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FROM THE EDITOR

KRISHNA S. DHIR, Editor, Berry College

It is an honor to be following Keong Leong as the editor of Decision Line. I have thoroughly enjoyed being a part of his editorial team. Through his vision and that of his predecessors listed here, Decision Line has become an effective voice of the Institute and the glue that binds the Institute together as an organic whole. Following in their footsteps, I hope that through this publication we will continue to collectively explore the emerging and prevailing trends shaping the education of business administration and the practice of decision sciences.

Past Editors of Decision Line

William R. Cornette, Southwest Missouri State University, 1975-1976
William R. Darden, Louisiana State University, 1976-1978
V. Thomas Dock, University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire, 1979-1981
Bernard W. Taylor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1982-1987
K Roscoe Davis, University of Georgia, 1988-1993
Terry R. Rakes, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1994-1996
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University, 1997-2002
G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada - Las Vegas, 2002-2007

An Invitation

I invite you to use Decision Line to channel your insights, opinions, philosophies, and conjectures regarding issues that interest you. Please send your essays of up to 2,500-word length to the respective feature editors, or me at kdhir@berry.edu, or Managing Editor Hal Jacobs at hjacobs@gsu.edu, at any time.

The Editorial Team

Decision Line offers a number of feature columns manned by an outstanding team of feature editors. John Davies of Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, is joining the editorial team as the editor of the International Issues column. Miles G. Nicholls of RMIT University, Australia, has agreed to oversee the Research Issues column. Daniel A. Samson of the University of Melbourne, Australia, will cover the Production/Operations Management feature column. Vijayan Sugumaran of Oakland University is the new feature editor of the Information Technology column. Xenophon Koufteros of Texas A&M University has agreed to become the new feature editor of the Doctoral Student Issues column starting in March. At that time, Bih-Ru Lea of the newly renamed Missouri University of Science and Technology (erstwhile University of Missouri – Rolla) will become the new feature editor for the In The Classroom column.

I am grateful to Manoj Malhotra of the University of South Carolina and Rick Hesse of Pepperdine University for their generous assistance with transitions in Doctoral Student Issues and In The Classroom columns, respectively. Xenophon Koufteros of Texas A&M University has agreed to become the new feature editor of the Doctoral Student Issues column starting in March. DSI Membership Roundtable Feature Editor Gary Hackbarth of Northern Kentucky University, From The Bookshelf Feature Editor Peter Ittig, Ecommerce Feature Editor Kenneth Kendall of Rutgers University, and yours truly with the Deans’ Perspective will continue in their respective features.

It is our good fortune that Managing Editor Hal Jacobs, with his extensive experience with Decision Line, continues to serve on the editorial team. We enjoy the unstinted assistance of the

See EDITOR, page 18
As a new feature editor for this column, I assure you that we will “cast the net” very widely to cover a diverse set of research issues. I have undertaken to write the first article on a topic rarely discussed at DSI annual meetings. I’m constantly surprised by the fact that even though we academics are connected with colleagues around the world both electronically and through conferences, we know little about how research is funded and managed in countries other than our own. I hope to have research managers from around the world, including the U.S., tell us all a little about their research-funding mechanisms and how they manage the task of encouraging research from their academic colleagues. As always, feature editors appreciate unsolicited submissions, so if you have something you’d like to share regarding research issues, please let me know.

[Miles Nicholls, Feature Editor]

Managing Research in Australia—Challenging at the Best of Times

by Miles G. Nicholls, Director of Research, Graduate School of Business, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

Managing research in an academic faculty is a difficult task at the best of times. This is made even more so by federal or state governments changing their research funding schemes as well as the type of research they would like to see undertaken (e.g., less theoretical and more industry and business related as in the case of Australia for business schools).

To effectively deal with the complexities of managing research, Australian schools of business often establish an office of associate dean (research) or director of research. While handling change is all in a day’s work for these offices, the added complexity for Australian research managers facing their foreshadowed research funding system is that the proposed scheme is the antithesis of the existing one. The key funding drivers for the immediate past primary research funding system, the ‘Institutional Grants Scheme’ (IGS), were the quantity of publications (irrespective of quality) (10 percent of the funding) together with research income (60 percent of the funding), and higher degree completions (30 percent). This ‘quantum’ system has been in place for many years and changing academics’ research behavior from producing as many journal articles, book chapters, and conference papers they can irrespective of the quality (and being rewarded accordingly) to producing fewer of much higher quality, is a daunting task. To make the task even more difficult, the government that proposed the new scheme has been defeated at the 2007 Australian Federal election, and the incoming government has indicated that it will not implement their foreshadowed research funding scheme. Adding to the complexity, the incoming government has made only vague references to what they intend to replace it with (other than it will be quality assessment)!

It should be noted that while the ‘quantum’ funding system of the past was not concerned with the quality of...
research per se, many researchers and universities were and strived to achieve excellence. However, the name of the funding game was clearly quantity at all costs.

The Quantum Era

In order to understand the magnitude of what is about to potentially happen in Australia’s universities, let’s go back several steps and look at what was necessary to encourage research output under the old ‘quantum’ research funding scheme (which will be phased out in 2008-2009). I should point out that I am only speaking from experience with a business school environment. Other disciplines may have had their own unique problems. In my previous position as director of research (later deputy head research) in a state university in Victoria, my role was to encourage substantial increases in research publications, higher degree completions, and the generation of research income which, of course, required an increase in participation as well as per capita productivity per se. To do this the senior management team of the business school employed some unique carrots and unusual sticks. This business school was in one of the new universities, that is, a former institute of technology which was created a university by an Act of Parliament in 1992 (similar to the conversion of polytechnics in the U.K.). The prevailing approach adopted by many academic staff around this time was to undertake large amounts of private consulting in conjunction with their main university activity (sometimes sole activity), teaching. Tough times ahead for all!

Changing the research culture through changing the research attitudes of academic staff (that is, members of the faculty) was achieved through two main “tools.” A Work Allocation Model (WAM) which was devised to provide academic staff an allocation of research time depending on how much they produced (i.e., a posteriori allocation). Additionally, funding for travel to conferences of interest was also used and this increased with output. There was also the provision of an annual research prize ($5,000) which capped it all off. These were essentially the ‘carrots.’

The ‘sticks’ consisted of having to meet an annual requirement of producing at least one ‘acceptable’ publication each year, for which a block allowance of 250 hours was made available in the WAM each year. Failure to meet this requirement would mean that staff would have an increase in workload the next year of 250 hours, that is, they had to pay back the time. This and the fact that less research inevitably led to more teaching (seen as a ‘punishment’ by many) spurred on the research. The university and the school had a very short time frame in which to ramp up research output, as the funding was essentially from a finite pool and other universities were also competing very fiercely (a zero sum game). This approach to research encouragement was really management-led rather than a result of leadership or collegially determined change—a time-frame imperative. Quality through this era, (say, 1998-2003) was very much on the back-burner for this school.

The results of this approach were excellent . . . well, mostly! Per capita research publications increased from 0.2 to 1.6, research participation went from 22 percent of all academic staff to 90 percent, and research income per capita rose 300 percent. Research funding (from the IGS) rose accordingly and this contributed significantly to the financial security of the school. Some unexpected and unwanted behavior occurred as a result of the implementation of the policies; namely, an excessive level of competitiveness, sometimes a mistrust of figures and data, and an expectation that international travel was a ‘right’ for performance. However, under the circumstances, overall a fair result.

The Quality Era

With the previous federal government’s new research funding scheme, the Research Quality Framework (RQF, which was very similar to the U.K.’s Research Assessment Exercise) having been foreshadowed for several years, universities have been re-inventing their research strategies yet again. Even with the change of government in 2007, a quality assessment scheme of some form for research funding is inevitable. Now increases in quality and participation are required. Thus having nurtured a culture of “more is better,” the new mantra becomes “quality not quantity—and make it high impact research while you’re at it.” The task before many universities is a huge one with new strategies required for increasing quality in research. While a few of the strategies that were implemented in the quest for increased quantity can form the basis for new strategies in the quest for quality, they cannot be implemented in the same way, that is, by decree. There is a need for a ‘democratization’ of the quality enhancement process (for more details here, see Cargill & Nicholls, 2007). WAMs cannot simply mechanically increase research allowances for academics since quality is the criteria for success now, not quantity. Hence a measure of quality together with a system for ‘negotiating’ with staff appropriate research allowances is required. The democratization of research encouragement does not mean abdication by school management, rather more leadership and, strangely, this concept does not sit well with some academic managers. This transition period between quantity and quality has coincided with my new position as director of research in the newly formed Graduate School of Business at RMIT University.

While the Graduate School was new, it was formed mainly with academic staff from other schools within the business faculty. Consequently, there was an entrenched ‘quantum’ ethos present. As Cargill and Nicholls (2007) point out, the quality enhancement issue requires a great deal of concurrence and internalized motivation from academic staff to effect the quality transition. Superficial compliance and token output is not acceptable. Unless change is seen as being led by the people of the organization affected, rather than
being managed by managers, the organization will reach a “stuck point” (Sturdy & Grey, 2003). A higher degree of collaboration with academics is called for—but not a total hands-off style or a complete democracy. Effectively, this translates to “academic staff need to be worked with rather than worked on.”

The need for ownership by academic staff and a greater participation stems from the type of strategies that need to be adopted to achieve this quality increase (Sturdy & Grey, 2003; Tsoukas & Chia, 2003; Burnes, 2004). Quality cannot be commanded and quality goals must be made clear and management must create the ‘template’ by clarifying available resources and unmovable constraints. Mechanisms for open, transparent and actionable discussion must also be available and their use encouraged in the development of the strategies for this change. Strangely enough, academic groups may creatively devise schemes within their own midst to get better quality outcomes in short time frames. An example might be uneven distribution of resources such as time allowances and funds to allow certain colleagues with the greatest potential to chase quality on their collective behalf. School management would have little success in decreeing such a strategy without some degree of hostility and resentment. It is also important to continue (in a modified way) much of the support provided by the strategies adopted for enhancement of research output (such as workload model research allocations).

Within the three years of existence of the Graduate School, many of these aspects discussed above have been introduced (to varying degrees) and the results to date are very encouraging, although there is clearly a long way to go. Not surprisingly, I have found that there is one legacy that is proving really hard to eradicate, that of the constant fall back by academic staff to the idea that “more is better.” It would seem that we as research managers taught them their first lessons too well and changing research management strategies turns out to be quite a challenge!

Postscript

There are some anecdotal indications from various funding authorities that the quality measurement style of funding research is being looked at in the U.S. as well. I hope that this article has some value for U.S. associate deans (research).
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Class Photo Album Using Office 2007

by Maurie Lockley, University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Making personal contact with students, especially in large classes, is extremely important as a teacher. Students feel validated when instructors know and use their names. They may even attend more regularly when not anonymous. They may believe that if the teacher knows my name, the teacher will notice if I am not in class. As instructors we face the challenge of personally connecting with our students to improve their learning experience. Fortunately, instructors can make these connections more personal using some of the latest technology.

Photo Ops
At the University of North Carolina, Greensboro (UNCG), the number of students enrolled in each section of some classes has increased many-fold over the last few years. As the number of students increase, some instructors experience a decrease in the ability to connect student names and faces. Luckily, technology exists that helps augment instructor memories. Most faculty members probably have the necessary tools—PowerPoint 2007, Word, or Excel and a digital camera. The following instructions help facilitate connecting with your students more easily.

Step One—Print the Class Roll
A. Obtain an electronic copy of your class roster. Course delivery software like Blackboard or the registration support software will provide a list of student names in a soft copy.
B. Open the list of names in Word or Excel.
C. Change the paper orientation to Landscape.
D. Increase the font size to 72.
E. Decrease all the margins to the narrowest setting your printer will support (generally about ¼” to ½”).
F. Print the large-font roster.

Step Two—Take Pictures
A. Take the large print roster, a pair of scissors, and a digital camera with you to class.
B. Pass the scissors and the roster around the room. Direct students to find their name and cut it out of the roster.
C. Ask each student to hold their name under their chin.
D. Pass the camera around the room. Each student takes a picture of the one seated next to them.

Step Three—Download the Pictures to Your Computer
A. Create a folder named with the semester, course number, and section number.
B. Follow the camera manufacturer’s instructions, download the pictures, and place in the newly created folder.

Step Four—Create a Photo Album
A. Launch PowerPoint 2007. Sorry, earlier versions do not work this slickly. Instructions for PowerPoint 2003 and predecessor versions are at the end of the article.
B. Click the Insert tab.
C. Click the Photo Album tool in the Illustrations group.

IN THE CLASSROOM

Maurie Lockley
earned a MA in economics from the University of North Carolina, Greensboro in 1994. She teaches classes in desktop software and business processes in the Information Systems and Operation Management Department. Following many years of technically editing desktop software texts, she wrote, Exploring Access 2007 (Prentice Hall, 2008). In her free time she reads, sings, baby sits grandsons, plays bridge and travels.
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D. Select and click New Photo Album.

E. Click the File/Disk button in the Photo Album wizard.

F. Browse to and open the folder containing the photos of the students.

G. Click the first photo in the section.

H. Press and hold the Shift key.

I. Scroll to the last photo in the folder and click it. (All the pictures should select.)

J. Click the Insert button.

K. In the Album Layout section click the drop down arrow to the right of Picture layout.

L. Select 4 Pictures.

M. Click Create. PowerPoint generates a title slide and a four-picture-per-slide slide show.

N. Rename the title slide with the course and section.

O. Save the file.

P. If you want a hard copy, print the file as handouts, two slides per page.

Conclusion
Spend a few moments prior to each lecture flipping through the slide show. Making the connection between names and faces grows easier with repetition. If the instructor publishes the finished product on BlackBoard or another class management system, it also helps students make connections with each other. This facilitates group formation and information exchange. Even a shy student may be emboldened to contribute to class discussions when they know the other students in the class. Students often use the photo album to ask questions of classmates. They feel surer that they are e-mailing their questions to the proper classmate.

Powerpoint 2003 Instructions
You may use earlier versions of PowerPoint to accomplish a similar result. Although tedious, the method does work. Print the role and take the photos following the earlier instructions. Launch a new, blank PowerPoint presentation. Select the four object slide layout for the first slide following the title slide. Click the first place holder on the first slide and choose Picture from the Insert menu. Browse to and select the first student’s picture and double-click to insert it. Select the second placeholder and insert the next student’s picture. Repeat four times. When the first slide is filled, insert a new slide and insert the student’s pictures one at a time into its placeholders. Eventually you will transfer the pictures into the slide show.

Figure 1. In Step Four, click the Photo Album tool in the Illustrations group, then select and click New Photo Album.

Figure 2. Click the File/Disk button in the Photo Album wizard. Next, in the Album Layout section, click the drop down arrow to the right of Picture layout. Select 4 Pictures. PowerPoint generates a title slide and a four picture per slide slide show.
In this fascinating article this month’s contributor, Sameer Verma, provides a provocative glimpse into the importance of code, the world of software licensing, and the practical implications of moving toward adoption of free or open source software. This is especially meaningful for those working in the ecommerce and Web realms, where content is drawn from many sources, often in a dynamic way. Along the way, Sameer provides an overview of the meaning of code, who should own it, who should license it and how, and what the meaning of all of this is for businesses, software developers, and authors. Sameer raises many important practical and theoretical research questions, including how our software needs as academics and authors may be well served through the use of non-commercial, non-proprietary software. [Kenneth E. Kendall, Feature Editor]

The Law of Code
by Sameer Verma, San Francisco State University

In 1994, when I was still a graduate student at Georgia State University, I co-authored a paper (Fazlollahi & Verma, 1994) that I presented at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute in Honolulu, Hawaii. (This paper eventually led me to taking up the academic profession, but that’s another story.) The paper in question had an interesting concept, and I wanted to use something similar in another study I was involved with, over the summer of 2007. So, I went back into my archives and dug up the paper. It had the .wpd extension on it; this paper was authored in Word Perfect for DOS. I no longer have DOS on any of my computers, or for that matter, Word Perfect. So, I tried opening it with Microsoft Word, but that did not work. As a last resort, I fired up OpenOffice.org’s Writer and sure enough, the paper opened up, complete with figures and references. Without losing a moment, I saved it under OpenOffice.Org’s native format—the Open Document Format—an ISO standard that does not risk vendor lock-in (Weiss, 2006).

This exercise was interesting for several reasons. (1) I realized that we, as researchers, give little thought to document formats when we archive precious work. (2) My document in Open Document Format was now unencumbered by some vendor’s archaic format lock-in. (3) A non-commercial, non-proprietary software title had trumped its commercial, proprietary cousin. I had a suite of capable software that did not cost me a dime.

Looking past my victory over document formats and saving many dimes, why should one care about open source and open standards? Let’s take a slight detour to build an analogy that helps us think about technological innovations and human progress.

Language is often cited as one of the features that separates humans from the rest of the animal kingdom (Knight, 2000). Its not just the ability to communicate, but to communicate effectively and in a rich manner. Language has evolved from a privilege of a select few, to one spoken and written by the masses. History has borne witness to this evolution, be it a transition from Latin to English, or Sanskrit to Hindi. Once the works were made available in commonly written (and spoken) languages, the intellectual property became a matter of public commons. Think of this evolution as Language 1.0—the first stage of an evolution where we witness...
the creation of public commons through language.

Fast-forward to the current time, where analog works are moving over into the digital domain. Books, music, movies are all being translated into digital files. They are no longer reams of paper, or spools of celluloid, but a veritable stream of bits—zeros and ones—with purposeful pattern. This digital representation of our society is a manifestation of our expressions in binary integers. All of this digitization is being created only to be processed by our laptops, desktops, PDAs, and computer clusters in order to do our will. We want these binary machines to process our intent. In the digital domain, we typically express our intents in two ways—software and content. Software is the instruction set that processes the content. One without the other is meaningless.

Now, imagine your collection of literary works, where, say, verbs become proprietary. What if your books refused to reveal their pages every 10 years or so because the publisher went out of business? Of course, all this sounds downright silly in the context of analog media, but digital media brings with it possibilities of encryption, lock-ins and DRM—Digital Rights Management. It remains to be seen as to whose rights are being managed.

**Code as Expression**

Let’s look at the business of software a bit further. Before we use software, someone has to write the code. How would we define “code?” In our context, code is a collection of instructions for a binary machine. For the person who writes it, though, code is an expression of the author’s thoughts. Our expressions take on different forms. Some may write a limerick in English, while others may prefer C++ when expressing themselves. Just like any work of expression, the resulting work gets automatically copyrighted as per the Berne convention (Besen & Raskind, 1991). Copyright is a form of protection provided by the laws of a country to the authors of original works, including literary, dramatic, musical, artistic, and certain other intellectual works. In the U.S., copyright is defined by title 17 of the U. S. Code. Copyright defines ownership, but it does not define use. The legal way in which a copyright owner grants permission to others to use his intellectual property is described by a license (Rosen, 2004). At this point, I must disclose that I am not a lawyer, so I will wholeheartedly stand on the shoulders of giants when writing about the law of code.

