contributions in research, teaching, and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, particularly his influential work in the theory and practice of operations management, decision support systems, and IT. Professor Schniederjans has authored over 95 research articles in over 50 different academic publications including top-tier journals such as Decision Sciences, Communications of the ACM, and Operations Research. He has also authored or co-authored 15 books. Professor Schniederjans has served as a journal editor and has been active on the editorial review board or advisory board of over 40 journals. He is a leader in offering a variety of web-based courses and his experiences are documented in several empirical studies, one of which was published in the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education. Among his outstanding service contributions for DSI, Dr. Schniederjans has served as Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator, Professional and Faculty Program Coordinator, and has served as Program Chair for the Midwest Region.

Gary Klein,
Cougar Professor of Information Systems, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. For his many notable contributions in research, teaching, and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, particularly his outstanding work on requirements analysis, decision support, forecasting, IS personnel, and technology transfer. He has published 99 articles in premier academic journals as Decision Sciences, MIS Quarterly, Management Science, Communications of the ACM, Naval Logistics Research Quarterly and the Journal of Management Information Systems and has been listed in CAIS as one of the top most productive researchers in IS for the five year period 1999-2003. Professor Klein has taught a wide variety of courses in operations research, management information systems, and statistics over the past twenty five years. He has delivered superior service to the Decision Sciences Institute as the Job Placement Services Coordinator from 1996 to 2001, bringing DSI Placement into the Internet age, in addition to serving with distinction on numerous national and regional committees for DSI.

Michael J. Maggard Receives 2006 Dennis E. Grawoig Distinguished Service Award

Michael J. Maggard, Professor of Information, Operations and Analysis, Northeastern University, College of Business Administration, for his more than 25 years of dedicated service to the Decision Sciences Institute and its membership as At-Large Vice-President and Twice Elected Regional Vice-President of the Board of Directors, as three times elected member of the Executive Committee, as President, Secretary, Program Chair, and Archivist of the Northeast Region Decision Sciences Institute, and as a member of many other committees of the Institute. Professor Maggard has never settled for the status quo, always preferring to take an active role in every position he has held. Over the years, he has been one of the proponents of change for the Institute at all levels. Equally important, he has been willing to act behind the scenes in supporting roles that have sometimes gone unrecognized but nevertheless have always contributed to the overall well-being of the Institute. He has served as a mentor and role model to colleagues and especially to new assistant professors, encouraging them not only to join the Institute but also to actively participate in it. For these contributions to the Institute and more, it is a pleasure to award to Michael J. Maggard, the Distinguished Service Award.
2006 Job Placement Service

The Placement Services at this year’s Annual Meeting in San Antonio were delivered with help from several people. Hal Jacobs from the DSI Home Office helped in creating all the print material including signs, message cards and other lists. Carol Latta, DSI’s Executive Director, coordinated pre-conference planning and provided guidance and support to help things run smoothly. Ghazale Haddadin, a graduate student at Wright State University, helped in manning the placement services and delivering messages. I am also grateful to Andrea Williams and Sandra Storrod from the DSI Home Office, who both continued to provide excellent support for the online placement system throughout the year. A special note of thanks also goes to Vivek Shah, the local arrangements coordinator, for providing the laptops and printer at the site, as well as giving his time at the placement site to relieve us from time to time. Finally, I would like to thank Gerry Campbell for providing excellent guidance to me to ensure I knew all the “trade-secrets.”

We tried to include a few personalized services for the 2006 annual meeting, including the delivery of messages and resumes to individual tables for universities who reserved a table. We will continue to improve on such personalized services in the future, with the hope that more and more universities will reserve tables with us, since it makes answering questions all that much easier. On an informal survey, we also found that universities with reserved tables received at an average of 60% more messages than universities without a reserved table. We hope that these services and numbers will convince more universities to reserve a table.

The three figures shown summarize 2006’s position and applicant counts as of the last date of the annual meeting. Figure 1 shows that there were more position listings than applicant listings, and demonstrates that Supply Chain Management, which was newly added in 2005, was often specified as the primary interest area for both applicants and positions. Figure 2 shows that position counts were steadying up this year from last year, hopefully ending the downward trend seen prior to 2005. Figure 3 shows that applicant listings were up from 2005.