In the context of software, licensing becomes very important. Those who write code often have an intent that goes with it. Code has capabilities, but these capabilities may only be used as per the intent of the copyright holder, and that intent is expressed by a license. For example, in the case of proprietary software, the license expresses the intent of the copyright holder about the use of such software. If you obtained a copy of proprietary software for, say, academic use, then you may not use it to run your company, or for that matter, to make posters for your neighborhood block party.

This is where Free and Open Source Software (FOSS) licenses are different. Instead of smiting away at their own licenses, each FOSS project gets to pick one of several approved licenses. The current set stands at 58 licenses and includes licenses recommended by the Free Software Foundation and those approved by the Open Source Initiative. So, to call your work “free software” or “open source software” you have to use one of these 58 licenses. In practice, though, no more than a dozen licenses are typically used.

**The Many Faces of Free**

You may come across several similar terms when reading about free software or open source software. One is FLOSS, or Free/Libre Open Source Software. Another is FOSS or Free and Open Source Software. Yet others are Open Source Software (OSS) or Free Software (FS). Largely speaking, all these terms are quite compatible with each other and deliver the same assurance: freedom and openness of expression via software. The following are some specifics.

- **Free Software Foundation:** Free Software Foundation is an organization founded by Richard Stallman as a way to further his efforts in the area of software freedom. The primary licenses that FSF is an umbrella for are the GNU General Public License (GPL), the Lesser GPL (LGPL), and the GNU Free Documentation License (GFDL). GPL and LGPL are widely used for software, while GFDL is most widely used for Wikipedia content.

- **Open Source Initiative:** The Open Source Initiative (OSI) was started in 1998 to disambiguate the meaning of free (free as in freedom versus free as in zero cost). The OSI goes beyond the FSF list of licenses and includes a list of 58 licenses that are considered compliant with the Open Source Definition.

Both organizations essentially advocate similar ideologies but differ in perspective. FSF’s goal is freedom based, while OSI’s goal is wide use of such software.

**Licensing Taxonomies**

Given that the domain of FOSS licenses is so large, it helps to classify the licenses in terms of how they came about and what they do. Larry Rosen (2004) does a great job of describing these different types of FOSS licenses:

- **Academic licenses:** These types of licenses were originally created by academic institutions. The Berkeley Software Distribution (BSD) of the original AT&T UNIX is one such example. BSD Unix is the code that University of California created and made available as public commons. Typically, academic licenses are least restrictive in that they allow for creation of public as well as proprietary commons from the code. For example, the TCP/IP stack in Microsoft Windows 9x series, a proprietary operating platform, originally came from BSD Unix (Gomes, 1991). Similarly, the core of
MacOSX platform from Apple Computers is based on a variant of the FreeBSD project (Jepson & Rothman, 2005).

- **Reciprocal licenses**: Such licenses allow software to be used for any purpose, but have a requirement to reciprocate—derivative works must be redistributed and must be done under the same license. Case in point is the Linux kernel, which is released under the GPL and any changes that are made to Linux are put back into the public commons under GPL. Even in cases where companies such as Cisco (parent of Linksys) used Linux in their routers, the GPL required them to release their implementation back to the public commons under GPL (Creeger, 2007).

Rosen (2004) also mentions two other categories, but they apply to standards and content as opposed to code. These are:

- **Standards licenses**: These licenses are designed to ensure open access to industry standard software so that standards may evolve if necessary and not be subject to vendor lock-ins.

- **Content licenses**: This variety of licenses are ones that govern the use of content such as music, art, film, literary work etc. and ensure that content can be available for any purpose whatsoever. A very popular example of content licenses are the creative commons licenses. More on that in a bit.

### Business Models

As I mentioned earlier, I am not a lawyer. However, I do have an interest in the economics of software and that is where licenses come into play. Licenses are very important from a business perspective. They influence what organizations are permitted to do with software. If the organization’s business model is dependent on using the software to provide services (as is the case with Google) or reselling software (as is the case with Red Hat), then the terms and conditions as put forth in a license will strongly affect the business model.

A business model is often defined as a set of concepts that are enabled by capabilities of a firm in order to produce a value add for the customer (Applegate, 2005). While a business model is more encompassing than just a license, technology companies will find that software sits at the core of their business processes, and the limits set forth by software licenses will influence their capabilities. Value has to be produced and delivered to the customer, but it has to be done within the ecosystem, and law is an important part of that ecosystem. The interactions that licenses have with business models provides for an interesting area of research.

### From Code to Content

Related to the matter of copyrights and intellectual property of software is the issue applied to content. Licenses such as GPL were designed specifically for code. What if I wanted to release photographs I took for use in other contexts? This is where we see a similar effort in action, but applied to content. This is the Creative Commons Project, a non-profit organization that has come up with a set of content licenses usually referred to as CC. The Creative Commons Project was the brainchild of Larry Lessig, a law professor at Stanford University. In concept, what CC does is simple. It is similar to what the Free Software Foundation does, but CC applies to content. I had the opportunity to use CC in my classroom a semester ago. This was a course on multimedia applications for business. We used [ccmixter.org](http://ccmixter.org), a site that releases audio content under very permissive licenses so that people may take songs, beats, drum loops, and even a capella pieces and remix them in ways to create new content. I can tell you, my students had a great time—they all became disc jockeys for a day! They also learned about the nuances of using someone else’s content, be it text, audio, video, or graphics. CC licenses are widely used in content sites such as Flickr.

As you can see, both software and content can immensely benefit from a free and open process. Projects like Wikipedia have grown to a significant level of prominence because its content is public commons—content owned and maintained by the public at large. Another project—One Laptop Per Child—is starting to take shape because it relies on an open process for hardware design, software development and content creation. We are witnessing a second coming of the language evolution. In many ways, this is *Language 2.0*, and we are all stakeholders in this IPO.

This article is authored in OpenOffice.Org’s Writer. It is archived in the Open Document Format (ODF), so that 10 years from now, if for some reason, I decide to revisit this article, I won’t have to go fishing for software to open it. ODF is unencumbered by proprietary lock-ins—it can be edited in any text editor.

So, whether you decide to conduct research on the economics of FOSS, create presentations for your business, or simply create posters for your neighborhood block party, feel free (pun intended) to use free and open source software without the fear of infringing.

### References
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The Dilemma: To Publish, To Teach, To Serve

by Sarah Bryant Bower, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

You have finished your hard-earned Ph.D. degree and are ready to continue life in the university setting, but this time as a professor rather than as a student. Granted, by working on research and teaching as a graduate student, you have already experienced the hybrid life between the two worlds, so you are set for the next step up. Perhaps you are already in a tenure-track position. Now reading this article and others on the balance of research, teaching, and service is a necessary step for you to make the most of the decisions that face you. We who have been through the ranks as professors and administrators want you to succeed. In this paper, various aspects of being a professor are explored and obstacles presented so that you may either negotiate up front to understand what you are getting into when you accept a position, or see a bit more clearly what faces you as you prepare your lectures semester by semester.

Choice of University and Position

One of the biggest decisions facing you is where to apply for positions. We all enjoy the feeling of hearing others ask us, “Oh, you teach in THAT University?” Prestige can feel really good, but only the top-tier journals will do in any field. Professors generally do not have a heavy teaching load, but instead, are expected to work on high-quality research for publication. Most of the teaching comes from graduate students, part-time faculty, or teaching faculty.

Tier-two universities tend to lean toward teaching more than tier-one universities, unless the tier-twos are trying to move into the upper echelon. Tier-three universities are much more focused on teaching, with research a “nice to have.” If you are interested in the welfare of students, these universities might be better fits for you than the more research-oriented universities.

In reality, most universities are looking for teacher/researchers, not researcher/teachers. Therefore, there can be a mismatch in expectations if the graduate takes a job at a teaching school thinking he will have time to maintain any other criteria. Much more important to your happiness and longevity in a university is fit, and especially in the choice of the balance of research and teaching. Almost all universities want you to be current in your field, some much more than others. The top-tier universities, large state universities, and “big name” private universities, base their reputations and rankings on how much you publish and in what journals. Only the top-tier journals will do in any field. Professors generally do not have a heavy teaching load, but instead, are expected to work on high-quality research for publication. Most of the teaching comes from graduate students, part-time faculty, or teaching faculty.

Tier-two universities tend to lean toward teaching more than tier-one universities, unless the tier-twos are trying to move into the upper echelon. Tier-three universities are much more focused on teaching, with research a “nice to have.” If you are interested in the welfare of students, these universities might be better fits for you than the more research-oriented universities.

In reality, most universities are looking for teacher/researchers, not researcher/teachers. Therefore, there can be a mismatch in expectations if the graduate takes a job at a teaching school thinking he will have time to maintain any other criteria. Much more important to your happiness and longevity in a university is fit, and especially in the choice of the balance of research and teaching. Almost all universities want you to be current in your field, some much more than others. The top-tier universities, large state universities, and “big name” private universities, base their reputations and rankings on how much you publish and in what journals. Only the top-tier journals will do in any field. Professors generally do not have a heavy teaching load, but instead, are expected to work on high-quality research for publication. Most of the teaching comes from graduate students, part-time faculty, or teaching faculty.
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and improve his publication record to perhaps move to another university. Choosing the right culture becomes necessary. Many Ph.D. programs admit only research-oriented students, with the expectation that the graduate will help the school’s ranking by going to another top-research university to research and possibly teach. The student may spend considerable time helping a professor with his/her research while a student. The student becomes a strong researcher with little training, or perhaps interest, in teaching. A teaching school may not be the correct selection.

Interview Skills

It is crucial for you to understand the balance of research, teaching, and service as you interview. This balance can be presented at the university, school, and departmental levels as different from each other. You must try to understand what is expected and how those expectations are supported at all three levels of administration. Ask for written standards. Many universities and schools never put expectations in writing for new faculty. Tenure and promotion decisions are applied on an as-needed basis. Standards morph over time to suit the promotion and tenure committees. Some examples of important information for which to listen: You are told that teaching is all that matters, but you find out that the last person in your job was dismissed because he did not publish enough. You are told that you are expected to publish, but there is no money to attend conferences or to receive a summer research stipend. You are told you must publish, but you are to be given a four/four teaching load your first year and thereafter, and 50 advisees. These are all warning flags.

Another area to question in the interview, as comfortably as you can, is the focus of the university, school, and department on how liberally tenure and/or promotion are granted. Does everyone get tenured or promoted, or do very few get the gold ring? Is tenure a separate decision from promotion, or are both decisions made concurrently? Some universities only tenure/promote a very few, leaving other assistant professors to find new positions. Some universities allow dismissal of a faculty member without explanation within the first two years. After that time, more justification to remove them is needed, as if the person is almost tenured. Tenure then becomes less of a trial. Finding out the culture of what is versus what is stated is crucial to smooth sailing in these murky waters.

After You Accept the Position

As a new assistant professor, you need to be in the right environment for yourself. You should understand and admit your own strengths and weaknesses, not just accept a position because of prestige or out of fear of not receiving another job offer. The culture may not fit one’s abilities or even personality.

You may not know what to ask of others or whom to ask. Establish a rapport with a broad array of others. Do not be shy. Sit down with senior faculty, other newly hired faculty, secretaries, your dean, the associate dean, and other administrators to ask, “What do I need to know?” From these meetings, you will obtain an overview of issues and procedures. They will explain what they can at that time, but also ask them again at another time. As issues come up, you will know who to talk to. In addition, taking time to get to know others across the university also helps you to make friends and to develop a university perspective.

Do be careful whom you trust, as at times, there can be factions within schools and even departments. Each may try to convince you of his or her point of view and get you involved. You do not know the history of relationships that have formed over years. Keep some distance from issues and people tied to those issues until you understand the entire picture and do not contribute to the rumor mill. If you need help with some of the issues, ask your dean to explain his or her view of the issues and the pitfalls to avoid.

Also, be aware that, at first, things that you do will take longer than they should. This aspect of your job will improve, but you do need to plan ahead to accomplish all that you will have to do. Do establish boundaries as to when you can be available to students, other faculty, and administrators. It is all right to say “no,” or to say “yes,” with conditions. Ask your chair and the dean to help you determine priorities of meetings to attend and other necessary schedule items. However, do remember, students do matter. They are our reason for teaching. Do not short-change them with missed classes and/or office hours. Limiting when you read e-mails or help them outside of class or office hours is acceptable, but do make this information known to them.

Keep careful records of your contributions on at least an annual basis. This effort will pay off handsomely when promotion and tenure documents have to be put together. Keep a file with articles published or presented, annual peer reviews, student evaluations of your classes, academic and community service contribution and attendance, clubs you advise, how many advisees you have each year, “thank you” messages from students and parents, other faculty, business people, etc. There is no way to remember all of this when the time comes to put the package together. One tip, do not list every meeting you ever attended. Some faculty members try to impress committees by listing pages.
of meetings attended, times, and dates. To a promotion and tenure committees, this can look trite, as if you are trying too hard.

Understand your own needs to be liked and provide service to students and the university, versus wanting to be left alone to publish. You must strike a balance. Listen to your dean and department chair if they give you warnings, even if subtle. Some new professors seek committee work to be involved in the life of the university, but neglect research. They have a standard excuse not to conduct research saying that they are too busy with students and committees to do any research. However, the opposite also occurs. Professors isolate themselves and minimize participation with colleagues. These scenarios play out in schools all over the country. The results are often the same: non-tenure votes in years five or six. In an example of the first case, in one school, the young professor was well liked and patted on the back for her exemplary service from her first semester onward. No one stopped her, and perhaps took advantage of her. She would not listen to the one person who tried to give her learned guidance. She enjoyed the limelight. Sadly enough, she did learn that what is rewarded in the short run through smiles and thanks may mean little in the longer run.

Another example of what not to do came from a professor who wanted to be promoted to full professor. After several years of inactivity, he made it plain that he was publishing and volunteering just to get promoted and would do nothing afterward. He did not get promoted either, and felt bitter that his efforts were not rewarded.

Treat students and colleagues with respect. Be careful of getting too close, especially with students. Any issues of impropriety can be ruinous to your career. Small practices can be dangerous. For example, keep the door open when you are meeting with a student. If the subject is sensitive and you feel privacy is necessary, ask a third party such as your department chair to be present. Many times, male and female students can “flirt” with their teachers in hopes of obtaining better grades or because there is genuine attraction. Avoid these traps. Avoid any opportunity that someone might claim that you behaved inappropriately, whether true or not. Accusations by others are difficult, if not impossible, to overcome.

Always remember, we want to be accepted and do the job for which we were hired. Do build value for yourself and your school. Travel to and network at conferences, meet business people to learn how our academic disciplines work in practice and to make connections that help students obtain internships and permanent employment. Take an internship yourself over a summer to update and strengthen your own skills, then write about it. Then in your tenure/promotion write-up, explain how these lessons learned linked to your research and classroom teaching.

However, a non-tenure vote is not a death knell for one’s academic career. You might do everything right, but for some reason some member of the promotion and tenure committee just does not like you. Perhaps, your teaching, research, and/or service were not up to standards. Anything can happen. There are other jobs out there, and the mantle of non-tenure does not have to stop you from continuing to climb the ladder at another school. Do not be afraid to move to another university. You can move laterally, be promoted, or perhaps move into administration. Learn your strengths and weaknesses. Just be sure that you learn from your mistakes and find the right fit in your next position.

Care of Ourselves and Others

Remember, we at any university live in a privileged society surrounded by well-educated people who, by definition, are scholars and thinkers. Most people in the world are not as educated as we are, but that does not make them less than we. We just know more than anyone else about our subject. Avoid absorbing poor culture habits of your department or school. If you see poor meeting attendance as a norm in your department, be the one who does attend and work with others to improve meeting agendas so that others will go. Take back to your department what you learn. Your reputation is built on the follow-through of your obligations. You get out of your work what you put into it. If others are lazy or ill spoken, do not fall prey to that attitude yourself. This is being politically careful. You never know who will hear what you said. Also, bad talk leads to bad attitudes that make for poor performance and an unhappy work experience. If the work place is poor, change it or leave.

Also, remember that all people count in this world, and no one is better than anyone else. Remembering this piece of advice can help you be kind to that wayward student who did not come to class to hear the answer to his question, to the annoying arrogant professor down the hall, and to the new professor whom you might mentor one day.

Always stay marketable. Work harder than anyone else to be the best teacher, researcher, and service provider that you can be. Be energetic; be positive; be aware. Take what might feel like risks, and take up for yourself. You will then never lack for opportunities.

Endnotes

1. Also see “Academic Street Smarts” in this column, July 2006. Four deans give their in-depth perspectives on this issue. There is some overlap of ideas between the earlier paper and the current one, but only some.
2. Full-time teaching faculty members are fairly new in top-tier universities, as they are hired to teach only and are not expected to do research. Often they do not hold tenure-track positions and are contractual only.
3. One promotion and tenure committee turned down an applicant for promotion and tenure by telling her that she needed 100 percent in each category!
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Building Cultures of Completion in Ph.D. Programs

by Varun Grover and Jason Thatcher, College of Business & Behavioral Sciences, Clemson University

A common misperception is that an academic life is an easy one. The reality is that in exchange for control over their time, students and faculty agree to work more. Due to the lack of precision in evaluating teaching, research, or other academic outcomes, work often goes into a deep abyss and it is hard to decide when investment (effort) is leading to diminishing returns. Of course, over time, we learn and get better at figuring out quality-effort tradeoffs. Doctoral students, however, have a particularly acute problem—as they need to manage projects, courses, comprehensive exams, and the dissertation—without the benefit of any significant experience.

In an earlier article (see “10 Mistakes Doctoral Students Make in Managing Their Program” Decision Line, May 2001), it was argued that while doctoral students might have intelligence and motivation, their ability to manage the program is critical for success. Many schools evaluate success based on the quality of placements; however, another metric for success is completion in a reasonable timeframe. Students that languish in doctoral programs for years dissipate valuable energy, and hurt themselves as well as their programs. These students linger on—watching their contemporaries move on to tenure-track positions, worried about resources to support themselves, and unable to push through the “barriers” to completion. Faculties lose substantial investments of time and emotion in these students. Therefore, it is essential that doctoral programs cultivate a culture of completion to avoid this dysfunctional consequence. By culture of completion, we are suggesting building a value system that encourages completion of a Ph.D. and providing the infrastructure necessary to realize that goal.

In the business disciplines, many Ph.D. programs are designed to be completed in four to five years. Students take two years of coursework, comprehensive exams after coursework, and then the dissertation stage. During their final years on campus, successful doctoral students transition from the rhythm and structure of coursework to the relatively unstructured, episodic dissertation experience (see “How Am I Doing? Checklist for Doctoral Students at Various Stages of Their Program,” Decision Line, March 2006). The dissertation phase is often unproductively stretched out through the annual job market cycles until students cannot sustain themselves (e.g., due to funding issues). A culture of completion can go a long way in alleviating this problem.

Below, we describe our perspective on cultures of completion based on our extensive work in designing doctoral programs with a research culture and our mentoring of doctoral students. We are hopeful that these suggestions can foster an environment where a good doctoral product can be produced within a reasonable time frame.

Key Tenets of a Culture of Completion

For doctoral programs to succeed, we believe it is necessary for faculty and students to collaborate in building cultures of completion. Of course, this must be done within a broader institutional context that is supportive of such a culture. The key tenets of such a culture
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that transcend specific relationships and interactions are:

- **Process Orientation**: Students and faculty have a general awareness of both formal and informal processes involved in doctoral education. For instance, dissertations are kept under control through ongoing communication between the advisor and student regarding dissertation structure, goals, and tracking of progress.

- **Forward Orientation**: There is a general emphasis on thinking ahead rather than evaluating the past. Students within such a culture are encouraged to plan. For instance, students can begin thinking about a dissertation topic early in the Ph.D. program, thereby creating synergies across various research projects.

- **Collegial Orientation**: There is a general “clan control” system where each person supports others in the program. In such culture, doctoral programs are not viewed as a competitive race—with one student reaping rewards when others fall to the wayside. Instead, at all stages of the doctoral program, students learn and practice collaboration and peer support.

- **Optimistic Orientation**: In a culture of completion, discourses are couched in a strong positive tone, encouraging a “can do” attitude. For instance, providing feedback on student’s research, a constructive tone can do a lot to build confidence and provide direction for further development. It is important that faculty and students share a sense of optimism that their hard work will be rewarded, students will find jobs, and that the field will flourish.

- **Urgency Orientation**: There is sensitivity to reducing temporal inefficiencies and discouraging too much down time. Four years may seem like a long time; however, it is not. Students need to understand the importance of “staying on track” and avoid long breaks in their research. For instance, doctoral students can be clearly discouraged from taking long breaks after finishing comprehensive exams.

### Enabling a Culture of Completion

Cultures of completion need to be cultivated until they become part of the innate environment. These cultures might have characteristics and structures in place that facilitate progress (and quality) through program, faculty, and peer interactions. Some of these are described below.

#### Program-Student Interaction

Some programs pride themselves on giving students flexibility in their choice of coursework, committees, comprehensive exams, and other program elements. Others create rigid structures (more akin to undergraduate programs) or cohort structures that force students to move through the program in lockstep fashion. While the rigid program can be efficient, it might not provide the latitude necessary for creative research or for creating close alignment with student interests. In order to create a culture of completion, programs should do the following.

**Advise and Commit to Offerings**: Good programs provide a broad structure for coursework—but more importantly, assign course advisors that can help students plan the coursework out by semester. Institutions make a true commitment to doctoral education by ensuring the coursework is there when planned. If there are required courses that are offered on a two year schedule due to resource considerations, then failure to offer the course when committed can have devastating consequences for a student’s ability to complete coursework on time. Students should meet with their advisor (or committee) to ensure that they are “on track,” and advice and resolution of problems should be paramount. In sum, the institution should not allow students to flounder and “fill-in” coursework—without careful assessment of progress, direction, and anticipation of potential problems. Students can be encouraged to provide clear, unequivocal feedback on their experiences with courses offered in referent disciplines.

#### Flexibility to Adjust

Despite the best attempts, situations arise where students cannot get the coursework needed. In some cases sub-optimal solutions are provided. This might be fine, as long as the student and advisor carefully evaluate the tradeoffs involved. More importantly, the program should provide the flexibility to adjust—even go outside strict program requirements—if it is in the best interest of the students. For instance, if a seminar is not offered on schedule and the sub-optimal solution (fill-in course) is unacceptable given the student’s needs and interests, then perhaps allowing the student to take comps and doing the coursework later might be a palatable solution. This might require turning a blind eye to the technical requirement that “all coursework must be completed prior to the comprehensive examination.”

#### Realistic Expectations

In the pressure to create students that can compete effectively in the job market, many programs require students to create “publishable work” as part of their coursework. As a result, many courses (particularly seminars) result in “incomplete” grades. We have observed some students approaching comps with 6-7 incomplete grades—resulting in eventual delay in taking the exam. While the objective of cultivating publications through coursework is good, it gets unrealistic if every course mandates such requirements in an independent, uncoordinated fashion. This not only results in “incompletes” and delays, but might not even yield productive outcomes for the student. It is important that faculty members coordinate and determine the appropriate structure to accomplish the goal. A two-seminar sequence, for instance, could be earmarked for realistically accomplishing a publishable piece; independent studies could be another mechanism. Even a comprehensive exam designed to have a research paper requirement can be successful. However, it is important for both students to coordinate their projects around their research interests,
and faculty coordinate around a structure that gives students time to conduct publishable quality work. This requires a program that carefully considers its expectations, workability and student needs.

**Minimal Teaching:** At some institutions, Deans use doctoral students to “close the gap” between the number of tenure-track faculty and demands for courses. Although teaching is a necessary part of the academic life, programs should keep teaching requirements within reasonable limits and faculty should protect their students from excessive teaching loads. In strong doctoral programs, students will teach one, perhaps two, courses prior to graduation.

**Faculty-Student Interactions**

To build cultures of completion, faculty and students must collaborate—and build structures that translate values into action. While faculty need not be close friends with their students, it’s important that they engage in a group sense-making process regarding what is reasonable for students to have the support necessary for success. For instance, by gently nudging students, offering to peer review their work, or informally discussing ideas, faculty create an environment that encourages students to gain the confidence to conduct independent, self-paced work.

**Brown Bags:** Faculty should consider using brown bag sessions to go beyond typical presentations of research work—and impart advice on other aspects important for doctoral student success. For instance, sessions on critical issues in the field, the review process, the stages of doctoral study, extra class behavior, the job of a faculty member, conducting a job search, good presentation skills, and time management can be invaluable to communicate advice, expectations, and facilitate a common understanding and value system.

**Collaborative Mentoring:** Faculty need to develop informal structures to share information and mentor doctoral students. Although faculty may sit in offices next to each other, often they are loath to discuss concerns about a peer’s student. Faculty need to develop cultures where they informally assess students’ progress and share responsibility for developing strategies to mentor each student. Open communication among faculty can facilitate diagnosis of problems and discussion of solutions as they occur.

**Managing Dissertations:** Clearly, this is where students often flounder. While students have a responsibility to manage their time, and their advisor (see “Interaction between a Doctoral Student and Advisor: Making It Work!” *Decision Line*, January 2003), there are aspects of faculty-student interactions that need to be in place in order to cultivate a culture of completion. First, the advisor needs to clearly indicate that the dissertation is the student’s responsibility. The students drive the process and they need to keep control of it by working with externally imposed deadlines and managing their own schedules. Second, students need to understand that pathological behavior, such as avoiding the advisor when work is not done on time, will only hurt the student. It tends to be self-reinforcing as delays get compounded and so does avoidance behavior. Continuous communication is key—and most advisors are responsive to genuine issues. Third, good advisors recognize that one of their responsibilities is to keep the project realistic—doable within the timeframe. So, careful assessment of costs and benefits of major changes needs to be explicitly discussed. Fourth, students need to be aware of the advisor’s style and expectations. So, if short meetings are the norm, a focused document with key issues laid out can make far more productive use of time. And, finally, students (in collaboration with their advisor) need to continuously update their schedule based on progress. By considering this, students are aware of slippage and adjustments (e.g., in scope or data expectations) can be made to rectify this.

**Open Solicitation:** In cultures of completion, students should be willing to solicit help, and faculty should be able to point students toward help. For instance, during the dissertation, students often have their first experience working with real data—quite different from canned sets used in statistical courses. It is important that students are comfortable admitting they do not know how to run the analysis—even though they’ve completed coursework. This requires a culture and relationships that encourage open communication—rather than students feeling apprehensive and fearing embarrassment. When faculty socialize students during the initial stages of their program, students who get accustomed to open, frank discussions about research would be more willing to seek help.

**Student-Student Interactions**

To successfully nurture cultures of completion, doctoral students must develop faculty-independent norms and behaviors that provide the support and knowledge required to complete a Ph.D. In many doctoral programs, senior students informally mentor new students and build cultures characterized by trust and opportunities for positive interaction.

**Trusting, Open Cultures:** Each student has unique strengths—some are thinkers, some are writers, and some are statisticians. In cultures of completion, students leverage these strengths through discussing their work, helping solve difficult theoretical or empirical problems related to dissertations, and providing moral support necessary for completing a dissertation. For these behaviors to manifest themselves, students must establish a baseline sense of rapport and trust—such that they do not need to worry about “peers” stealing ideas or their inadequacies exposed to faculty. Formally, faculty help build such cultures by requiring students to collaborate on class projects. Informally, students build trusting relationships through simple behaviors such as sharing a cup of coffee or lunch. When students build open, trusting cultures as a group, they are more likely to move more quickly through their Ph.D. programs.
**Channels for Interaction:** Students must take the initiative to create enduring structures that enable knowledge transfers and provide other necessary support required to complete coursework and dissertations. In our experience, cultures of completion are characterized by these kinds of formal or informal groups. For instance, we have seen seminar study groups where students get together physically or virtually to discuss papers before the discussion in class. These groups constitute an opportunity to reflect on, not learn, course material and constitute a launching point for building “bonds” within cohorts of students. Similarly, we have seen student writing groups, where doctoral students peer-review papers for courses, conferences, and journal submissions. Often, students can offer comments that would be devastating coming from a faculty advisor. Also, during post-comps, when coursework ends, students lose anchors that gave their daily lives rhythm and required them to interact. At this stage, informal meetings that allow students to exchange ideas on dissertations and other problems they might be facing can provide both cognitive and emotional support that is of a different flavor than what comes through faculty-student interactions.

**Conclusion**

Doctoral programs are difficult and many students falter. By fostering a culture of completion characterized by a general awareness of processes, forward-thinking orientation, high level of collegiality and clan control, optimism, and a constant sense of urgency, an environment that makes it difficult to flounder can be cultivated. However, to do this well, program elements must provide structure and allow for flexibility, while creating realistic expectations and limiting teaching responsibilities. Faculty must create structures that allow for open communication and clear demarcation of dissertation responsibilities in order to prevent slippage. Also, students themselves can create channels of interaction that can nurture successful outcomes. While these guidelines are not novel, it is their conscious fostering and institutionalization that yields outcomes that go beyond completion of doctoral degrees to instillation of values that lead to career success.

---

**EDITOR, from page 3**

Institute’s Executive Director Carol Latta, who also covers the ‘In the News’ column.

**Articles in This Issue**

This issue begins with the President’s Letter, “Renewing DSI: Simplicity is a virtue,” in which DSI President Ken Kendall of Rutgers University commends the virtues of simplicity as a value. While heeding Jim Horning’s caution that nothing is as simple as we hope it to be, Ken suggests strategies for incorporating simplicity into the Institute’s design, structure, and procedures.

There are various models of research administration around the worlds. Australia offers a dynamic and shifting environment for research administrators. In the Research Issues column, Feature Editor Miles Nichols of RMIT University provides us with a fascinating glimpse of the challenges associated with managing academic research in the evolving academic scene in Australia. The Classroom column offers ideas for creating a cohesive classroom community in an article entitled, “Class Photo Album Using Office 2007,” by Maurie Lockley of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. Maurie calls on the instructors to make personal connections with the students and facilitate the process of networking through emerging technologies.

Sameer Verma, San Francisco State University, presents “The Law of Code” in the Ecommerce column. The essay is rich in ideas and implications, and covers a broad spectrum of highly relevant issues pertaining to the business of software. In the Deans’ Perspective column, Sarah Bower visits us again with an essay on the challenge of balancing between publishing, teaching and service. She explores the dilemma as it is faced by those in the initial stages of their academic career and shares distilled insights filtered through broad experience and deep maturity. She tells it like it is: “Most people in the world are not as educated as we are, but that does not make them less than we. . . . Avoid absorbing poor culture habits. . . .”

Varun Grover and Jason Thatcher, both of Clemson University, discuss “Building Cultures of Completion in Ph.D. Programs” in the Doctoral Student Issues column. They suggest fostering a culture that is process-oriented, proactive, collegial, optimistic, and urgent. In The Bookshelf column, Craig Seal of Niagara University draws our attention to Gerd Gigerenzer’s Gut Feelings: The Intelligence of the Unconscious, an exciting book on reason and decision-making. In the DSI Membership Issues column, Gary Hackbarth, Northern Kentucky University, reports on the recent survey of the Institute members, providing new insights and shattering many myths about who we are. Also, in this issue, Chetan Shankar of Auburn University, the new editor of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, shares his vision for the journal.

I look forward to feedback from our readers. Happy reading!
Gerd Gigerenzer’s Gut Feelings: The Intelligence of the Unconscious is a fascinating journey that challenges our contemporary understandings of reason and decision making. A simple rule of thumb for evaluating any book is to see if the material challenges and expands the way the reader thinks, acts or feels. In this regard, Gigerenzer delivers, weaving together an interdisciplinary alternative to complex rational decision-making models. Gigerenzer outlines elegantly simple, intuitive, and effective rules of thumb that are the core tenants of the book. For this review, I will summarize each chapter, as well as expand on the importance and limitations of the book for decision science scholars, educators, and practitioners.

**Summary**

The book is broken into two main sections, “Unconscious Intelligence,” which lays the foundation for the adaptive toolbox that result in gut feelings, and “Gut Feelings in Action,” which elaborates on how the adaptive toolbox explains and predicts various decision making situations.

The first chapter, “Gut Feelings,” provides the premise of the text, outlining the limits of rationality through Ben Franklin’s moral algebra, whereby decisions are based on a complex weighing of cost benefit analysis. Although the example is overused throughout the text, it does provide a succinct rationale that resonates with the reader regarding the limitations of complex rational decision-making models. The main focus is the distinction between previously marginalized satisficers, who search for options that are good enough, against the more mainstream concep-
tion of maximizers, who focus on getting the best possible outcome. The author introduces the concept of heuristics through the example of a human being catching a ball in flight through the use of the “gaze heuristic,” which simplifies how to catch a fly ball by focusing on the angle of the gaze as the only relevant factor. This simple but elegant strategy removes the need for a complex (and potentially fruitless) calculation of trajectory, drag, wind speed, etc. Gut feelings (or intuitions), therefore, refer to a judgment (1) that appears quickly in consciousness; (2) whose underlying reasons we are not fully aware of; and (3) is strong enough to act upon. Gut feelings work through two components: (1) a simple rule of thumb (or heuristic); and (2) evolved capacities of the brain (genetically and environmentally influenced factors that develop over time).

The second chapter, “Less Is (Sometimes) More,” discusses the benefits of forgetting, or at least how having less information may actually prove more useful under the following conditions: (1) a beneficial degree of ignorance (where simple recognition may often outperform having too much information); (2) unconscious motor skills (when expert execution may be impeded by overdeliberation); (3) cognitive limitations (starting small); (4) freedom-of-choice paradox (the more options, the more possibilities for experiencing conflict); (5) benefits of simplicity (simple rules of thumb can predict complex phenomena); and (6) information costs (gathering too much information is potentially harmful).

Chapter 3, “How Intuition Works,” uses the perception analogy to discuss how gut feelings work. The central premise is that, just as our brains make things up to fill in our perceptual blind spots, similarly our minds create inferences about the world from incomplete information. These inferences are often unconscious and automatic and impact the schemes whereby we make gut feelings. The schemes influenced by these inferences include: (1) gut feelings (what we experience); (2) rules of thumb (what is responsible for producing gut feelings); (3) evolved capacities (construction material for rules of thumb); and (4) environmental structures (the context in which the rule of thumb is used). The focus of the scheme is that, similar to perceptions, our gut feelings fill in gaps in our knowledge through an adaptive approach, that is, developing flexibility as we interact with our environment.

Chapter 4, “Evolved Brains,” defines evolved capacities and the adaptive toolbox by contrasting the differences between human and machine as well as human and animal. The central premise is that important decisions are not adequately explained by rational calculations; rather they appear to be based on gut feelings informed by rules of thumb that emerge from our adaptive toolbox. The evolved capacities that lead to rules of thumb include language, memory, tracking, imitation, and emotions that are acquired through our genes and our learning environment. Using the prior fly ball example, the adaptive toolbox encompasses the layers of (1) evolved capacities (e.g., fix your gaze on the ball); (2) building blocks (e.g., start running); and (3) rules of thumb (e.g., adjust your running speed so that the angle of gaze remains constant).

Chapter 5, “Adaptive Minds,” makes the argument that complex behavior does not necessarily indicate complex strategies, but rather may be a function of the interaction between the subject and the environment. Using the prior fly ball example, the adaptive toolbox encompasses the layers of (1) evolved capacities (e.g., fix your gaze on the ball); (2) building blocks (e.g., start running); and (3) rules of thumb (e.g., adjust your running speed so that the angle of gaze remains constant).

Chapter 6, “Why Good Intuitions Shouldn’t Be Logical,” discusses the difference in our understanding of what happens frequently (the logical understanding) as contrasted with what is plausible, believable, and whether there is evidence; which are less restrictive, but also more adaptive and useful. These inferences include the three characteristics of intuitions: (1) I know the meaning; (2) I act on it; and (3) I do not know how I know it. The discussion includes the issue of framing, defined as the expression of logically equivalent information in different ways. In other words, the choice regarding the context of the message (e.g., the order in which options are presented) creates a frame that adds meaning beyond the message itself.

The second part of the book focuses on “Gut Feelings in Action,” by providing additional examples of how intuitions impact decision making.

Chapter 7, “Ever Heard Of . . .?” focuses on the recognition heuristic, illustrating a model whereby recognition is a result of quality (e.g., information, product, etc.) and publicity (e.g., newspaper articles, advertising, etc.). Recognition continues the less-is-more theme of the book, and may emerge (1) between two groups of people (where a knowledgeable group makes worse inference); (2) between domains (higher accuracy in an unfamiliar domain); and (3) during knowledge acquisition (when preferences change). To be effective, the recognition heuristic requires both the recognition component (e.g., I have heard of that brand name) as well as evaluating component (e.g., I can trust the brand as quality).

Chapter 8, “One Good Reason Is Enough,” goes beyond recognition to discuss recall memory, defined as episodes, facts or reasons that help make decisions. The focus on one-reason decision making continues, adding a level of complexity through sequential decision making, which includes three
fails to generate trust and compliance among citizens.