In June 2007 the remains of the current listings will be cleared from the Web site, improvements to the system will be implemented, and then the system will be reopened for the next recruiting cycle. Until then, the current listings may be viewed by visiting the Placement Services Web site at www.decisionsciences.org/placement and following instructions available through links on the site.

Figure 1: DSI Placement Database Counts.

Figure 2: University Position Counts.

Figure 3: Applicant Counts.

DSI Placement Services Coordinator
Arijit Sengupta
Wright State University
Raj Soin College of Business
Information Systems and Operations Management Department
3640 Colonial Glenn Hwy/271 Rike Hall
Dayton, OH 45435
(937) 775-2115 / fax: (937) 775-3533
arijit.sengupta@wright.edu
At this time, I also want to remind everyone of the first DSI sponsored Mini-conference on Service Science, which will take place at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh on May 24-26 of this year. The deadline is February 15 for submitting refereed papers and March 15 for submitting abstracts and workshops, panels, etc. As part of this miniconference there will be two best paper awards that are sponsored by IBM and Bentley College. There will also be several scholarships (also sponsored by IBM and Bentley College) available for graduate students to attend this miniconference. For more information, see the link to the conference home page at http://atc3.bentley.edu/site/dsiminiconference/. The link for submitting a paper, abstract or panel/workshop, etc. is http://ss.byu.edu/dsimini/. If you have any questions on the miniconference or want more information, please do not hesitate to contact me at mdavis@bentley.edu.

As academics, we have the luxury at the end of each calendar year (after we have graded exams and submitted course grades, and before the spring semester begins) to take a couple of weeks to catch our breath and reflect back on what has transpired over the previous year. In terms of professional activities, this past year could have included a new job (which may have required moving to a new location or receiving tenure at your current institution) or having an article (or two) accepted for publication. From a personal perspective this past year could have included marriage (yours or your son’s or daughter’s), or the birth of a child or perhaps even the birth of a grandchild.

Change is Good

As I have stated previously, change is good and whether we like it or not, it is occurring every day, especially within our profession. There is change in the content of what we teach as well as how we teach it. Change is all around us. Business is changing at an ever faster rate, and it is incumbent upon us as academic professionals to embrace these changes rather than to try and resist them. To ignore change is to live in the past, presenting old, outdated material in what we teach, and using old technology (if you want to call it that) in how we teach. In fact, change is the only thing we can truly be sure of today. It is the only constant in our lives.

Change is also good for professional organizations like the Decision Sciences Institute. In the past year, we have witnessed several changes within DSI, all of which I believe are for the good. These include (a) the formation of the Indian Subcontinent Region of DSI, which is another step in our goal to become a truly global organization, (b) the first DSI-sponsored miniconference, and, on a more pragmatic level (c) a new home page for the Institute and for the annual conference, both of which were designed with you, the end user in mind.

As an organization, DSI will hopefully continue to evolve into a newer and better organization that better meets the ever changing needs of its membership. But we can’t do it without you, the members of DSI, providing us with input and feedback. Otherwise we are just guessing at what changes we need to make.

So I would like to encourage each of you to take a more active part in helping us shape the future of DSI. Let us know what we can do to provide more value for you. I look forward to hearing from you.

MARKETPLACE

SUNY PLATTSBURGH
School of Business Management and International Development
Assistant/Associate Professor

The Management and International Business Department of the State University of New York College at Plattsburgh invites applications for a tenure-track full-time position to start Fall 07.

Responsibilities: Teach, research, and provide leadership in Management Information Systems. S/he will be responsible for teaching our Business Applications and Information Technology core course and will help us develop our strengths in Management Information Systems and Supply Chain Management. Teaching load is six courses per year.

Qualifications: The candidate will hold a Ph.D. in Management Information Systems or closely related field or be ABD with a Ph.D. expected within the first year. The successful candidate will have a well developed or emerging research agenda that explores information systems issues. Applications from candidates from AACSB accredited schools are encouraged.

SUNY Plattsburgh is an equal opportunity employer committed to excellence through diversity. Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the position is filled. Candidates to whom offers are made will be required to verify their academic credentials by providing original transcripts prior to the start of employment.

Please submit a current resume and three letters of reference to:
Chair, Search Committee (PJ# 4773-310)
c/o Human Resource Services
SUNY Plattsburgh
101 Broad Street
Plattsburgh, NY 12901-2681
Fax: (518) 564-5060
hr.apply@plattsburgh.edu
http://www.plattsburgh.edu
Find the right book for your course at SAGE Publications!

www.sagepub.com/kock  www.sagepub.com/iveyCasebooks  www.sagepub.com/grover

www.sagepub.com/iveyCasebooks  www.sagepub.com/mentzer  www.sagepub.com/gundry

Not finding what you need? View our entire collection at www.sagepub.com

SAGE Publications
this should not be standard practice, it may be necessary when budgets are cut or are not sufficient. One side benefit of this limited usage is a more positive perception politically by administrators outside the college.

Budget the fee expenditures each year to ensure that funds are being used in meeting needs consistent with the college’s strategic plan. In our case, the additional fee revenue is equivalent to the funds we would receive from a $10 million endowment. New monies of that magnitude do not come around that often, so both good stewardship and maximizing the input are two key factors to be considered with each expenditure.

Don’t expect all faculty to be pleased with you and this new revenue stream because they will probably not perceive they are receiving equal benefits from the fee. Be wary of the “Chinese Wall Model” discussed by Louisville Dean Charlie Moyers in a 2004 issue of Decision Line, in which faculty expect the dean to raise new monies, toss them over the wall to them so they can use at their discretion, and then go out and obtain more funds.

Some days, I do worry about an “exit strategy” in case the differential fee is eliminated by the university or our Regents Board, but I’m hoping that will be the next dean’s concern and not mine!

Feature Editor Krishna S. Dhir invites papers, essays or notes for the Deans’ Perspective feature column from administrators, faculty members, and students. This column is a forum for dialog among our readers on issues pertaining to academic leadership. Perhaps you have some thoughts on issues that influence deans or are influence by them. Discussions of any and all aspects of the various leadership issues confronting business schools are welcome. Please contact Dean Dhir at kdhir@campbell.berry.edu, or call him at (706) 346-5066, or send him a fax at (706) 802-6728. Articles should be of about 2500-word length.

### The Global Conference of the Global Institute for Flexible Systems Management and Technology

which will be held in the U.S. in June 2008, seeks volunteers to form an International Advisory Committee, and Conference and Program Committees including Track Chairs. The theme of this conference is “Flexible Enterprise for Global Business.” If interested, please contact Co-chair Jatinder N. D. (Jeet) Gupta, Eminent Scholar and Professor of MIS, College of Administrative Science, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, 301 Sparkman Drive, Huntsville, AL 35899, Phone: 256-824-6593 (office), fax: 256-824-6328. e-mail guptaj@uah.edu.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Annual Meetings</th>
<th>November 19-22, 2011</th>
<th>Southeast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 17-20, 2007</td>
<td>Boston Marriott Copley Place Hotel</td>
<td>February 21-23, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Marriott Desert Ridge</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>Marriott Savannah Riverfront Hotel, Savannah, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort &amp; Spa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22-25, 2008</td>
<td>Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel and Courtyard by Marriott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21-24, 2009</td>
<td>Hyatt Regency New Orleans at the Superdome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20-23, 2010</td>
<td>San Diego Marriott Hotel and Marina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Annual Meetings</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 19-22, 2011</td>
<td>tba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 12-14, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Garden Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 28-30, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Harbor Place Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publications

UCFV Research Review seeks papers for a special issue on Ethical Citizenship and Post-Secondary Education (2:3), to be published in October, 2007. Submissions from a variety of disciplinary perspectives are invited from undergraduate and graduate students, and college and university educators. Submissions are due April 15, 2007. Contact: editor-stj@ucfv.ca.
http://journals.ucfv.ca/ojs/rr/RR-info/cfp-4.html

Management Science Journal seeks papers for a special issue on “Interfaces of Operations and Finance.” Submitted papers should feature original research contributions, display the rigor emphasized in the editorial statement of Management Science, clearly articulate their managerial relevance, and obey the journal’s author guidelines. Guest editors are John Birge, University of Chicago, Graduate School of Business, jbirge@chicagogsb.edu; Panos Kouvelis, Washington University in St. Louis, Olin School of Business, kouvelis@wustl.edu; and Duane Seppi, Carnegie Mellon University, Tepper School of Business, ds64@andrew.cmu.edu. Submission deadline is July 31, 2007. http://cits.tamu.edu/ieeepc/