Chapter 11, “Social Instincts,” discusses the link to instincts, trust, imitation, and change. Particularly compelling is the section on imitation outlining structural features that make imitation adaptive (a relatively stable environment, lack of feedback, and dangerous consequence for mistakes) as well as when imitation is futile (i.e., when the world is quickly changing).

Importance
For any practitioner, educator, or scholar who focuses on decision making, *Gut Feelings* provides a stark contrast to the complex decision-making models prevalent in academia and industry. The elegant, simple use of our intuitions, informed by single rule sequential decision-making heuristics, genetically and environmentally influenced, adaptable to the context, and are valid and reliable within certain parameters, is both powerful and provocative.

The opportunity to apply the various schemes in our personal and professional lives fosters a deeper level of understanding about our behavior that resonates ‘intuitively’ with what we know from our own experience. Of particular value is the importance of contextual factors to the decision-making process, in particular, how framing impacts our perception of events and the decision rules we adopt.

The book clearly helps to explain the limits of rationality, or in this case, of complex decision making that is so often impotent in predicting even the simplest of future human behaviors. Any social scientist will appreciate the opportunity to experience and understand potentially efficient and important criteria of focus.

This emerging paradigm of decision making has extensive applications for both education and business. For educators it is an opportunity to expand on the critical thinking prowess of students both by challenging their assumptions on decision making as well as providing a robust, simple, and effective alternative to the complex models that dominate. For business, it provides a legitimate set of analyses that can be applied to better understand how decisions are actually being made within organizations, illuminate potentially unconscious rationalizations that impact decisions, and postulate a model that may be more efficient and effective for the organization to adopt.

Limitations
Despite the merits of the potential importance of the book, there are several limitations. The most obvious is the repetitive examples which tend to bog down the reader and limit the overall generalizability of the material. The anecdotal and selective empirical examples are often overstated and undermine the critical approach fostered. As fascinating as the models are, the book often fails to provide clear operational definitions, assuming the reader is familiar with various heuristics and would have benefited from presenting a clear, comprehensive model to help bridge the various sections.

Although, the terms “gut feelings,” “intuitions,” and “intelligence of the unconscious” are used interchangeably, this is problematic, since the real focus of the book seems to be a treatise on understanding and defending satisfying and simple decision-making rules. Perhaps this is just arguing semantics, but it is one thing to have unconscious influences on decision making and quite another to create very clear, conscious rationales that both explain and predict behavior. The author seems to want it both ways, to call gut feelings intuitive, but then to provide very rational models to explain and even train future behaviors.

The later chapters move from an interesting discussion of the value of insights, into a moral utopia, solving the problems of medicine, law, and morality, forming an ivory tower perspective that fails to fully incorporate the
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2005 DSI Members Survey:
A Summary of Results

by Gary Hackbath, Northern Kentucky University

During the November 2007 DSI Annual Conference a number of discussions were held including a Town Hall meeting concerning the future of the Decision Sciences Institute. These discussions had their basis in the membership survey taken during the summer of 2005. The Member Services Committee would like to share the key findings of the 2005 DSI survey with you to aid in your understanding of recent DSI executive board decisions and future DSI initiatives. Conducted every three years, the membership survey focused on the performance of our organization. As conducted in the past, 1999 and 2002, these surveys are used by the Executive Committee to guide DSI. We would like to thank you for your participation, time and helpful comments.

There were 437 usable responses from the 2005 survey representing approximately 20 percent of our membership which was consistent with past participation. The 2005 questionnaire included questions from past surveys to maintain continuity with the past and added others based on input from the Member Services Committee and the DSI Executive Committee. We asked a number of demographic questions to validate the character of our organization, questions about the quality and congeniality of our national and regional meetings, improvements to the DSI website, and general questions related to initiatives our organization might undertake in the future.

Demographics
The average DSI member has been a member for 12.27 ± 9.43 years. Interestingly, approximately 10 percent of our members have been members for 30 years or more and approximately 25 percent three years or less. The good news is that we are growing and attracting new and energetic young scholars. The not-so-good news is that many of our most senior people are approaching retirement age, creating opportunities and a need for those of us in the middle to step up and participate in the organization.

We are still a group focused on research and the development of business researchers, with 61 percent of our members tenured and approximately half affiliated with doctoral programs. One of the strengths of DSI is our interdisciplinary interests, 78.2 percent “Agreeing, Strongly Agreeing, or Very Strongly Agreeing” with this perception of our organization. Our members come from a wide variety of backgrounds, but of more benefit is where we perceive ourselves to be today. We asked respondents to choose three primary academic areas of interest to them as shown in Table 1. While difficult to interpret longitudinally because of additions and deletions of research topic areas, we do see focus areas related to the decision sciences. Of particular note is the large percentage increase in members interested in Supply Chain Management, Statistics, and Innovative Education.

The academic focus areas of our national organization are complemented by member participation in our regional DSI organizations. More than half (55.6 percent) of our membership is directly affiliated with regional DSI organizations. Figure 1 shows the breakdown of regional members by re-
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While these 55.6 percent of our members are based primarily in the U.S., we are seeing some expansion globally. Importantly, we hope to see and encourage the establishment of European affiliations among others in the future.

### Annual Conference

The DSI annual conference is an important event for the Institute as members gather to present research, share ideas, renew friendships, and revitalize our excitement for what we do. As such, considerable effort is made to make the annual conference as enjoyable and effective as possible. Most members “Agree” to “Very Strongly Agree” that their DSI membership is a good value (69.7 percent) as is the DSI annual meeting (74.5 percent). Importantly, 91.1 percent of our members sometimes or usually attend the national conference, while 60.1 percent sometimes or usually attend regional DSI conferences. Compared to other organizations, 85.3 percent believe DSI offers the same or greater value. As a first choice of conferences to attend, 51.2 percent would attend the DSI annual conference.

Participation in the annual conference for many members is a necessary condition to receive funding to attend the conference. Just to attend, members must present a paper or serve on a panel or workshop (71.4 percent), have an accepted paper (34.6 percent), publish in the proceedings (28.4 percent), serve as a session chair or facilitator (22.2 percent), participate as a discussant (13.0 percent), or have no requirement at all (13.7 percent). As a result, we understand that participation opportunities at our conference are considered extremely important. Overall, 73.8 percent of the membership feels that there is “High,” “High Opportunity,” to “Very Large Opportunities” to participate at national meetings and activities while 74.3 percent find this true at the regional level.

There are many reasons our members choose to attend the annual conference. Members place a “High,” “High Importance,” to “Very High Importance” ranking on opportunities to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Field</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations Management</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Sciences</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/OR</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology/Innovation</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Education</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy/Policy</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Commerce/Business</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Problem Solving</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Systems</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Not all members picked three academic areas so numbers may not sum correctly. And, not all categories were present in all surveys.*

Table 1. Primary academic areas of interest to DSI members.

![Figure 1. Breakdown of DSI regional members by region.](image-url)
interact with colleagues (80.8 percent), presentation feedback on a paper (79.1 percent), learning about innovative teaching techniques (74.1 percent), general professional development (70.6 percent), opportunities to interact with international scholars (65.1 percent), the desirability of the conference location (62.3 percent), opportunities to interact with colleagues in other fields (53.9 percent), learning about curriculum changes at other institutions (51.9 percent), viewing book and software exhibits (50.2 percent), interactions with journal editors (47.6 percent), interactions with industry professionals (42.8 percent), the job placement center (42.8 percent), tutorials and professional development consortia (39.7 percent), participation as a session chair or discussant (31.9 percent), learn how to obtain external funding (30.6 percent), or doctoral student consortium (30.6 percent). These reasons are consistent with past surveys and remain uppermost in the minds of those who plan and execute the annual conferences.

Each survey cycle we ask questions about the structure and timing of annual meeting sessions. Most members “Agree,” “Strongly Agree,” to “Very Strongly Agree” that no more than three papers be scheduled per session (65.8 percent) as do most of us in the audience (61.7 percent). Most of us agreed that a fifth session (e.g., 5:00 – 6:00 PM) (23.4 percent) and not starting before 8:00 AM (86.6 percent) were not good ideas, while there were mixed results as to whether sessions should be shortened to 75 minutes (53.8 percent agreeing). These results suggest that we will probably just leave things as they are.

Members see leadership opportunities at the national level (45.9 percent) as “High,” “High Opportunity,” to “Very Large Opportunity.” This percentage rises to 64.4 percent in the regional context. The leadership of DSI is committed to providing leadership opportunities to groom leaders for tomorrow.

**DSI Website**

An important component of the survey was questions about the DSI website. Based on informal conversations with the membership prior to the survey, we knew we had to do it better. As we suspected, 35.1 percent of the membership “Agreed,” “Strongly Agreed,” or “Very Strongly Agreed” with the statement that they visited the DSI website regularly. In the same context, 61.0 percent found the DSI website easy to navigate. Clearly, we need to identify areas that would improve interest in the DSI website. Table 2 rank-orders the summed responses from those who answered “Agree,” “Strongly Agree,” to “Very Strongly Agree” as to whether or not they wished to add a specific hyperlink to the DSI website. These recommendations from the members were used to prioritize improvements to the DSI website.

**Journals**

We would like present and interpret survey questions concerning our journals cautiously since *Decision Sciences Journal* (DSJ) experienced a change of editors and *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education* (DSJIE) had not yet completed three years of publication at the time of the survey. In this light, we see our data as a baseline.

Members value their DSI journal publications with 72.1 percent “Agreeing,” “Strongly Agreeing,” to “Very Strongly Agreeing” with the statement that DSJ is a valuable membership benefit. As an elite journal, publication in DSJ should be a goal for each of us, with 89.6 percent “Agreeing,” “Strongly Agreeing,” to “Very Strongly Agreeing” with the statement that DSJ publishes high-quality articles. Further, most agree that DSJ is an important journal in their area of interest (64.9 percent) and is multidisciplinary journal (70.8 percent). We find it encouraging given the diversity of our organization that 58.8 percent finds that DSJ meets their expectations and 44.3 percent routinely reading one article every issue.

In the last three years, 7.5 percent of the membership has published at least one article in DSJ, 26.4 percent submitting an article, and 31.1 percent reviewing at least one article. We believe these numbers support the eliteness and vitality of the submissions to our journal. Your efforts to provide timely and valued-added reviews are important elements needed by the editor in improving the status of our journal.

Similarly, 70.6 percent of the membership feels that DSJIE publishes high-quality articles and is a multidisciplinary journal (65.1 percent). In less than three years DSJIE is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add these Hyperlinks To the DSI Website</th>
<th>Percent that Agreed, Strongly Agreed, to Very Strongly Agreeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSI Journals</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Opportunities</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Tools</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Round Placement</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Renewal Site</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Tips/Innovations</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSI Regional Websites</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSI Regional Meetings</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Opportunities</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Databases – Working Papers</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Databases – Syllabi</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Databases – Presentations</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Journals</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Websites</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Society Sites</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner Resources</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and Awards for research and Teaching</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bios of officers running for positions</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional meetings</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Bios about the Home Office</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bios of DSI Officers</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Summary of responses about adding specific hyperlinks to the DSI website.**
now considered an important journal in their area of research by survey respondents (47.7 percent) with 41.5 percent reading at least one article every issue. In the last three years, 8.2 percent have published at least one article, 14.1 percent have submitted an article, and 7.3 percent reported reviewing for DSJIE. Furthermore, 89.6 percent “Agree,” “Strongly Agree,” to “Very Strongly Agree” with the statement that DSJIE publishes high quality articles. Not to be left out, 6.4 percent have published at least one article and 6.6 percent have submitted an article to Decision Line.

Since this is the first survey where we have asked these questions, it is difficult to interpret them, but we believe these percentages reflect the quality and level of effort needed to publish in top-tier peer reviewed publications. And, as with all the DSI publication, editors are working with publishers and the Institute to improve the speed and fairness of the review process.

Future Directions

What happened to the survey data? An initial evaluation of the data was undertaken and included in the Members Services Annual report to the DSI Executive committee. The initial findings were discussed at the executive Board Meeting in January 2006. Besides further study of the data, the recommendation from the Member Services Committee for DSI to incorporate website features and capabilities as ranked by the members was approved. Further, the committee was charged to develop a process for recruiting members willing to maintain website pages and sections.

Importantly, survey data is shared with other committees with their own charges and responsibilities. More recently, a strategic survey was conducted in the summer of 2007 to look hard at the direction our organization is headed. As the 2008 national convention approaches, your Members Services Committee will be asking your help in supporting and maintaining an organization that for many is the professional organization of choice for members who are establishing or reestablishing research careers. Further, we need to encourage Ph.D. students to not only join but participate in DSI activities. Since we have a number of charges related to improving the organization, feel free to share and express your opinions and ideas.

BOOKSHELF, from page 21

realities faced by individuals, groups, and institutions.

Perhaps most importantly, the book fails to adequately address one of the primary purposes, that is, to better explain when and if to actually trust our gut feelings or when to fall back to more complex rational decision-making models. However, although the limitations are at times frustrating, they do not sufficiently diminish the overall value of the book.

Conclusion

Gigerenzer invites the reader on a voyage of exploration that challenges assumptions about rational choice, and in that regard he delivers, providing a thought-provoking overview of an exciting, emerging paradigm of how decisions are actually made and how we can improve those decisions. His theory of gut feelings, resonates with our experience, is simple to understand and apply, and is elegantly efficient and effective. Overall, Gut Feelings is well worth the time and effort to explore, with opportunities for personal and professional growth for those willing to take the journey.

DSI members are invited to suggest books that should be reviewed in this column and reviewers to review them. Responses, suggestions or letters to the Feature Editor may be sent to: Peter T. Ittig, Feature Editor, Peter.Ittig@umb.edu.

ECOMMERCE, from page 11
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A Vision for the Future of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education

by Chetan S. Sankar, Auburn University

Barbara Flynn of Indiana University has done a tremendous job in positioning Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education (DSJIE) at the forefront of pedagogy and learning research in colleges of business at the national level. She should be highly commended for seeing the need for such a journal and maintaining its consistently high standard since its launch in 2003. As Ed Lusk, a faculty member at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania and SUNY: Plattsburgh, has stated: “DSJIE is the only journal that offers carefully selected peer-review information that can be used in developing or fine tuning the presentation of the technical information, which is the usual fare in Decision Sciences curricula, so as to better engage students in the learning process. It is the DS-muse.” I am therefore honored and delighted to be appointed as the new editor of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education and wanted to share with you my vision for the journal’s future.

Vision for the Future

AASCB International gives equal importance to three kinds of research: pedagogy and learning research, discipline-based scholarship, and contributions to practice. Given the importance of the pedagogy and learning research, it is critical that we continue to strive to position the journal as a top-tier journal in this area. My vision for the future is to:

- Continue to build our reputation as a top-tier journal in business areas.
- Increase publicity/marketing to encourage more research in learning and pedagogy.
- Bring in new resources to help support these endeavors.

Vision 1: Continue to build our reputation as a top-tier journal in business areas

My goals related to this vision are:

- Have the journal listed in the Web of Science maintained by Thomson. This takes more than two years, and the first steps in the process have already been initiated.
- By 2011, become one of the top 20 journals in the Education & Educational Research Category in this portal.
- Achieve an impact factor > 1.0 by 2011.
- Achieve an immediacy index > 0.24 by 2011.
- Improve our reputation within academic departments so that DSJIE is recognized as a top-tier journal.
- Increase the number of issues in the immediate future so that the existing backlog of accepted articles can be published within a reasonable time frame.
- Appoint associate editors so that the journal can handle the anticipated increase in the volume of papers and encourage new papers to be submitted. I am fortunate that six highly respected academics have accepted appointments as associate editors. They are:
  - Grandon Gill, University of South Florida
  - Christine T. Kydd, University of Delaware
  - Patrick McMullen, Wake Forest University
  - Ceyhun O. Ozgur, Valparaiso University

Chetan S. Sankar

is the Thomas Walter Center Professor in the College of Business and has taught and researched in the area of Management Information Systems for more than 25 years. He has worked at AT&T Bell Laboratories and at other companies as both a manager and a consultant. He conducts research on pedagogy and learning research issues and to bring real-world issues into the classrooms. He has obtained funding support to pursue this research from from the National Science Foundation budgeted at $2.2 million. The funding has helped him develop many multi-media case studies (www.litee.org). These case studies are used in the colleges of engineering and business at several universities and have been documented to improve the perceived higher-order cognitive skills of students.

sankacs@auburn.edu
Barbara Price, Georgia Southern University
Brad Shrader, Iowa State University

- Invite additional DSI members to become members of the editorial review board in the future.
- Modify the journal’s call for papers by mid-2008 to enable authors to specify two associate editors and provide a list of four potential reviewers, of whom we will include one in the review process. If possible, obtain three reviews per paper.
- Encourage the best DSI Instructional Innovation Competition Award paper(s) to be reviewed, modified, and published in the journal.
- Encourage the DSI conference best case studies to be published on the DSJIE website to encourage potential adopters of case studies to visit the DSJIE website and pursue articles published in DSJIE.
- Encourage associate editors to develop calls for papers for them-specific special issues and authors to submit articles to these issues.

Vision 2: Increase publicity/marketing to encourage more research into learning and pedagogy

The goals that will contribute to achieving this vision are:

- Invite deans of colleges of business to discuss learning and pedagogy research issues and how this research area is treated in their colleges.
- Encourage the deans who participated in the DSI panel to publish their presentations in Decision Line and/or in DSJIE so that DSI members can gain an appreciation of deans’ perspectives on learning and pedagogy research.
- Develop a brochure to publicize the journal.
- Expand the journal’s perspective by adding international members to the editorial review board and encouraging submissions by international authors. Publish articles that focus on learning and pedagogy innovations with an international dimension.

Vision 3: Bring in new resources

The goals that will help in achieving this vision are:

- Work with software companies and publishers to include advertisements in the journal/website and to sponsor paper competitions conducted by DSJIE in different sessions during the annual conference.
- Encourage members to seek research grants for studying issues related to learning and pedagogy. Funding opportunities will be highlighted on the journal website.
- Encourage associate editors/editor to attend regional DSI conferences, conduct workshops to encourage authors to write articles on pedagogy and learning research, and to support the mission of the journal.
- Revise the DSJIE website. This will include developing a weblog, instituting a discussion forum, and building in the ability to include case studies and teaching briefs on the website. Funding has already been authorized by DSI and this should be complete by the middle of 2008.
- Publish outstanding teaching briefs in a book. Barb Flynn has agreed to serve as the editor-in-chief of a volume that will include the best teaching briefs from past issues of DSJIE. This will bring in revenue for the journal and also help by increasing the citation of articles published in the journal.

Any journey of this type into the future needs companions and I invite all of you to work with me to achieve the goals set forth above and to accomplish this vision of making DSJIE one of the top journals in its field. Please continue to contribute articles and teaching briefs to the journal and consider registering as a reviewer for the journal. You can access manuscript central from the website:

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/dsjie/

The journal’s new website www.dsjie.org will become operational in the very near future.