Production and Operations Management seeks papers for a special issue on Operations Management in Business to Business Markets: Practice and Research. Guest Editors are Wedad J. Elmaghraby, University of Maryland, welmaghr@rhsmith.umd.edu; and Christopher S. Tang, University of California, Los Angeles, chris.tang@anderson.ucla.edu. Deadline for submissions is December 31, 2007. http://www.poms.org/Journal.html

Management Research News seeks papers for a special issue on “Strategy in Emerging Markets.” Guest Editor: Prof Rajesh K Pillania, Management Development Institute, India. Deadline for submission of papers is June 1, 2007. Contact Rajesh K Pillania, Management Development Institute, Mehrauri Road, Sukhrali, Gurgaon - 122001.India, r_pillania@yahoo.com.

that contribute to advancing the Service Science field. All submissions should have a clear services focus and be transdisciplinary in nature; that is, they should involve more than a single traditional discipline.

Authors will have a choice of submitting either a research paper that will undergo a blind review by at least two referees, a non-refereed research abstract of 300 words maximum, or a session proposal. All submissions will be submitted electronically following the detailed instructions provided below.

All refereed research papers that are accepted will be published in the Conference Proceedings. In addition, all accepted refereed papers will be further reviewed for inclusion in a Special Topics Forum on Service Science, which will form part of an issue of the Decision Sciences Journal. Research papers not accepted as such will automatically be accepted as a research abstract.

The submission of a research paper or research abstract means that the authors certify that the research is not copyrighted, it has not been accepted for publication in a journal, it has not been presented or accepted for presentation at another professional meeting, and it is not currently under review for presentation at another professional meeting. Further, authors certify their intent to register for and attend this meeting to present the paper, abstract, or proposal. The copyrights for all forms of presentation at this meeting will remain with the authors.

**Submission Deadlines**

The submission deadline for refereed research papers is **February 15, 2007**. The submission deadline for non-refereed research abstracts and proposals is **March 15, 2007**.

**Best Paper Awards**

There will be **two best paper awards of $750.00 each**. These awards are being sponsored by IBM and Bentley College.

**Hotel Information**

(Forthcoming)

**Instructions for Electronic Submissions**

(Forthcoming)

**Contacts**

For further information or questions regarding this conference please go to the conference website at

http://atc3.bentley.edu/site/dsiminiconference/

or contact any of the following individuals:

**General Conference Chair:**

Mark M. Davis, Professor of Operations Management  
312 AAC  
Bentley College  
Waltham, MA 02452  
Email: mdavis@bentley.edu  
TEL: 1-781-891-2739

**Program Co-Chairs:**

Tor Andreassen, Associate Professor of Marketing  
BI Norwegian School of Management  
Room # C4-078  
Nydalsveien 37

PoBox 20  
N-0442 Oslo, NORWAY  
Email: tor.w.andreassen@bi.no  
TEL: 47 46410525

Birgit Mager, Professor for Service Design  
UBierring 40, Room 320  
Köln International School of Design 50678 Cologne  
50678 Cologne  
GERMANY  
Email: mager@service-design.de  
TEL: 49(0)221 8275-3220

Larry Menor, Associate Professor of Operations Management  
Richard Ivey School of Business  
The University of Western Ontario  
1151 Richmond Street North  
London, Ontario N6A 3K7  
CANADA  
Email: lmenor@ivey.uwo.ca  
TEL: 1-519-661-2103

Peter Mills, Gerald B. Bashaw Professor of Business  
Department of Management, Lundquist College of Business  
1208 University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR, USA 97403-1208  
Email: pmills@lcmbmail.uoregon.edu  
TEL: 1-541-346-2691

**Conference Proceedings Editor:**

Mellie Pullman, Willamette Industries Professor of Supply Chain  
P.O. Box 751  
School of Business Administration  
Portland State University  
Portland, OR 97207  
Email: mpullman@pdx.edu  
TEL: 1-503-725-4768
2006 Independent Auditors’ Report

To the Members of the Decision Sciences Institute, Inc.

I have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. (the “Institute”) as of June 30, 2006 and 2005, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Institute’s management. My responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on my audits.

I conducted my audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that I plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. I believe that my audits provide a reasonable basis for my opinion.

In my opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. at June 30, 2006 and 2005, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

My audit was made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The combining schedules included in Schedules 1 and 2 are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements. The combining information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements and, in my opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

---

2006 Treasurer’s Report

by Janelle Heineke, Boston University School of Management

It is the policy of the Institute to publish the annual auditor’s report containing the financial statements and schedules in Decision Line. Within this issue, you will find the independent auditor’s report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, compiled by James Dykhouse, CPA. In addition to the auditor’s report, since 1994 a brief report from the Institute’s Treasurer has been published to explain the outcome for the year, compare it to the previous year, and to point out any unique circumstances.

To summarize, comparing Fiscal Year 2005 to 2006, the Institute’s total revenue decreased by $65,489 (from $839,442 in 2005 to $773,953 in 2006), and the Institute’s total expenses increased by $17,653 (from $748,098 in 2005 to $765,751 in 2006). The decreased revenue in fiscal year 2006 was largely attribut-

---

### STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION

**June 30, 2006 and 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$144,850</td>
<td>171,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>412,591</td>
<td>397,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, less allowance for doubtful accounts of $955 in 2006 and $1,090 in 2005</td>
<td>20,942</td>
<td>20,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>2,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred charges</td>
<td>16,146</td>
<td>16,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>597,969</td>
<td>609,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment, less accumulated depreciation of $120,971 in 2006 and $114,727 in 2005</strong></td>
<td>9,969</td>
<td>16,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>607,938</td>
<td>625,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities and Net Assets | | |
| Accounts payable | $ 25,284 | 54,405 |
| Accrued vacation expense | 23,354 | 23,354 |
| Accrued retirement benefits | 10,568 | 18,448 |
| Deferred revenue: | | |
| Convention deposits | 4,445 | 6,490 |
| Membership dues | 101,475 | 88,516 |
| **Total current liabilities** | 165,126 | 191,213 |
| **Net assets - unrestricted** | 442,812 | 434,610 |
| **Total Assets** | 607,938 | 625,823 |

See accompanying notes to financial statements.
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

June 30, 2006 and 2005

(1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

(a) Nature of Business

Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. (the “Institute”), founded in 1969, is a not-for-profit professional organization consisting principally of researchers, managers, educators, and students interested in decision-making techniques and processes in private and public organizations.

(b) Principles of Combination

The financial statements include the combined operations of the Institute and six regional organizations. For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2006, and 2005, the accounting transactions of the regions were handled through Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. All material interregion balances and transactions have been eliminated.

(c) Basis of Accounting

Assets and liabilities and revenue and expenses are recognized on the accrual basis of accounting.

(d) Basis of Presentation

The Institute’s net assets and revenues, expenses, gains, and losses are classified based on the existence or absence of donor-imposed restrictions. Accordingly, net assets of the Institute and changes therein are classified and reported as follows:

Unrestricted net assets: Net assets that are not subject to donor-imposed stipulations.

Temporarily restricted net assets: Net assets subject to donor-imposed stipulations that may or will be met either by actions of the Institute and/or the passage of time.

Permanently restricted net assets: Net assets subject to donor-imposed stipulations that be maintained permanently by the Institute. Generally, the donors of these assets permit the Institute to use all or part of the income earned on related investments for general or specific purposes.

As of June 30, 2006, and 2005, all net assets of the Institute are unrestricted.

(e) Cash Equivalents

Cash equivalents consist primarily of short-term cash investments and certificates of deposit with maturities of 90 days or less. For purposes of the statement of cash flows, the Institute considers all short-term, interest-bearing deposits with maturities of three months or less to be cash equivalents.