I look forward to receiving your contributions and support as we work together to continue to build DSJIE’s reputation as a leader in learning and pedagogy research in colleges of business around the world.

Tips for Doctoral Students— Getting the Most from the Annual Meeting

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

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

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

ERRATUM: In the October 2007 Decision Line, we incorrectly identified participants at the 1977 DSI Annual Meeting. Carol Latta is shown here with program co-chairs (from left) Herb Moskowitz and Norm Chervany.
Alpha Iota Delta launches the International Journal of Applied Decision Sciences (IJADS)

Alpha Iota Delta, the international honor society in decision sciences and information systems publishes the *International Journal of Applied Decision Sciences (IJADS)* in cooperation with Inderscience Publishers in the United Kingdom.

IJADS, the flagship journal of Alpha Iota Delta, is a double-blind refereed international journal whose focus is to promote the infusion of the functional and behavioral areas of business with the concepts and methodologies of the decision sciences and information systems. IJADS distinguishes itself as a business journal with an explicit focus on modeling and applied decision-making. IJADS is not an official publication of the Decision Sciences Institute.

The thrust of IJADS is to provide practical guidance to decision makers and practicing managers by publishing papers that bridge the gap between theory and practice of decision sciences and information systems in business, industry, government and academia. Papers published in the journal must contain some link to practice through realistically detailed examples or real applications. Author(s) are required to demonstrate the managerial relevance and implications of the decision problem. The decision-making environment may include single or multiple decision makers considering single or multiple criteria in operational or strategic domains. IJADS draws on a wide range of disciplines, including accounting, decision sciences and management science, finance, information systems, marketing, operations and business process management and strategic and organizational management.

Papers published in IJADS should not only meet high standards of research rigor and originality, but also embrace managerial relevance. The principal objective of the journal is to establish an effective channel of communication between policy makers, government agencies, practicing managers, academic and research institutions and persons concerned with the practical applications of decision sciences. IJADS is interested but not confined to papers that focus on one or more of the following dimensions:

- Define new problem domains in managerial decision-making
- Develop new methodologies to formulate decision problems
- Apply decision sciences and/or information systems methods uniquely to interesting problems

The audience for IJADS includes anyone interested in practical aspects of decision sciences and information systems. Because decision sciences and information systems are highly interdisciplinary, our audience includes the research community specialists and practitioners who work as consultants or in-house experts in business, industry, and government and those who study or teach courses in decision sciences, information systems, or related disciplines in academia.

IJADS publishes original papers, review papers, technical reports, case studies, management reports, book reviews, notes, and commentaries. Special Issues devoted to important topics in decision sciences and information systems will occasionally be published.

IJADS is a forum for exchange of research findings, analysis, information, and knowledge in areas which include but are not limited to: Accounting, Decision Sciences and Management Science, Finance, Information Management and Systems, Marketing, Operations and Business Process Management, and Strategic and Organizational Management.

Submitted manuscripts will be reviewed for possible publication based on the following criteria:

1. Applicability: Does the manuscript bridge the gap between theory and practice of decision sciences and information systems?
2. Credibility: Does the manuscript present credible and accurate information?
3. Methodology: Does the manuscript use sound and appropriate method(s)?
4. Readership: Does the subject of the manuscript appeal to the interests of the Journal’s readership?
5. Organization: Does the manuscript follow a definite direction and clear organization?
6. Originality: Does the manuscript add new findings, insights, or knowledge to the body of literature?
7. Research: Does the manuscript compare and weigh the material against the work of others?
8. Style: Does the manuscript follow a clear, informative, and persuasive writing style?

IJADS promises to be a respectable academic journal in Decision Sciences. The Editorial Board of IJADS, comprised of over 80 renowned scholars and researchers from 20 different countries, plans to publish the inaugural issue of the Journal in September 2008. Author(s) may submit their paper in the form of an MS Word file attached to an e-mail to the IJADS Editor-in-Chief below:

Madjid Tavana
Editor-in-Chief, *International Journal of Applied Decision Sciences*
La Salle University
1900 West Olney Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19141, USA
Phone: 215-951-1129
Fax: 267-295-2854
tavana@lasalle.edu
http://lasalle.edu/~tavana
http://www.inderscience.com/ijads
MIDWEST REGION ANNUAL MEETING
DIANE PARENTE, Pennsylvania State University

Midwest DSI Region’s Annual Meeting offers unique experiences and sessions

The Midwest Region of the Decision Sciences Institute will hold its 39th Annual Meeting on April 17-19 in Erie, Pennsylvania. The Program Team has been busy planning some unique experiences and sessions at the MWDSI Conference. Our objective is to provide a quality, accessible regional program. With today’s budget crises in higher education, many academics do not have the resources to travel to the national conferences. We hope that the attendees will include colleagues from institutions of all sizes. Since we are piloting a number of new initiatives, we are hopeful that the conference will also attract others from outside the Midwest region as well as non-academics.

The conference is hosted by Penn State – Erie, The Behrend College (Sam & Irene Black School of Business), but three other local Colleges and Universities are also actively involved as co-hosts: Gannon University, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, and Mercyhurst College. This special consortium of academic units provides a lot of energy and a wealth of new ideas and approaches to the conference planning process.

The Saturday sessions of the conference are being held in Penn State – Erie’s new 160,000 square-foot Regional Economic Development Center (the RED-C) that houses both the Sam & Irene Black School of Business and the School of Engineering. In addition to facilitating cross-functional research tracks with engineering, holding the sessions in the RED-C allows us to offer some unique sessions. Some of these ‘first time’ experiences include:

- A “hands-on” SAP software lab demonstration
- A participative online procurement auction

Another ‘first time’ activity is the presentation of a set of Symposia designed specifically for College and University Administrators. These symposia will feature panels of experts discussing accreditation from various bodies, Evaluation of Teaching, the Evaluation of Research, and the Administrative Side of On-line Teaching.

In addition to the traditional student paper competition, we are also offering a Case Study Competition that is open to teams of students. These teams may consist of Ph.D., Masters, or undergraduate students (or any combination thereof!). The top teams will be invited to present their analysis at the conference to a set of judges that includes the actual CEO of the subject corporation.

Thursday, April 17 will include the traditional Doctoral Consortium. PhD students should apply on the website. The program will consist of a strategic plan for research workshop, a session on Life as an Academic, and a reception with local university administrators and Midwest officers. The doctoral consortium will be held in the century old Logan House mansion.

Also on Thursday, the general membership is invited to visit to one of Western Pennsylvania’s finest wineries as well as a rare look inside the General Electric (GE) plant where the world’s best and most environmentally friendly locomotives are produced. The Erie area of the Great Lakes has the largest uninterrupted stretch of vineyards of any along the Great Lakes. The GE locomotive facility is one of only a few in the world. Pre-arrangements are requested.

Of special interest is our speaker on Friday night. We have arranged for Albert H. Brinkman, Director of Equity Derivatives Marketing for the Philadelphia Stock Exchange (PHLX), to be our special guest and keynote speaker.

As we are also targeting the smaller colleges in our region, we have many new and cross-functional tracks designed to incorporate the faculty from all business and economics departments, even those in the liberal arts schools. Some of these tracks include Information Security, Innovative Education & On-line Instruction, Ethics and Sustainability, and Business Economics. We have developed a list of colleagues in the Midwest region as well as colleges near Erie and have been keeping them up to date on the activities planned by email.

Families are more than welcome and there is plenty to see and do in Erie to keep them happy. The conference hotel is the Courtyard by Marriott where we have secured very reasonable accommodations. In addition, the hotel owner also operates “Splash Lagoon” (where it’s always 84 degrees!), Erie’s premier indoor water park and special discounts on tickets are available to us. The hotel provides a complimentary shuttle to Splash Lagoon. There’s a lot to see and do in Erie, just check out the conference website (see below) and discover Erie!

Please do not miss this incredible chance to participate and experience these new and exciting opportunities. We think we have prepared one of the best regional conferences ever and hope you will accept this challenge to come and see on April 17-19 in Erie, PA. All information needed to submit articles and abstracts as well as to register for the conference, is available at:

www.mwdsi2008.org
Institute Meetings
The 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 22-26, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 31-41 for detailed information on activities in Baltimore. Contact Program Chair Marc Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, at dsi2008@unl.edu.
http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

The Asia Pacific Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on February 20-22, 2008, at the Regal Sun Resort in the Walt Disney World Resort in Orlando, Florida [reservation code is “Decision.”] Submission deadline was September 24, 2007. Contact Program Chair Barry A. Wray, Dept. of ISOM, Cameron School of Business, UNC Wilmington, 601 College Road, Wilmington, N.C. 28403, wrayb@uncw.edu, (910) 962-3515, Fax (910) 962-3068.
http://www.apdsi.org

The Northeast Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on March 28-30, 2008, at the Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge. All papers, abstracts and workshop proposals must be submitted electronically on or before October 21, 2007. Contact Snehamay Banerjee at nedsiny@camden.rutgers.edu.
http://www.nedsi.org

The Southeast Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on February 28-22, 2008, at the Regal Sun Resort in the Walt Disney World Resort in Orlando, Florida [reservation code is “Decision.”] Submission deadline was September 24, 2007. Contact Program Chair Barry A. Wray, Dept. of ISOM, Cameron School of Business, UNC Wilmington, 601 College Road, Wilmington, N.C. 28403, wrayb@uncw.edu, (910) 962-3515, Fax (910) 962-3068.
http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region will hold its 2008 (29th) Annual Meeting on March 4-8, 2008, in Houston, Texas, USA. Submission deadline was September 17, 2007. Contact Program Chair Kai S. Koong, University of Texas-Pan American, koongk@utpa.edu.
http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region will hold its 2008 (37th) Annual Meeting on March 18-22, 2008, at the Courtyard by Marriott, Erie, Pennsylvania. Submission deadline is February 22, 2008. (See previous page for more details.) Contact Diane Parente, Program Chair, Pennsylvania State University, dhp3@psu.edu.
http://www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

Call for Papers

Conferences

Publications
Operations Management Research, a new journal published by Springer starting in 2008, publishes high-quality research that is shorter and more sharply focused than articles in existing OM journals. The Editors-in-Chief of the journal are Jack Meredith and Patrick McMullen, both of Wake Forest University.
www.springer.com/12063
www.editorialmanager.com/omra
(Important information for authors)

Production and Operations Management seeks papers for a special issue on Operations In Financial Services. Guest Editors are Manos Hatzakis, Global Equities, Merrill Lynch & Co., manos_hatzakis@ml.com; Suresh Nair, Department of Operations and Information Management, University of Connecticut, suresh.nair@business.uconn.edu; and Michael Pinedo, Department of Information, Operation and Management Science, Stern School of Management, New York University, mpinedo@stern.nyu.edu. Submission deadline is April 1, 2008.
http://www.poms.org/journal/

Springer-Verlag seeks book chapters for two books: Soft Computing Applications in Business and Soft Computing Applications in Industry. Papers are reviewed and accepted/rejected on first come first serve basis.
http://www.bhanuprasad.org/chapters.html

The software pattern blog seeks articles on software patterns, stable analysis and design patterns, architectural patterns, pattern languages and how to develop systems of patterns. The blog belongs to the editors of IJOP, columnists, staff, advisory, editorial and domain expert boards, external reviewers, and to those who have been specially invited.
http://pattern.ijop.org

■
The 2008 DSI Annual Meeting will be held in Baltimore, Maryland, from November 22-25 at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront. This hotel is set on the edge of Baltimore Inner Harbor in the heart of Harbor East, the newest Baltimore neighborhood. You are steps away from Inner Harbor restaurants and shopping, the National Aquarium, Maryland Science Center, and USS Constellation. There are just too many things in Baltimore alone to list, plus you are less than 35 miles (55.2 km) from Washington, D.C., which makes this a great location to take in a wide variety of places to visit. Registration information on the hotel and meeting event activities in Baltimore is available on the meeting website. If you have any questions, suggestions, or requests, feel free to email me at dsi2008@unl.edu. For information on the hotel, go to the website at


You are invited to participate in the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore. Plan to present your most recent research and teaching innovations, and attend a number of miniconferences 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.
The Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) invites contributions to the 2008 Annual Meeting in the following categories: Refereed Research Paper, Non-Refereed Research Abstract, and proposals for a Workshop, Tutorial, Panel, Symposium, or Colloquium. 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.

If 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 colloquium will be evaluated for possible inclusion in the annual meeting by the appropriate track chairs, coordinator, or program chair. Authors are required to submit all contributions online using the instructions provided in the following section and updated on the meeting website. When using the website for submission, contributors of refereed research papers and proposals for a workshop, tutorial, panel, symposium, and colloquium will also be required to submit an electronic version of their paper or proposal as a pdf attachment. So that a double-blind review process can be maintained, the electronic file should contain only the body of the paper and the title of the submission, but no author identification information (which will be captured via a web-based form).

Any individual author or co-author may submit up to three refereed research papers and/or non-refereed research abstracts to the annual meeting. (This does not include invited papers, workshops, tutorials, panels, symposia, and colloquia.) The submission of a refereed research paper or non-refereed research abstract means the author certifies the manuscript is not copyrighted, has not been accepted for publication in a journal, has not been presented or accepted for presentation at a professional meeting, and currently is not under review for presentation at another professional meeting. (Material printed in its entirety in any conference proceedings is considered published.) Furthermore, the author certifies his/her intention to register for and attend the meeting to present the paper, abstract, or proposal if it is accepted. The copyrights for all forms of presentation at the Institute’s Annual Meeting shall remain with the authors.

The submission deadline for refereed research papers is April 1, 2008. The submission deadline for non-refereed research abstracts and proposals for workshops, tutorials, panels, symposia, and colloquia is May 1, 2008. (Please refer to specific competitive awards for their respective submission deadlines.) Submitting authors will be acknowledged through a reference number at the conclusion of the submission process.

**Instructions for Electronic Submissions**

The 2008 DSI Annual Meeting will use the existing conference information system (CIS) owned by the Institute. The authors must handle all submissions electronically using this system, which will be available on the DSI website after February 1, 2008. All of the following information must be provided for the submission to be accepted.

- Title of submission (title changes will not be allowed at a later date)
- 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
- 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).
- (Optional) Provide the name and contact information of a possible reviewer for the Refereed Research Paper only (not for abstracts). It is optional for track chairs to use these reviewers.
- Abstract of 50 words or less, which must accompany all types of submissions.
- Stage of your research as of today and by the time of the conference.
- Invitation information

---

**Technology in the Classroom Miniconference**

The Technology in the Classroom Miniconference provides a forum for participants to share novel or innovative applications of technology in the classroom that enhance the student’s learning experience. Submissions should be limited to creative approaches and best practices for using course support software, multimedia, spreadsheet software, simulation software, online tutorials, or other applications of technology, and be capable of being demonstrated and discussed within a 20-30 minute timeframe. Submissions will be competitively reviewed and selected for their creativity, novelty, and contribution to pedagogy, and should not be duplications of material found in existing textbooks. Please send your submission (following the “Instructions for Electronic Submissions”) directly to Coordinator William Johnson by May 1, 2007. See address below. Questions may also be directed to Coordinator Rupak Rauniar.
2008 Competitions

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

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition

The purpose of the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition is to encourage and publicize outstanding dissertation research by selecting and recognizing the best dissertations written in the past year in the decision sciences. The Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award, accompanied by a $1,500 prize, will be presented at the annual meeting. Applicants for this award should submit three (3) hardcopies of their dissertation in the required format directly to the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator by April 1, 2008. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Julie Kendall, Rutgers University, kendallj@crab.rutgers.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 website. The due date for submissions is April 1, 2008. For information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.

Nancy Lea Hyer, Vanderbilt University, nancy.lea.hyer@ Owen.vanderbilt.edu

Best Paper Awards Competition

Best Paper Awards will be presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting. Categories include Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper, Best Application Paper, and Best Interdisciplinary Paper. At the discretion of the program chair and track chairs, outstanding scholarship may be recognized through a distinguished paper award in a given track. Reviewers will be asked to nominate competitive paper submissions for these awards. Nominations will then be reviewed by a best paper review committee, which will make award recommendations.

E. Powell Robinson, Texas A&M University, e-robinson@ tamu.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. 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).

Ayman Abuhamdieh, Indiana State University, sdayman@ isugw.indstate.edu

Best Student Paper Award

An award for the best student paper will be presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting. Reviewers will be asked to nominate competitive paper submissions for this award. Nominations will then be reviewed by a Best Student Paper Award review committee that will make award recommendations. This is a great opportunity for students to receive recognition for their research.

Kathryn M. Zuckweiler, University of Nebraska at Kearney, zuckweilerkm@ unk.edu

Bicyclists admire the view of the harbor from the nearby Federal Hill neighborhood.

Baltimore loves its crabs—whether steamed or in tasty crab cakes.
2008 Professional Activities

Curricular Issues Miniconference
The Curricular Issues Miniconference provides a forum to learn from those at the forefront of curriculum innovation and improvement, and to share experiences and lessons. Separate tracks on undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs will offer ideas and insights for those responsible for designing, teaching, and administering business programs.

Vijay R. Kannan, Utah State University, v.kannan@usu.edu

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

Maling Ebrahimpour, Roger Williams University, bizdean@rwu.edu

Doctoral Studies Miniconference
Doctoral education is at the core of academic and scholarly development. However, very little attention has been given to the promotion, dissemination, and sharing of research that specifically deals with issues of doctoral education in focus areas such as information systems, decision sciences, operations research and management, information technology, and information science. This miniconference will provide an opportunity for researchers to discuss new ideas on research conducted, or future opportunities for research, in doctoral studies related (but not limited) to the key focus areas noted above. Primarily, the Doctoral Studies Miniconference will be interested in original papers, initial research drafts, works in progress, and panel discussion proposals in these focus topics.

Vijay R. Kannan, Utah State University, v.kannan@usu.edu

Yair Levy, Nova Southeastern University, levyy@nova.edu; Irma Becerra-Fernandez, Florida International University, becerf@fiu.edu; George M. Marakas, University of Kansas, gmarakas@ku.edu

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

William B. Carper, University of West Florida, bcarper@uwf.edu; Carl W. Gooding, Samford University; James A. Pope, Louisiana State University in Shreveport

Professional and Faculty Development Program
The Professional and Faculty Development Program is for Institute members at all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. The content of the sessions is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today's rapidly changing environment (see topics on the 2008 Annual Meeting website). 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. Submission deadline is May 1, 2008.

Binshan Lin, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, Department of Management, binshan.lin@lsus.edu

Successful Grantsmanship Miniconference
Securing external research grants is a valuable experience, or even a necessary step, because it can significantly enhance research projects. A day-long event to be held on Sunday, November 16, 2008, the Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship is intended to help develop interests among DSI members in obtaining external research grants and to sharpen skills in writing grant proposals so that endeavors may be more fruitful. You are invited to hear expert panelists and network with like-minded researchers.