See NOTES on page 46
# SCHEDULE 1: COMBINING SCHEDULE OF REVENUE, EXPENSES, AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS INFORMATION

**Year ended June 30, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Northeast DSI</th>
<th>Southeast DSI</th>
<th>Midwest DSI</th>
<th>Southwest DSI</th>
<th>Western DSI</th>
<th>Asia DSI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$204,630</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>327,544</td>
<td>24,795</td>
<td>24,645</td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>77,240</td>
<td>474,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>52,466</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>52,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>8,965</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>9,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and interest income</td>
<td>11,256</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>(138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized and unrealized losses on investments</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed support from affiliate</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$79,278</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>773,953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>261,884</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>215,988</td>
<td>34,301</td>
<td>23,095</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>58,985</td>
<td>349,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>88,639</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>56,373</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>56,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$622,884</td>
<td>35,085</td>
<td>23,879</td>
<td>16,183</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>64,473</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in net assets</strong></td>
<td>(5,829)</td>
<td>(7,927)</td>
<td>6,074</td>
<td>(610)</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>14,805</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>222,550</td>
<td>58,260</td>
<td>47,839</td>
<td>25,587</td>
<td>38,256</td>
<td>46,212</td>
<td>(4,094)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$216,721</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>53,913</td>
<td>24,977</td>
<td>39,544</td>
<td>61,017</td>
<td>(3,693)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Home Office net assets differ from the Internal Financial Statements by the amount of accrued vacation expense, $23,354, and accrued retirement benefits of $10,568, for a total of $33,922. In addition, Board of Director Meeting expense, President’s Fund and Executive Director’s Fund have been reclassified from Member Services (as displayed in the Internal Financial Statements) to Supportive Services (Audit Report).

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.

---

# SCHEDULE 2: COMBINING SCHEDULE OF REVENUE, EXPENSES, AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS INFORMATION

**Year ended June 30, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Northeast DSI</th>
<th>Southeast DSI</th>
<th>Midwest DSI</th>
<th>Southwest DSI</th>
<th>Western DSI</th>
<th>Asia DSI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$210,624</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>210,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>391,907</td>
<td>31,075</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>15,090</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>41,505</td>
<td>510,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>55,800</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>58,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>14,514</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>46,489</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>46,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$627,583</td>
<td>35,085</td>
<td>28,746</td>
<td>16,579</td>
<td>8,317</td>
<td>47,598</td>
<td>(93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>265,923</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>228,520</td>
<td>21,774</td>
<td>23,399</td>
<td>10,605</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>47,805</td>
<td>336,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>86,651</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>46,489</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>46,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$75,627</td>
<td>12,566</td>
<td>3,932</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>(8,173)</td>
<td>(922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in net assets</strong></td>
<td>75,627</td>
<td>22,519</td>
<td>24,814</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>5,206</td>
<td>55,771</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>146,923</td>
<td>45,694</td>
<td>43,907</td>
<td>20,384</td>
<td>35,145</td>
<td>54,385</td>
<td>(3,172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$222,550</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>58,260</td>
<td>47,839</td>
<td>25,587</td>
<td>38,256</td>
<td>(4,094)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Home Office net assets differ from the Internal Financial Statements by the amount of accrued vacation expense, $23,354, and accrued retirement benefits of $18,448, for a total of $41,802.

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
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able to $36,083 less in registration fees received at the 2005 annual meeting in San Francisco than in the 2004 Boston meeting and to $13,020 less in gains on investments.

The increase in expenses in fiscal 2005 is primarily due to $12,948 in increased conference expenses and to a $9,884 increase in management and general-supportive services expense. Total revenue in fiscal year 2006 was $8,202 greater than total expenses, compared with a $91,344 surplus for the prior year. This increased the Institute's net assets to $442,812 in fiscal 2006 from $434,610 in 2005.