Q. B. Chung, Villanova University, q.chung@villanova.edu

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference
The Technology in the Classroom Miniconference provides a forum for participants to share novel or innovative applications of technology in the classroom that enhance the student’s learning experience. Submissions should be limited to creative approaches and best practices for using course support software, multimedia, spreadsheet software, simulation software, online tutorials, or other applications of technology, and be capable of being demonstrated and discussed within a 20-30 minute 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 submissions (following the “Instruction for Electronic Submissions”) directly to the miniconference coordinators by May 1, 2008.

William Johnson, Bentley College, wjohnson@bentley.edu; Rupak Rauniar, University of St. Thomas, rauniar@stthom.edu
2008 Doctoral Dissertation Competition

Searching for the best 2007 dissertation in the decision sciences

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

McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute are co-sponsoring the Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition. The purpose of the competition is to identify and recognize outstanding doctoral research in the development of theory or applications of the decision sciences completed during 2007. A monetary award of $1,500 will be presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting. Submission deadline is April 1, 2008.

The dissertation must deal with the development of methodology for, or application of, the decision sciences. The dissertation must have been accepted by the degree-granting institution within the 2007 calendar year. It is not necessary for the degree to have been awarded by the end of 2007. Also, the dissertation may not have been submitted previously to a Decision Sciences Institute dissertation competition.

Send the following as PDF files to: dissertations@thekendalls.org

1. 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 emailed as a PDF file to the e-mail address given above either together with the other material (preferred) or separately. Call this file “ZZZ-Nomination” where ZZZ is the first 3 letters of the student’s last name. (For example, if the student’s name is Kong, the file should be called “Kon-Nomination.”)

2. A separate statement by the major professor about why the dissertation deserves special recognition. This letter should be emailed as a PDF file to the e-mail address given above either together with the other material (preferred) or separately. Call this file “ZZZ-Recommendation” where ZZZ is the first 3 letters of the student’s last name.

3. 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 and 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 and theory, operations management, supply chain 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 letter should be emailed as a PDF file to the e-mail address given above either together with the other material (preferred) or separately. Call this file “ZZZ-Summary” where ZZZ is the first 3 letters of the student’s last name.

4. A complete dissertation in PDF format. This must be a single file. Separate files for individual chapters or appendices are NOT acceptable and will not be reviewed. Please email this file in a ZIP format to conserve space to the email address above. Call this file “ZZZ-Dissertation” where ZZZ is the first 3 letters of the student’s last name.

Important: Because of the blind-review process, it is essential that the author, degree-granting institution, and supervising professor not be identified within the contents of items 2, 3, and 4 above. All acknowledgments or other references that would identify the author, institution, or professors must be removed from the dissertation and all accompanying documents except the nominating letter. The coordinator will change the names of files before they are distributed to the reviewers so that the names of files are not identifiable with a particular student.

Supervising professor and student materials may be submitted together or separately. In ALL email communications, make sure that the doctoral student’s full name appears somewhere in the email message.

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition Coordinator
Julie E. Kendall
Rutgers University
School of Business-Camden
dissertations@thekendalls.org

Professional and Faculty Development Program

The Professional and Faculty Development Program is for DSI members in all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. The content of the sessions is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing environments. Topics include, but are not limited to the following:

- Assessment in practice.
- Balancing the needs of different stakeholders in the educational process.
- Blogs in business school.
- Career path strategy.
- Cutting edge pedagogical research.
- Developing Chinese business education.
- Globalization of business education.
- How do you get the message across?
- How do you turn conference paper into journal article?
- Meeting increasing demands in teaching, service, and research.
- New instructional and research methodologies.
- Obtaining research funding.
- Online communities in academic world.
- Sustainability and management in business school.
- Teaching an integrated core curriculum.
- The challenges and opportunities of new technologies.
- The role of grading and assessment.
- Transforming curriculum design and development.

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. Submission deadline is May 1, 2008.

Professional and Faculty Development Program Coordinator
Binshan Lin
Louisiana State University in Shreveport
Department of Management
binshan.lin@lsus.edu
2008 Doctoral Student Consortium

Creating successful career paths for students

Co-sponsored by McGraw Hill/Irwin, Beta Gamma Sigma, and DSI

DSI's 26th 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 22, 2008, at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland.

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, finance, 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.

Your Career as a Professor. In this session, you will hear from Professor Ira Horowitz, a DSI Fellow and past president who will share his insight and secret for success as a professor in academia.

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 Student 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 Student Consortium. Those wishing to be included should submit:
1. A current curriculum vita, including contact information (e-mail in particular), your major field (accounting, finance, marketing, management, 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 Maling Ebrahimpour, Doctoral Consortium Coordinator, by July 30, 2008. 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 conference 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.

2008 Track Chairs

Accounting: Assurance and Public Accountability
Ashley Burrows, University of Wisconsin-Lacrosse

Business Ethics and Leadership
Shirley Hopkins, California State University, Chico

Case Studies
Corinne Karuppan, Missouri State University
Muthu Karuppan, Drury University

DSS/Al/Expert Systems
Mahour Mellat Parast, University of North Carolina-Pembroke
John H. Kim, Southwest Minnesota State University

E-Commerce
Seongbae Lim, Suny-Geneseo
Daesung Chang, Kyonggi University

Fellows Track
Manoj K. Malhotra, University of South Carolina-Columbia

Finance/Financial Management
Barbara Poole, Roger Williams University

Hospitality Management
G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada-Las Vegas
Natasa Christodoulidou, California State University, Dominguez Hills

Information Security
Merrill Warkentin, Mississippi State University
Allen C. Johnston, University of Alabama-Birmingham

Information Systems
Jeryl Nelson, Wayne State College
Tim Garvin, Wayne State College

Innovative Education
Steven Yourstone, University of New Mexico
Rachna Shah, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

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

Knowledge Management
Dianne Hall, Auburn University
Todd Peachey, Auburn University

Manufacturing Management and Practice
John R. Olson, University of St. Thomas
Carol Prahniski, Michigan State University

Marketing: Theory Applications and Practice
Effie Stavrulaki, Bentley College

MS/OR: Techniques, Models and Applications
Gyu Kim, Northern Illinois University
Suk-Ki Hong, Dankook University

Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory
Robert Dengler, Benedictine University

Project Management and New Product Development
Dwight Smith-Daniels, Arizona State University
John McCreery, North Carolina State University

Quality and Productivity
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University

Service Management
Jo Ann Duffy, Sam Houston State University
Gerald Köhers, Sam Houston State University

Statistics and Decision Analysis
Robert J. Pavur, University of North Texas
Kellie Keeling, University of Denver

Strategy and Policy
Karen L. Fowler, University of Northern Colorado

Supply Chain Management
Sahin Funda, University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Doctoral Consortium Coordinator
Maling Ebrahimpour
Dean and Professor of Management
Gabelli School of Business
Roger Williams University
Bristol, RI 02809
bizdean@rwu.edu
(401) 254-3444
2008 Instructional Innovation Award Competition

Recognizing outstanding contributions that advance instructional approaches within the decision sciences

Co-Sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta, Prentice Hall, and DSI

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 2008 Annual Meeting, the 30th 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 1, 2008.

Instructions
Applications must be submitted in electronic form using instructions on the conference website at
http://www.decisionsciences.org/Annualmeeting

A tentative summary of instructions appears below; however, applicants should consult the website instructions before submitting. Submissions will consist of one document electronically submitted using the conference website, and one supplemental letter sent via U.S. mail.

Electronic Submission Notes
1. Number of documents and their format: The electronic submission must consist of one document, in 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, websites, or other identifying information in your document. This information is captured separately on the electronic submission form. Applicants not adhering to this policy will be ineligible for consideration.

Document Format
Competition finalists will closely adhere to these format requirements:

1. Length: Your one electronically submitted document can be no more than 30 total pages when formatted for printing.
2. Title Page: On the first page, provide the title of the submission and a table of contents. Number all pages in your submission in the upper right-hand corner.
3. Innovation Summary: On the second page, explain why your submission provides a new innovative approach to teaching. You may also incorporate this into the abstract to be entered separately on the electronic submission form.
4. Summary Section: On the next 3 to 7 pages, present a double-spaced summary of your submission, with the following headings:
   a. Topic or Problem toward which your approach is focused.
   b. Level of students toward which your approach is focused.
   c. Number of students with whom the approach has been used.
   d. Major educational objectives of your approach.
   e. Innovative and unique features of your approach.
   f. Content: Describe the content or substance of the material addressed with your approach. Indicate why you focused your innovative efforts on this material or content.
   g. Organization: Explain how you structured the material or content, unique features of your approach, and how your approach contributes to student learning.
   h. Presentation: Discuss how you designed the explanation and illustration of the material or content, what is unique about your approach, and how its use makes learning more effective.
   i. Effectiveness and specific benefits of your approach to the learning process: Indicate how your major educational objectives were met, benefits derived from the presentation, students’ reactions to the presentation, and how you evaluated the effectiveness or benefits derived. 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:
   a. List experiential exercises, handouts, etc. (if any), which are part of your innovative approach and explain where they fit in your approach.
   b. Add any other discussion or material that you feel is essential to an understanding of your submission.
   c. Appendix. Attach copies of illustrative material, especially any that you have developed, and a copy of the most recent course syllabus in which the innovative activity was used.

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

**Page Counts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page</td>
<td>1 page</td>
</tr>
<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 16, 2008. If you are one of the finalists, you will be required to attend the Instructional Innovation Award Session at the annual meeting in Baltimore. 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 1, 2008.

---

Instructional Innovation Award Competition Coordinator
Nancy Lea Hyer
Owen Graduate School of Management
Vanderbilt University
401 21st Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37204
nancy.lea.hyer@owen.vanderbilt.edu

---

Scenic views of Baltimore’s harbor.
New Faculty Development Consortium

The New Faculty Development Consortium is for faculty in the beginning years of their academic careers who would like to learn more about teaching, research, publishing, and other professional development issues. Attendance at this consortium is by application and is limited to faculty members who have earned their doctoral degrees in a business discipline and who are in the first three years of their post-doctoral teaching careers within business schools or equivalent. The chronological age of the participant is not material—the key is being a “new” faculty member.

The consortium will last a full day on Saturday, November 22, 2008, beginning with a meet and greet session at 7:30 am. It will include interactive and panel sessions with faculty at varying stages of their careers as well as opportunities for interaction and networking with more experienced colleagues. The content of the sessions offered is intended to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing higher education environment. Topics may include, but will not be limited to, the following:

- What it means to be a faculty member today
- Learning the “rules” of the game—tenure and promotion policies at different types of schools
- Becoming an excellent teacher and how to documenting it
- Becoming an excellent researcher in various types of environments
- The role of service—departmental, institutional, community, and professional

See NEW FACULTY, next page

Application for
New Faculty Development Consortium
November 22, 2008 • Baltimore, Maryland

Send in this form and a current copy of your vita to the Co-Coordinator (see above). Application deadline: Sept. 15, 2008.

Name: ____________________________________________________________
Current institution and year of appointment: _____________________________
Mailing address: _____________________________________________________
Year doctorate earned: _______________________________________________
Doctoral institution: ________________________________________________
Phone: _____________________________________________________________
Fax: ________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _____________________________________________________________

Research interests: _________________________________________________
Teaching interests: _________________________________________________
Major concerns as a new faculty member and/or topics you would like to hear discussed:

Have you attended a previous DSI Doctoral Student Consortium?
_____ yes _____ no
If so, when? ________________________________

New Faculty Development Consortium Co-Coordinators
William B. Carper
College of Business
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514
(850) 474-2350 F: (850) 474-2314
bcarper@uwf.edu
Carl W. Gooding
Samford University
James A. Pope
Louisiana State University in Shreveport

See NEW FACULTY, next page
2008 Case Studies Award & Workshop

Disseminating new ideas in case studies topics

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The top three contestants, selected by a panel of case experts, will present their case studies and analysis at a regular session at the 39th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute held in Baltimore. 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 2008 Annual Meeting (see below).

34th Annual Case Workshop

The 34th Annual Case Workshop for members engaged in developing new instructional cases will be held at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore. Members are invited to submit completed case studies along with an appropriate instructor’s note to the DSI program chair.

The format this year will include critiques of the individual cases by case writers in appropriate fields. The purpose of these discussions is to help the case writer further develop their case studies so that they can be shared with other faculty using the case method. Attendance at the Case Writers’ Workshop is open to all conference attendees. Submission deadline is April 1, 2008.

Best Case Studies Award Competition Coordinator
Ayman Abuhamdieh
Indiana State University
ayman@indstate.edu

The star-shaped Fort McHenry is a famous point of interest in Baltimore. It was the valiant defense of the fort during the War of 1812 that inspired Francis Scott Key, a lawyer and amateur poet, to compose the Star Spangled Banner.
We were favored with lovely weather in Phoenix for the 2007 DSI Annual Meeting in Phoenix, which was attended by 1,259 members, including 237 student members. Attendees came from every U.S. state and 25 countries around the world.

In all, we received 1,031 submissions in 24 paper tracks and assigned to 335 sessions. The supply chain track was the largest, with 104 submissions and 55 sessions.

In addition to the tracks, four miniconferences were held: Professional Development, coordinated by Joy Field; Successful Grantsmanship, coordinated by Q. Chung; Technology in the Classroom, coordinated by Keong Leong; and Curricular Issues, coordinated by Ina Markham. Across all tracks and miniconferences, session attendance ranged from 1 to 30; the mean was 9.35; the median was 8.

As in prior years, the Doctoral Consortium was held on Saturday, this year coordinated by Powell Robinson and Funda Sahin. The New Faculty Development Consortium, coordinated by Maling Ebrahimpour, was held on Saturday and on Sunday morning. Thirty-one new faculty participated.

Along with the serious work of the meeting, we were able to mix and mingle with each other at the beautiful Marriott Desert Ridge Resort. The post-meeting survey showed that the Sunday evening family barbecue was a hit with attendees: perfect weather, lots of food and time to just relax together.

I hope all of you who attended enjoyed both the intellectual and social aspects of the meeting. Again I’d like to thank the 50 members of the Program Committee for all of their efforts with preparation and planning and the Home Office for all of their hard work for the Institute, not only at the meeting, but throughout the year.

If you weren’t able to attend the 2007 meeting, I hope to see you at the 2008 meeting in Baltimore!
Grandon Gill of the University of South Florida won the 2007 Instructional Innovation Award for his teaching innovation titled “A self-paced, game-based programming course.” The other finalists were “Undergraduate TechTrek: A blueprint for high-impact, integrative, cross-disciplinary field learning,” by John M. Gallaugher of Boston College; and “EXEC: An interactive learning approach to developing decision making expertise in business and management programs,” by Thomas M. Triscari Jr. of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

The competition was conducted in two phases. In the first phase the competition committee received and reviewed applications. 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, and (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 at the DSI Annual Meeting in Phoenix. 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. Indeed, the DSJIE has committed to work with winners to prepare a suitable submission for the publication in the Institute’s journal.

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 the author of the winning submission. Authors of each of the remaining finalists each receive $750. Winning and finalist abstracts are included below.

WINNER
“A Self-Paced, Game-Based Programming Course”
Grandon Gill, University of South Florida

The innovation described relates to an introductory programming course that is required for MIS majors in the College of Business at a large public university. Among the innovative elements of the course design are: (1) a project-oriented focus that emphasized the creation of games and simulations, (2) a self-paced organization that allows students to complete assignments at their own pace, (3) an instructor developed monitoring and reporting system that helps both staff and students assess their progress, (4) a validation-based assessment system that provides rigorous measures of student achievement while providing them the ability to collaborate with their peers, (5) online discussion groups modeled after comparable professional forums, (6) the deployment of all static course content (i.e., lectures and readings) online, and (7) the replacement of classroom lectures with instructor-led interactive learning activities.

FINALISTS
“Undergraduate TechTrek: A blueprint for high-impact, integrative, cross-disciplinary field learning”

John M. Gallaugher, Boston College

The Undergraduate TechTrek is a three-credit course that combines a rigorous half-semester classroom learning experience with a week long field study to Silicon Valley. Classroom study leverages a lecture introduction followed by a team-oriented, seminar learning format. The field study portion of the course consists of a series of master classes, case studies, and Q&A sessions hosted and led by senior executives and managers onsite at their firms. TechTrek should not be confused with a field trip, a recruiting trip, or a series of business celebrity meet-and-greet sessions. The resulting program is a demanding, integrated course that goes far beyond what faculty alone can offer in the classroom. The program has received significant praise from students and is now regarded as one of the University’s marquee learning experiences.

“EXEC: An Interactive Learning Approach to Developing Decision Making Expertise in Business and Management Programs”

Thomas M. Triscari Jr., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
The last decade has been marked by rapid change, disruptive technologies, globalization, and increased competitiveness. The basic foundation of thinking about the world is shifting from one of underlying stability and orderliness derived from Newtonian thinking to one of underlying uncertainty and entropy. Accordingly, business or executive decision making has become increasingly complex, fraught with uncertainty and increased risks. What an incredible opportunity for decision scientists to make significant contributions to the Decision Sciences Institute. Barb is a Fellow of the Institute, and is the founding editor of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, our first journal dedicated to publishing significant research relevant to teaching and learning issues in the decision sciences. Barb has served as the 33rd President of the Institute, President-Elect, Vice-President, Treasurer, Editor of Decision Line, Associate Editor of Decisions Sciences, Track Chair, and Curricular Issues Program Coordinator. Barb has also chaired several key committees including the Fellows Committee, Regional Activities Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Investment Advisory Committee, Publications Committee, Executive Committee, the Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences, and the Doctoral Student Affairs Committee. Barb has served the Institute in each of these key roles with passion, humor, and keen insights. Many DSI members cite Barb as an inspiration for their own academic careers. She is the very embodiment of the word “service,” and her contributions have helped the Institute grow and thrive in countless ways. Barb has worked tirelessly for the Institute and through her efforts she has cultivated a new group of enthusiastic leaders for DSI who are well prepared to face the future.

INNOVATION AWARD, from previous page

The last decade has been marked by rapid change, disruptive technologies, globalization, and increased competitiveness. The basic foundation of thinking about the world is shifting from one of underlying stability and orderliness derived from Newtonian thinking to one of underlying uncertainty and entropy. Accordingly, business or executive decision making has become increasingly complex, fraught with uncertainty and increased risks. What an incredible opportunity for decision scientists to make significant contributions to preparing professionals to face such a formidable challenge! Our contention is effective decisions—and decision practitioners—will be those employing decision strategies from an arsenal of analytical tools and cumulative insights to address the dynamic and highly competitive global business environment.

2007 Instructional Innovation Award Competition Committee

Peter M. Arnold, Boston University, Chair
Nancy Lea Hyer, Vanderbilt University, Chair Designate
Karen A. Brown, Thunderbird
Lori Cook, DePaul University
Jo Ann M. Duffy, Sam Houston State University
Kellie Keeling, Virginia Tech
Ronald Klimberg, Saint Joseph’s University
David M. Levine, Baruch College-CUNY
Francis Mendez, Texas State University
Nada R. Sanders, Wright State University
Norio Takemura, Senshu University
Gregory W. Ulferts, The University of Detroit Mercy

Using Learning Style Instruments to Enhance Student Learning

Thomas F. Hawk, Frostburg State University
Amit Shah, Frostburg State University

Learning from the Pros: Influence of Web-Based Expert Commentary on Vicarious Learning About Financial Markets

Matthew W. Ford, Northern Kentucky University
Daniel Kent, Northern Kentucky University
Steven Devoto, Northern Kentucky University

Impact of Personality on Academic Performance of MBA Students: Qualitative Versus Quantitative Courses

Keith L. Whittingham, Rollins College

Barbara Flynn Receives 2007 Dennis E. Grawoig Distinguished Service Award

To Barbara B. Flynn
The Richard M. and Myra Louise Buskirk Professor of Manufacturing Management at the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University, for her selfless contributions to the Decision Sciences Institute. Barb is a Fellow of the Institute, and is the founding editor of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, our first journal dedicated to publishing significant research relevant to teaching and learning issues in the decision sciences. Barb has served as the 33rd President of the Institute, President-Elect, Vice-President, Treasurer, Editor of Decision Line, Associate Editor of Decisions Sciences, Track Chair, and Curricular Issues Program Coordinator. Barb has also chaired several key committees including the Fellows Committee, Regional Activities Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Investment Advisory Committee, Publications Committee, Executive Committee, the Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences, and the Doctoral Student Affairs Committee. Barb has served the Institute in each of these key roles with passion, humor, and keen insights. Many DSI members cite Barb as an inspiration for their own academic careers. She is the very embodiment of the word “service,” and her contributions have helped the Institute grow and thrive in countless ways. Barb has worked tirelessly for the Institute and through her efforts she has cultivated a new group of enthusiastic leaders for DSI who are well prepared to face the future.
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 2007 Annual Meeting in Phoenix, the following DSI members were named Fellows.

**Kendall, Malhotra and Tang**

**Named DSI Fellows**

**Manoj K. Malhotra, Jeff B. Bates**

*Professor and Chairman of the Management Science Department, University of South Carolina*

For his many contributions in research, teaching, and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, particularly his influential work focused on the deployment of flexible resources in manufacturing and service firms and on the interface between operations and supply chain management. Manoj has authored numerous articles in top-tier journals such as *Decision Sciences*, *Journal of Operations Management*, and *Production and Operations Management*. He has also coauthored *Operations Management: Processes and Value Chains*, 8th edition, in which he was responsible for innovations regarding constraint management, lean systems, and location. The winner of many prestigious teaching awards for his work with international graduate students, Manoj has also supported doctoral students, chairing many doctoral dissertation committees, participating in DSI doctoral student committees, and serving as Feature Editor for Doctoral Student Issues in *Decision Line*. Dr. Malhotra’s notable service for DSI includes serving as Program Chair of the 36th Annual Meeting in San Francisco.

**Julie E. Kendall, Professor, Rutgers University, School of Business-Camden**

For her many contributions in research teaching and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, particularly her outstanding service contributions to DSI, including serving as Treasurer, Vice President, Doctoral Student Consortium Co-Coordinator, Proceedings Coordinator and Track Chair. She has served with distinction on numerous DSI committees, chairing the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee, the Doctoral Student Affairs Committee and the Investment Advisory Committee. Julie has authored or co-authored a leading textbook, an innovative hypertext-based software package and numerous articles in top-tier journals, such as *Decision Sciences*, *MIS Quarterly*, *European Journal of Information Systems*, and *Information and Management*. She has been extremely active in Ph.D. and new faculty mentoring and has coordinated numerous consortia, workshops and camps devoted to doctoral students or new faculty mentoring.

**Kwei Tang, Professor, Associate Dean for Programs and Student Services, and Director of International Initiatives, Krannert Graduate School of Management Purdue University**

For his distinguished contributions in research, teaching and academic administration, and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, particularly for his research in quality control, reliability, and operations management. Kwei has authored over 60 papers in such journals as *Decision Sciences*, *Management Science*, *IIE Transactions*, *Production and Operations Management*, *Naval Research Logistics*, *Technometrics*, and *European Journal of Operational Research*, and has served in numerous editorial positions for many of these publications. He has received several teaching awards, including the prestigious university-wide Salgo Noren Foundation Award for Excellence in Teaching at Purdue, and has led significant internal program development activities and external partnership initiatives for Purdue’s MBA program, particularly with overseas institutions. Kwei has also served the Decision Sciences Institute in various ways, including as a member of the Case Studies Competition Committee, Programs and Meetings Committee, Publication Committee, and Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee.
2007 Best Case Award Competition

Rebecca Grant of the University of Victoria submits winning case

Congratulations to the winner of the 2007 DSI Best Case Award Competition, Rebecca Grant (University of Victoria) for her case, “istockphoto.com.” The honorable mentions in this year’s competition were Matthew J. Drake (Duquesne University), Paul M. Griffin (Georgia Institute of Technology), and Julie L. Swann (Georgia Institute of Technology) for their case “The Groundhog’s New Clothes”; and Scott A. Newman (University of Utah), Gary Grikscheit (University of Utah), Kee (Kevin) Kao (University of Utah), and Rohit Verma (Cornell University) for their case, “eBay Tackles Fraud & Community Unrest”.

The three finalists were determined by a panel of judges in a blind-review process. Final judging took place at the annual meeting in Phoenix. “The Institute has a long history of encouraging the development and teaching of high quality case studies,” said Kate McKone-Sweet, Babson College, 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 2008 Case Studies Competition, coordinated by Ayman Abuhamdieh (Indiana State University) at ayman@indstate.edu. Further information on the competition can be found in this issue of Decision Line or online at www.decisionsciences.org.
The Curricular Issues Miniconference has become an integral part of the DSI annual meeting, providing members a forum to share and discuss the issues that are related to curricula. This year’s conference offered six very interesting and well-attended sessions.

There were two sessions facilitated by Barbara Flynn (outgoing editor of DSJIE) and Chetan Shankar (incoming editor) that presented some of the empirical research papers as well as innovative teaching briefs from the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education. In support of this specific initiative, I am very pleased to report that this year there was $2,000 in prize money from Wiley-Blackwell for the best research papers in DSJIE. The best paper, “Using Learning Style Instruments to Enhance Student Learning” by Thomas Hawk and Amit Shah (Frostburg State University), received a cash award of $1,000 while two other papers, “Learning from the Pros: Influence of Web-Based Expert Commentary on Vicarious Learning About Financial Markets,” by Matt Ford, Daniel Kent and Steven Devoto (Northern Kentucky University); and “Impact of Personality on Academic Performance of MBA Students: Qualitative Versus Quantitative Courses,” by Keith Wittingham (Rollins College), received $500 each.

The session on “Outstanding Teaching Briefs” showcased three papers: “Statistical Quality Control: Developing Students’ Understanding of Variable Control Charts using String” by Lynn A. Fish (Canisius College); “Is This a Game or a Learning Moment?” by Gilles Reinhardt and Lori Cook (DePaul University); and “The Supply Chain Puzzle Game: Highlighting Behavioral Issues in SCM” by Stan Fawcett and Matthew McCarter (Brigham Young University). The presenters did an outstanding job of involving the audience in experiential learning through a variety of exercises. All of these papers were extremely well-received and the passion that these individuals bring to the classroom was apparent to everyone there. It is my sincere hope that DSJIE is able to bring prize money to this category of papers in the future.

One of the sessions was “Assessment in Practice: Building Blocks for Development and Implementation of a Successful Assessment Process,” presented by Elizabeth Anderson-Fletcher (University of Houston), David G. Martin (Bloomburg University of Pennsylvania), and Karen Tarnoff (East Tennessee State University). These AACSB assessment facilitators shared their considerable expertise on how to successfully develop and implement assessment and assurance of learning. As can be expected, the timeliness of this topic generated very lively discussions with the audience.

The panel on “Developing Chinese Business Education” was presented by Ye-Sho Chen (Louisiana State University), Linda Kao (Southern Methodist University), and Stanley Chang (Ernst and Young China). Discussions centered on various formats of Chinese business courses (undergraduate and MBA) on a U.S. campus; the role of language courses in a business curriculum; and the role of the business practitioners in the curriculum. It was especially interesting to learn about experiential learning ranging from a short-term study abroad to dual-degree programs, U.S.-China projects sponsored by corporations in both nations, and internships at multinational offices in China. This session generated a lot of questions from the audience. Special thanks goes to Robert Sumichrast (University of Georgia) for putting together and facilitating this session.

The session “Teaching an Integrated Core Curriculum” by Michael E. Busing (James Madison University), Peter Arnold (Boston University), and Rex R. Cutshall (Indiana University), described the integrated core at each of their schools, comparing and contrasting the different ways in which students can be taught to successfully think “business” instead of “discipline.” The panelists also shared tips on working with a team of faculty, grading issues, and class management. The audience was comprised of faculty at other institutions with integrated curriculum as well as others who are looking at some form of integration in the future. There was a lot of interest and discussion in this session.

Freda Z. Hartman, Brian G. Lindquist, and Dawn Iwamoto (University of Phoenix) presented “Transforming Curriculum Design and Development: A Corporate Model.” It was interesting to learn of the non-traditional approach to curricular development at the University of Phoenix. The process from curriculum design to ultimate delivery has distinct stages with different groups/teams being involved at each stage. The audience in this session had a lot of questions that led to comparison of this approach to the more traditional approach at most schools.

The high quality of the sessions at the miniconference is a credit to all the presenters. As in past years, the Curricular Issues Mini-conference continues to be a setting where we can exchange ideas and learn about those issues that are central to what we do in business education. It has been my pleasure to coordinate the 2007 miniconference. If you missed this year’s sessions, I strongly encourage you to plan on contributing to and attending next year’s sessions. Vijay Kannan will be the coordinator of the 2008 Curricular Issues Miniconference, and he can be reached at v.kannan@usu.edu.
**2007 DSI Annual Meeting**

**Winners Chosen for the 2007 Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award Competition**

We are pleased to announce the winner and honorable mentions for the 2007 Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award Competition. The purpose of the award is to encourage and publicize outstanding dissertation research by selecting and recognizing the best dissertations written during 2006 in the decision sciences.

Twenty submissions were received and entered into a two-stage review process. Each dissertation was subject to an initial screening by eight to ten reviewers. This round resulted in the selection of six dissertations for further reviews. In the second round, each of the remaining six dissertations was reviewed by three reviewers, each of whom reviewed two dissertations and voted for the “best” one.

The winner received a $1500 check and a plaque at the Decision Sciences Institute conference in Phoenix on November 20, 2007. The honorable mentions each received a plaque as well.

We wish to thank the many reviewers who assisted 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**

*Essays on Manufacturing Outsourcing*

**John Gray,** The Ohio State University

**Degree-granting Institution:** The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

**Dissertation Co-Advisors:** Aleda V. Roth, Clemson University; Wendell G. Gilland, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

**Honorable Mentions (in alphabetical order)**

**Continuous Improvement and Operations Strategy: Focus on Six Sigma Programs**

**Gopesh Anand,** The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Degree Granting Institution:** The Ohio State University

**Dissertation Advisor:** Peter T. Ward, Fisher College of Business, The Ohio State University

**Improved formulations, Heuristics and Metaheuristics for the Dynamic Demand Coordinated Lot-sizing Problem**

Arunachalam Narayanan, Assistant Professor, Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution, Texas A&M University

**Degree Granting Institution:** Texas A&M University

**Dissertation Advisor:** E. Powell Robinson, Mays Business School, Texas A&M University

**Development of Appointment Scheduling Rules for Open Access Scheduling**

Xiuli Qu, North Carolina A&T State University

**Degree Granting Institution:** Purdue University

**Dissertation Advisor:** Ronald L. Rardin, University of Arkansas Fayetteville

Thanks and appreciation to the following individuals who assisted with reviewing:

Anil Aggarwal, University of Baltimore

Vijay Agrawal, University of Nebraska at Kearney

Sanjay Ahire, University of South Carolina

Patrice Auger, University of Melbourne

Kenneth Baker, Dartmouth College

Kathryn Blackmon, University of Oxford

Sanjeev Bordoloi, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Kurt Brethauer, Indiana Univ.-Bloomington

Joseph Carter, Arizona State University

Pamela Carter, Florida State University

Kyle Cattani, Indiana University-Bloomington

Candace Deans, University of Richmond

Jo Ann Duffy, Sam Houston State University

Amit Dutta, George Mason University

Steven Erikson, Babson College

James Evans, University of Cincinnati

Mark Ferguson, Georgia Institute of Technology

Geraldo Ferrer, Naval Postgraduate School

Joy Field, Boston College

Byron Finch, Miami University

Barbara Flynn, Indiana University

S. Thomas Foster, Brigham Young University

Srinagesh Gavirneni, Cornell University

Susan Meyer Goldstein, Univ. of Minnesota

John Goodale, University of Oregon

Janet Hartley, Bowling Green State University

Karina Hauser, Utah State University

H. Seb. Heese, Indiana University-Bloomington

Xinxin Hu, Indiana University-Bloomington

G. Tomas Hult, Michigan State University

Peter Ittig

Jayanth Jayaram, Univ. of South Carolina

Vijay Kannan, Utah State University

Ravi Kathuria, Chapman University

Julie Kendall, Rutgers University

Kenneth Kendall, Rutgers University

Jay Kim, Boston University

Mehmet Murat Kristal, York University

Sang M. Lee, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Kevin Linderman, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities

Robert E. Markland, University of South Carolina

Kathleen McFadden, Northern Illinois University

Lawrence Menor, University of Western Ontario

Nagesh Murthy, University of Oregon

Carol Prahinski, Michigan State University

Madeleine Pullman, Portland State Univ.

Cliff Ragsdale, Virginia Tech

Roberta Russell, Virginia Tech

Brooke Saladin, Wake Forest University

Vallabh Sambamurthy, Michigan State University

Kenneth Schultz, University of Alberta

Kristie Seawright, Brigham Young University

Scott Shafer, Wake Forest University

Dwight Smith-Daniels, Arizona State University

Linda Sprague, CEIBS

Morgan Swink, Michigan State University

F. Brian Talbot, University of Michigan

Srinivas Talluri, Michigan State University

Weiyu Tsai, University of Utah

Rajesh Tyagi, DePaul University

Assoo Vakharia, University of Florida

Thomas Vollmann, IMD

Scott Webster, Syracuse University

Finally, the coordinator would like to thank *Linda Stoker* at Cornell University for assistance in coordinating the award process in the most efficient manner.

**Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator**

Rohit Verma, Cornell University
New Faculty Development Consortium

by Maling Ebrahimpour, Roger Williams University

The theme of the 2007 NFDC was “Your Journey to a Successful Career.” Under this theme, we experimented with several new ideas. For example, several news topics were added to the consortium as well as the length of the consortium were extended to a day and a half. Some of the new ideas that presented were: (1) an in-depth discussion of Emotional Intelligence (EI), followed by a lively discussion which included an interactive real life experiment. (2) A session that dealt with faculty liability. Several scenarios were presented to the participants. A very interesting discussion ensued where awareness of the participants was raised regarding issues such as liabilities in taking students to, for example, a field trip. (3) Three newly tenured and promoted faculty along with their spouses discussed their families’ roles during the long journey of receiving tenure and promotion.

More than thirty new faculty joined the Doctoral Student Consortium participants for two joint sessions. In the first session, participants learned about writing publishable articles and how to navigate the review process from editors of various decision sciences publications. This second joint session was a working lunch meeting which created an environment for networking among all participants.

Participants heard from different deans about the early stages of new faculty’s career and how it can differ from one school to another depends on the mission of each school.

A special session dealing with the role of scholarly activities and how it can help faculty’s career were received enthusiastically by audience. In this session, several scholars discussed publication of scholarly work form the idea generation stage all the way to actual publication. The NFDC was concluded by an hour of open session where participants shared and discussed their concerns with the panel members and among each other.

2007 Decision Sciences Journal Awards

by Vicki Smith-Daniels, Editor, Decision Sciences Journal, Arizona State University

On behalf of the entire Decision Sciences editorial team, I am pleased to announce the following 2007 awards of excellence. Please join me in congratulating these outstanding authors, reviewers, and associate editors for their peer-recognized scholarly achievements.

2007 Best Paper Award

Clinic Overbooking to Improve Patient Access and Provider Productivity
Linda R. LaGanga, Mental Health Center of Denver
Stephen R. Lawrence, University of Colorado at Boulder

2007 Best Paper Award Finalists

Managing Internet Product Returns: A Focus on Effective Service Operations
Diane A. Mollenkopf, University of Tennessee
Elliot Rabinovich, Arizona State University
Timothy M. Laseter, University of Virginia
Kenneth K. Boyer, Michigan State University

Usability of Online Services: The Role of Technology Readiness and Context
Anne P. Massey, Indiana University
Vijay Khatri, Indiana University
Mitzi M. Montoya-Weiss, North Carolina State University

Channel Coordination for a Supply Chain with a Risk-Neutral Manufacturer and a Loss-Averse Retailer
Charles X. Wang, State University of New York at Buffalo
Scott Webster, Syracuse University

Vertical Integration with Price-Setting Competitive News Vendors
Chongqi Wu, Alabama A&M University
Nicholas Petruzzi, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Dilip Chhajed, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Competitive and Cooperative Positioning in Supply Chain Logistics Relationships
Richard Klein, Clemson University
Arun Rai, Georgia State University

LaGanga and Lawrence
2007 Professional and Faculty Development Program

by Joy Field, Boston College

The 2007 Professional Development Program at the Decision Sciences Institute annual meeting included nine sessions held from the first through third days of the conference. The sessions sought to accomplish the objectives for this year’s program by appealing to the Institute’s members in all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. Content of the sessions, panels, and workshops were designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities related to professional service, teaching, and research. The program was coordinated in consultation with the Institute’s Professional Development Program Director Robert E. Markland (University of South Carolina). The program included the following sessions.

A four-session workshop, “Automating Supply Chains: Capabilities and Hypes Surrounding RFID,” covering many areas of automatic identification including RFID and real-time locating systems and applications in supply chain management, healthcare, warehousing and inventory management. Workshop participants demonstrated the implementation of automatic identification technologies and discussed bringing these technologies into the classroom and opportunities for academic research to better understand the implications for operations management. Another session involved a workshop on academic publishing in Decision Sciences Journal, “Decision Sciences Journal’s Order Winners and Order Qualifiers: Preparing Your Manuscript for Publication Success.” Vicki Smith-Daniels, editor of Decision Sciences, discussed topics such as journal editorial focus, review process, managerial relevance, writing style, theoretical development and targeted areas of opportunity.