If you have any suggestions to offer regarding the financial management of the Institute, please contact me at: jheineke@bu.edu.
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 (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, College of Charleston
Beranek, William, University of Georgia
Berry, William L., The Ohio State University
Benini, Charles P., Stanford University
Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia State University
Bufa, Eldwood S. (deceased), University of California-Los Angeles
Cangul, Vincent (deceased), University of Southwestern Louisiana
Carver, Phillip L., Arizona State University
Chase, Richard B., University of Southern California
Chervany, Norman L., University of Minnesota
Clapper, Aladdin Tem-Rite
Collins, Rodney D., Drexel University
Couger, J. Daniel (deceased), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummings, Larry L. (deceased), University of Minnesota
Darden, William R. (deceased), University of Michigan
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., Indiana University
Franz, Lorri S., University of Missouri-Columbia
Glover, Fred W., University of Colorado at Boulder
Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State University
Grawoig, 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 in Huntsville
Hahn, Chan K., Bowling Green State University
Hammer, W. Clay, Duke University
Hanyya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State University
Hershamber, James C., Arizona State University
Horowitz, Ira, University of Florida
Houck, Ernest C. (deceased), Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Huber, George P., University of Texas-Austin
Jacobs, F. Robert, Indiana University
Kendall, Kenneth E., Rutgers University
Keown, Arthur J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Khumawala, Basheer M., University of Houston
Kim, Koo Young, Yonsei University
King, William R., University of Pittsburgh
Klein, Gary, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
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, Naresh 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
Olsen, David L., Texas A&M University
Perkins, William C., Indiana University
Peters, William S., University of New Mexico
Philippatos, George C., University of Tennessee-Knoxville
Raiffa, Howard, Harvard University
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Reinmuth, James R., University of Oregon
Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College
Roth, Aleda V., Clemson University
Sakade, Lawrence L., University of Texas at Arlington
Schniederjans, Marc J., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Schriber, Thomas J., University of Michigan
Schroeder, Roger C., University of Minnesota
Simone, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology
Stoelma, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist University
Sobol, Marion G., Southern Methodist University
Sorensen, James E., University of Denver
Sprague, Linda C., China Europe International Business School
Steinberg, Earl, Teuche Ross & Company, Houston, TX
Summers, George W. (deceased), University of Arizona
Taylor, Bernard W., III, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Trout, Marvin D., Kent State University
UBI, Kenneth P. (deceased), University of Illinois
Vazsonyi, Andras, University of San Francisco
Voss, Christopher A., London Business School
Wasserman, William, Syracuse University
Weisbrod, Urban, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Wheeleight, Steven C., Harvard University
Whitten, Betty J., University of Georgia
Whybark, D. Clay, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wickland, Gary A., Captive Research
Winkler, Robert L., Duke University
Wooldrey, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines
Wortman, Max S., Jr. (deceased), Iowa State University
Zmud, Robert W., Florida State University

Decision Line, January 2007

47
**MARCH 2007**

**March 13**  
The Southwest Region will hold its 2007 (28th) Annual Meeting on March 13-17, 2007, in San Diego, California. Contact Program Chair Bonnie F. Daily, Management Department, College of Business, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001, bdaily@nmsu.edu, 505.646.2015, Fax 505-646-1372. http://www.swdsi.org

**March 28**  

**March 30**  
Submission deadline for the 9th Decision Sciences Institute International Meeting, in conjunction with the 12th Annual Meeting of the Asia Pacific Region, to be held July 11-15, 2007, in Bangkok, Thailand. For more information, see http://www.interdsi2007.org.

**APRIL 2007**

**April 3**  
DSI Western Region will hold its 2007 (36th) Annual Meeting April 3-7, 2007, at the Inverness Hotel and Conference Centre in Denver, Colorado. Contact: Program Chair G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada Las Vegas, 702-895-1762, WDSI2007@unlv.edu. http://www.wdsinet.org

**April 12**  
The Midwest Region will hold its 2007 Annual Meeting April 12-14, 2007, at the Hilton Garden Inn (www.hiltongardenchicago.com) in Chicago, Illinois. Contact Program Chair Charles Petersen, Operations Management and Information Systems Department, College of Business, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, IL 60115, cpetersen@niu.edu. http://www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

**JUNE 2007**

**June 31**  
Submission deadline for papers to Decision Sciences Journal’s Special Topic Forum on “New Directions for Supply Chain Design. Associate Editor Team: Kyle D. Cattani and Vincent A. Mabert, Indiana University.

**NOVEMBER 2007**

**November 17**  
38th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute will be held in Phoenix, Arizona. Refereed papers are due April 1, 2007; abstracts and proposals are due May 1, 2007. Contact Program Chair Janelle Henrieke, Boston University, School of Management, 595 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, (617) 353-2919, fax: (617) 353-4098, dsi2007@bu.edu.

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