Two other teaching workshops included:

- Workshop on “Conducting Research in Technology-mediated Learning: Issues, Opportunities and Future Directions.” The purpose of the workshop was to encourage interdisciplinary dialogue in order to accelerate the development of research on technology-mediated learning in business education.

- “Innovative Use of Large Datasets in the Classroom—“Hands On” Decision Making Applications,” with presentation and hands-on use of examples and exercises related to IBM, SAP, Teradata, and Microsoft enterprise systems.

- “Using In-Class Experiential Exercises for Providing Conceptual Context.” The workshop focused on how to use exercises as lead-off activities when presenting new concepts and ways in which the shared common experience can be used to deepen students’ understanding of the subject.

- Panel discussion on the “Do’s and Don’ts of Teaching Online.” Invited panelists are distinguished scholars who provided insights from research and experiences on what to do and what not to do when teaching online so as to maximize faculty and student performance success.
2007 DSI Distinguished Track Papers

ACCOUNTING: THEORY, APPLICATIONS AND PRACTICE
Stakeholder Influences on Environmental Audit Choice: An International Study
Nicole Darnall (George Mason University), Inshik Seol (Clark University), Joseph Sarkis (Clark University)

ECOMMERCE
Measuring E-Commerce Technology Enabled Business Value: A Finnish Perspective
M. Adam Mahmood (University of Texas at El Paso), Francisco J. Lopez (Macon State College), Mikko T Siponen (University of Oulu, Finland), Carole Cangioni (University of Texas at El Paso)

ETHICS AND SUSTAINABILITY
Health & Safety and Operational Practices and Outcomes: Towards a Multiple Stakeholder Perspective
David A Johnston (Schulich School of Business, York University), Mark Pagell (York University)

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS
Corporate Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries: The Case of Thailand
Terrence C. Sebora (University of Nebraska), Piyporn Aiemthitiva (Bangkok University), Sang M. Lee (University of Nebraska-Lincoln), Lester A. Digman (University of Nebraska-Lincoln)

INNOVATIVE EDUCATION
Does the MBA Experience Support Diversity? Regional and Demographic Effects on Program
J. B. Arbaugh (University of Wisconsin Oshkosh), Regina Bento (Harvard Business School), Alvin Hwang (Pace University)

INFORMATION SYSTEMS
Student-Created Screen Capture Videos as a Part of Information Systems Science Course: Comparing Ways of Learning on the Web
Pekka Makkonen (University of Jyväskylä)

INFORMATION SYSTEMS
Identifying Risks in ERP Implementation
Wullianallur Raghupathi (Fordham University), Aditya Saharia (Fordham University)

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT
Towards a Knowledge Model for Computer-Aided Knowledge Management
Teresa L. Ju (Shu-Te University), Szu-Yuan Sun (National Kaohsiung First University of Science and Technology)

MARKETING: THEORY, MODELS, AND APPLICATIONS
Antecedents to Supply Chain Integration: A Transaction Cost Theory Perspective
Thani Jambulingam (Saint Joseph’s University), John R. Navin (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Ravi Kathuria (Chapman University)

MANUFACTURING MANAGEMENT
Maintenance and the Maquiladora Industry
Shad Dowlatshahi (University of Missouri-Kansas City)

MARKETING/OM/IS INTERFACE
Distribution Channel Strategy for Durable Goods Manufacturers with Complementary Products
Yusen Xia (Georgia State University), Tiaojun Xiao (Nanjing University), Peter G. Zhang (Georgia State University)

MS/OR: TECHNIQUES, MODELS AND APPLICATIONS
Optional Search and Stopping Rules for the Continuous-Type Dichotomous Search
Young H. Chun (Louisiana State University)

ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR/ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY
The Discovery of Virtual Organization: Metaphorical Analysis
Jinyoul Lee (SUNY at Binghamton), Bandula Jayatilaka (SUNY at Binghamton), Pairin Katerattanakul (Western Michigan University), Soongoo Hong

QUALITY
Purchasing Service Quality And Internal Customer Satisfaction: An Empirical Study
Minjoon Jun (New Mexico State University), Shaohan Cai (Lakehead University)

SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT
Relational Governance in Buyer-Supplier Relationship: Structures, Processes, and Performance Implications
Shaohan Cai (Lakehead University), Minjoon Jun (New Mexico State University), ZhiLin Yang (City University of Hong Kong)

2007 Best Paper Awards

BEST APPLICATION AWARD
Effects of Six Sigma and Knowledge Management on Healthcare Organizational Results and Competitive Advantage
Charles R. Gowen III, Gregory N. Stock, Kathleen L. McFadden, Northern Illinois University

BEST THEORETICAL/EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AWARD
Optimal Search and Stopping Rules for the Continuous-Type Dichotomous Search
Young H. Chun, Louisiana State University

BEST STUDENT PAPER
WINNER
Creating Successful Collaborative Relationships: An Empirical Study in Europe [Supply Chain Management Track]
Evelyne Vanpoucke, Ghent University

HONORABLE MENTION
Measuring the Environmental Impact of a Product [New Product Development and Project Management Track]
Erika L. Marsilliac, University of Toledo
Indeed, our lives have become more complex and, as a professor who teaches courses in the adoption of emerging information technologies, I can’t help but think that I add to the complexity of some people’s lives.

My nature is one in which I take technology very easily. I had my first PC (minicomputer as it was called then) in 1980; I used email when all of the people I communicated with by email (actually, BITNET) would fit on a very small piece of paper; and I designed my own Web site in 1995. I find these technologies liberating, but others do not.

In the May 2007 issue of Decision Line, I explained how I introduced core values as we began the process of the renewal of the Institute. These core values are communication, feedback, simplicity, and courage. In this column I will address simplicity as a value in our renewal of the Institute.

**Simplicity Can Be Incorporated into Systems Design**

In 1969, I became the lead systems designer for the first successful regional blood inventory management system that was eventually used throughout the world. Two other firms attempted to design systems, but their designs were overly complex by tracking each unit of blood collected through to its final disposition.

In our design, we simplified the system by not worrying what happens to the blood after its expiration date. Other systems tried to force hospitals to return units of blood, we did not. I credit our success to simplicity of design, where other systems, steeped in complexity, failed.

**Simplicity Can Be Built into Structure**

Since we are in the process of renewing DSI, I start each Board meeting by listing the four core values of my presidency. Last year the DSI Board discussed, but did not vote on, a proposal to have different types of DSI vice presidents, some having three-year terms, others having two-year terms. I found that to be unmanageable.

This year I asked the Board to look into other designs for roles of DSI officers and committee structures. We’ll find out soon if we can simplify DSI’s boards, committees, and meetings.

**Simplicity Can Be Found in Rules**

In my quest for simplicity this year, I decided to simply follow Robert’s Rules. Running meetings using Robert’s Rules is useful because meetings are more orderly, a greater number of Board members get to contribute (Robert’s Rules state that a member can only discuss the same question twice), and it is clear how votes are to be counted.

As I served on DSI committees over the years, I observed that ex-officio members were not voting. This was incorrect, so I sent along a set of rules to each committee explaining that ex-officio members have all of the rights of any elected or appointed members. Ex-officio in this instance simply means by virtue of the position within the organization (such as an officer, committee chair, past committee chair), the person is present on the committee.

One only has to observe DSI’s Executive Committee which is made up of five ex-officio members and only one elected vice president. Obviously, ex-officio members on the Executive Commit-
Simplicity Requires Patience

When something doesn’t work, we often try to find a reason and try to correct the problem. In an organization, that sometimes means modifying the structure or the rules. Often we make things more complex in trying to improve something. This is because it is difficult to see how simple, small changes can result in very positive improvements.

Edward Teller, the theoretical physicist, sometimes called “the father of the hydrogen bomb,” stated that, “No endeavor that is worthwhile is simple in prospect; if it is right, it will be simple in retrospect.” When we continue to renew the Institute we must remember that while it may seem difficult and complicated at first, our diligent work may eventually evolve into elegant and simple solutions.

This year’s Information Technology Committee has accepted the challenge and has just finished an audit of the IT needs of the Institute. We have already taken the first step towards a coordinated and improved database and an improved IT system in general. Redesigning new IT systems will take time. Once again, this will require patience.

Finally, we recognize that, as American computer scientist Jim Horning has said, “Nothing is as simple as we hope it will be.”

Endnotes
1. As quoted in The Columbia Dictionary of Quotations from Walden, “Where I Lived, and What I Lived For” (1854)
2. As quoted by “The Quotations Page.”
3. From The Pursuit of Simplicity, Pepperdine University.
4. As quoted by “The Quotations Page.”

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering
Faculty Positions

The Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering at the University of Michigan invites applications and nominations for faculty positions beginning September, 2008. We seek outstanding candidates for faculty positions in the following areas:

- Assistant/Associate/Full Professor in Health Systems Engineering. Expertise and primary research focus in healthcare systems including delivery, management and/or quality but exceptional candidates in all areas of health engineering, broadly construed, are encouraged to apply.
- Associate/Full Professor in Financial Engineering (FE). Expertise in financial, energy, or insurance markets, risk management, and/or engineering of financial systems is especially welcome but exceptional candidates in all areas of FE, broadly construed, are encouraged to apply.

Candidates must have a Ph.D. and must demonstrate a strong commitment to high-quality research and evidence of teaching potential. Experience related to manufacturing and/or service operations is desirable. Candidates for Associate or Full Professor should have a commensurate record of research publications and are expected to provide organizational and research leadership, develop sources of external funding, build relationships with industry, and interact substantively with faculty colleagues.

Candidates should provide (i) a current C.V., (ii) a list of references, and one page summary statements describing: (iii) career teaching plans; and (iv) research plans. The application review process will begin on December 1, 2007, but the positions will remain open and applications will continue to be reviewed until appointments are made.

We seek candidates who will provide inspiration and leadership in research and actively contribute to teaching. We are especially interested in candidates who can contribute, through their research, teaching and/or service, to the diversity and excellence of the academic community. The University of Michigan is responsive to the needs of dual career families.

Send inquiries and responses to:
Professor Lawrence M. Seford, Chair
Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering
University of Michigan
1205 Beal Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2117

The University of Michigan is a non-discriminatory, affirmative action employer.
**CLEMSON UNIVERSITY**  
Department of Industrial Engineering  
Fluor Corporation Endowed Chair in Supply Chain and Logistics

The Department of Industrial Engineering at Clemson University is soliciting applications for the Fluor Corporation Endowed Chair in Supply Chain and Logistics. This position is supported by a $4M endowment created by Fluor Corporation and the State of South Carolina to establish a Research Center of Economic Excellence in Supply Chain and Logistics.

We seek a dynamic, innovative leader with a distinguished record of scholarship in supply chain and logistics. He or she will have an earned doctorate in industrial engineering or a closely related discipline with 10-plus years of academic and/or relevant commercial experience. Appointment will be at the rank of full professor. The Fluor Chair will have extensive industrial, commercial, and governmental contacts; a publication record of high-quality and high-impact interdisciplinary research; a demonstrable history of securing external funding; and meaningful outreach activities. The Chair is expected to expand the body of research and its application related to the supply chain and logistics of global capital projects and industrial facility design, construction, and maintenance.

Applicants should submit a letter stating interest in the position that cites experience relevant to the above-noted candidate qualifications, a curriculum vitae, and names and contact information for five references. Informal inquiries, applications, and nominations should be directed to Dr. WG Ferrell, Jr., Chair of the Search Committee, 110 Freeman Hall, Box 340920, Clemson, S. C. 29634-0920; Phone: 864-656-2724; fwillia@clemson.edu.

All application materials received by January 31, 2008 will receive full consideration; however the search will remain open until the position is filled. We expect that the position will be filled in August 2008.

Clemson University is an AA/EEO employer and does not discriminate against any person or group on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation or veteran status.

**NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
College of Business

The College of Business at NDSU invites applications for a full-time lecturer to teach Operations Management and Principles of Management starting Fall 2008. This is a nine-month non-tenure-track position. A Ph.D in Operations or Management is preferred (Minimum, Master’s degree) with a record of quality teaching, good interpersonal skills, and effective communication skills.

Accredited by AACSB, the College of Business has over 1,300 undergraduate and graduate students at the Fargo campus. NDSU, one of two major research universities in North Dakota, currently has an enrollment over 12,000 students.

Full information is available at:

http://www.ndsu.edu/jobs/

Please send letter of application, vita, and names of three references to Dr. Gerry Macintosh, Chair, College of Business, North Dakota State University. P.O. Box 5137, Fargo, ND 58105-5137. Send electronic applications to:

gerry.macintosh@ndsu.edu

Minorities and women are encouraged to apply. NDSU is an equal opportunity institution.

**UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - ST. LOUIS**  
College of Business Administration  
Logistics & Supply Chain Management

The College of Business Administration, University of Missouri – St. Louis, has an opening for a qualified, tenure track faculty member in Logistics & Supply Chain Management (LSCM) for Fall Semester, 2008. This position is affiliated with our new Ph.D. program in Logistics & Supply Chain Management which admitted its first students in 2007. Our goal is to hire an assistant professor, an associate professor, or a full professor with a strong track record and a willingness to play a leading role in our new PhD emphasis in LSCM. Currently, the College offers a graduate certificate and an area of concentration within the MBA in LSCM, along with PhD emphases in LSCM and Information Systems. The Logistics, Operations Management, and Supply Chain Faculty include nine tenured, tenure-track, or professionally qualified individuals. See:

http://www.umsl.edu/divisions/business/ms/

Further information may be obtained at:

http://business.umsl.edu/position_announcement.htm

---

**DSINFO Listproc**

DSINFO, a listproc maintained by the Decision Sciences Institute, broadcasts emails on news and announcements relating to DSI and the decision sciences community. The listproc can be used for announcing calls for papers and for updating news on meeting and other events. (We ask that you support the Institute by using the DSI Job Placement Service or online Marketplace to list job positions.)

DSINFO subscribers also receive notice from DSI when Decision Line articles are made available on the DSI website. Because this content is placed online prior to printing the hard-copy, the articles are available on the Internet weeks before the publications arrive in the mail.

For more information on joining DSINFO or to subscribe, visit http://mailbox.gsu.edu/mailman/listinfo/dsinfo

---

**Future DSI Annual Meetings**

**November 21-24, 2009**  
Hyatt Regency New Orleans  
at the Superdome  
New Orleans, Louisiana

**November 20-23, 2010**  
San Diego Marriott Hotel and Marina  
San Diego, California
OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS

The Institute’s 2007-08 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Secretary, and Vice Presidents elected at-large to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2009.

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, 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 DSII Fellows on this page.)

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

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

Decision Sciences Institute Fellows

Adam, Everett E., Jr., University of Missouri-Columbia
Anderson, John C., University of Minnesota
Benson, P. George, University of Georgia
Beranek, William, University of Georgia
Berry, William L., The Ohio State University
Bonini, Charles P., Stanford University
Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia State University
Buita, Elwood C. (deceased), University of California-Los Angeles
Cangello, Vincent (deceased), University of Southwest Louisiana Carter, Phillip L., Arizona State University Chase, Richard B., University of Southern California Chervany, Norman L., University of Minnesota Cleppner, James M., Aladdin TempRite
Collins, Rodger D., Drexel University Couger, J. Daniel (deceased), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummins, Larry L. (deceased), University of Minnesota
Darden, William R. (deceased), Louisiana State University Davis, K. Rocco, University of Georgia Davis, Mark M., Bentley College Day, Ralph L. (deceased), Indiana University Dignan, 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 Fetters, Robert B., Yale University Flores, Benito E., Texas A&M University Flynn, Barbara B., Indiana University Franz, Lori S., University of Missouri-Columbia Grover, Fred W., University of Colorado at Boulder Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State University Grauvoig, 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 Hamner, W. Clay, Duke University Harya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State University Herschauer, 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, Julie E., Rutgers University Kendall, Kenneth E., Rutgers University Keown, Arthur J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Khumawala, Basheer M., University of Houston Kim, Kee Young, Yonsei University King, William R., University of Pittsburgh Klein, Gary, University of Colorado at 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 Mahbert, Vincent A., Indiana University Malhotra, Manoj K., University of South Carolina Malhotra, Naresh K., Georgia Institute of Technology Markland, Robert E., University of South Carolina McMillan, Claude, University of Colorado at Boulder Miller, Jeffrey G., 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 Olson, 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 Rauha, Howard, Harvard University Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Ronnuth, James K., University of Oregon Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College Roth, Aleda V., Clemson University Schade, Lawrence L., University of Texas at Arlington Schneidmengers, Marc J., University of Nebraska-Lincoln Schrubber, Thomas J., University of Michigan Schroeder, Roger G., University of Minnesota Simone, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology Slocum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist University Sobol, Marion G., Southern Methodist University Soerenson, James E., University of Denver Sprague, Linda G., China Europe International Business School Steinberg, Earle, Touche Ross & Company, Houston, TX Summers, George W. (deceased), University of Arizona Tang, Keiwei, Purdue University Taylor, Bernard W., III, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Trott, Marvin D., Kent State University Uhl, Kenneth P. (deceased), University of Illinois Vaizernt, Andrew (deceased), University of San Francisco Vos, Christopher A., London Business School Wasserman, William, Syracuse University Weemser, Robert, Urban University of Wisconsin-Madison Wheelwright, Steven C., Harvard University Whitten, Betty J., University of Georgia Whybark, D. Clay, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Wickland, Gary A., Capricorn Research Winkler, Robert L., Duke University Woolsey, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines Wortman, Max S., Jr. (deceased), Iowa State University Zmud, Robert W., Florida State University
February 20
The Southeast Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on February 20-22, 2008, at the Regal Sun Resort in the Walt Disney World Resort in Orlando, Florida. See page 29.

March 4
The Southwest Region will hold its 2008 (29th) Annual Meeting on March 4-8, 2008, in Houston, Texas, USA. See page 29.

March 18

March 28
The Northeast Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on March 28-30, 2008, at the Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge Hotel in New York. The hotel is located in New York City's most celebrated neighborhood, just across the river from Manhattan at the foot of the Brooklyn Bridge. See page 29.

March 31
The Asia Pacific Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on July 2-5, 2008, in Brisbane, Australia (South Bank campus of Griffith University). Submission deadline is March 31, 2008. See page 29.

April 1
Submission deadline for refereed submissions to the 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute, to be held November 22-26, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 31-41 for detailed information on activities. Submissions for nonrefereed submissions are due May 1st.

MAY
May 1
Submission deadline for nonrefereed submissions to the 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute, to be held November 22-26, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 31-41 for detailed information on activities.

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