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PRESIDENT’S LETTER

Renewing DSI:
We Have a Heart, We Have a Brain—All We Need Is Courage

Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University, President, DSI

It takes a great deal of courage to stand up to your enemies, but even more to stand up to your friends.1 [J. K. Rowling, British author]

In previous columns I have written about the values of communication, feedback, and simplicity. This month’s column, my last as president, is about courage.
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Decision Line, March 2008
On March 14th a rare event occurred in the heart of Atlanta, Georgia. It was not quite 10:00 p.m. Some members of the DSI Executive Committee, including Ken Kendall, Norma Harrison, Carol Latta, and Keong Leong, along with Julie Kendall and yours truly, were huddled together over dinner just a handful of miles north of the Centennial Olympic Park along Peachtree Street. Then it happened! A tornado unexpectedly struck downtown Atlanta. It swirled along Marietta Street right past DSI’s home at the Georgia State University’s J. Mack Robinson College of Business. All in all, tornadoes touched down at 13 different locations in and around Atlanta. Fortunately, the Institute and its people were safe.

In this issue, President Ken Kendall’s letter is about the virtue of courage. His previous letters, all touching the theme of renewing DSI, were about communication, feedback, and simplicity. With his term coming to a close at the end of March, this letter is the last of his presidency.

As usual, this issue brings you another set of exciting, thought-provoking essays. In the Production/Operations Management column, Feature Editor Danny Samson of the University of Melbourne, Australia, calls our attention to the need and opportunities for research on issues that reside at the interface of operations management and other functional disciplines, such as marketing, human resources management, knowledge management, and finance. He suggests that such research will bring maturity to the discipline of operations management.

As always, the Ecommerce feature column offers yet another insightful essay: In this issue, Tim DiVito of Rutgers University explores OpenID, a new authentication technology, and describes its potential for solving some of the prevailing problems. He also describes the hurdles that may confront implementation of this technology.

In the column on the Deans’ Perspective, George E. Stevens of Kent State University calls for business schools to re-examine their programs, curriculum, intellectual contributions, and other activities to adapt to the changing times. From the Bookshelf features Barbara Price and Xiaolong Zhang, both of Georgia Southern University, discussing four specific books on business forecasting. I hope you will find these articles stimulating and useful.

Krishna S. Dhir is the Henry Gund Professor of Management at Berry College in Mount Berry, Georgia. He earned his PhD from the University of Colorado at Boulder, MBA from the University of Hawaii, MS in chemical engineering from Michigan State University, and a BTech from the Indian Institute of Technology – Bombay. He has published in numerous journals, including Applied Mathematical Modeling, Corporate Communications: An International Journal, Decision Sciences, IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, International Journal of the Sociology of Language, and Journal of Information and Optimization Sciences. He has received various DSI awards, including Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper Award at the 1993 Annual Meeting in Washington, DC, and Best Application Paper Award at the 1999 International Meeting in Athens, Greece. The Penn State Harrisburg awarded him its 2001 James A. Jordan Jr. Award and 2000 Provost’s Award, both for Teaching Excellence.

kdhir@berry.edu

see image at http://www.atlantatornado.org

A tornado struck downtown Atlanta on March 14th only a few blocks away from the DSI Home Office, located at Georgia State University (photo by Shane Durrance, www.atlantatornado.org).
Under-researched: Operations Management Interfaces

by Danny Samson, Department of Management and Marketing, University of Melbourne, Australia

In this column I want to propose some ideas about important aspects of operations management, that we probably do a better job of teaching and even consulting in, than in our rigorous research. To begin, I want to suggest as a working definition that operations management (OM) is concerned with the design, conduct of, and improvement of any and every organizations’ value-adding production processes. If we consider it as a field of professional practice, underpinned by some useful frameworks and theoretical constructs, then it can be interesting to consider the relationship between elements within operations management, and elements (of management) that are outside operations management. The thought I want to put to colleagues is that we have done a much better job of researching problems that are wholly within operations management, than those which span the boundary, and that there is much good work to be done on trans-boundary problems. If that is true, perhaps we should prioritize more work on the more challenging and complex inter-functional problems that are indeed real in most industries, which we have under-researched.

Key examples of ‘interface’ issues are at the boundaries of operations management, marketing, human resource management, and financial/performance management. There are many others, too. While recent decades have seen the field of operations management make a lot of progress on applications to service industries, solid consideration of environmental issues, and extensions from single firm operations to consider supply chain management, have we largely neglected the functional interfaces challenges?

First, consider the interface with marketing: there are many practical problems in which the marketing mix and the operations strategy configuration should be jointly considered, and hopefully jointly optimized. The design of the product or service itself has massive marketing (e.g., revenue, consumer attractiveness, market positioning pricing, and channel to market) and operations implications. Clearly the complexity of a product, product family, set of offerings, degree of customization that is built in, level of technology, and other design elements have massive impacts on efficiency and cost, and on the market outcomes. What theories and models do we have and what empirical studies exist in our top journals that provide insights about what, how, and how much various approaches deliver superior overall outcomes? There are some studies, but not many. Perhaps the reason is to do with how we are organized, trained as researchers, and rewarded in our universities. As a sweeping generalization, I assert that it is generally easier to do and to publish research within a field than that which spans across fields. Too few of us in operations management work with colleagues in marketing and other fields, hence the ‘under-research’ outcome of the ‘big’ problems, which would be okay, except that these trans-discipline problems are actually some of the most important challenges faced by practitioners who need guiding frameworks, best practice tips, etc. We
need to build theories that integrate the operations strategy set with the marketing mix. We need to do more case study research at this key interface, and then we need some large-scale studies that validates ‘what works’ in general, and then details of what works in various sectors, industries, and big versus small companies. On the particular subject of optimizing the firm’s offerings, how does the ‘cost of complexity’ manifest, where I assume here that product range complexity generally brings marketing benefits (up to a point), but also drives direct operations and overhead costs. There are many other issues of practical importance at the marketing-operations interface. How best to develop and integrate new products and services into mainstream operations is a further example that needs more research. This leads to a consideration of the interface of operations management and technology management, which is another area of some real complexity in organizations, in which we need to work more on theory and practice in order to guide professional practice. To the extent that here is real theory in either innovation management or technology management, have we been able to integrate it with that of operations management? How does it manifest in different industries, from commodities such as mining and oil, through traditional manufacturing, to pure services, and even the new economy? In asking these questions, it seems to me that we are at a fairly early stage of knowledge in relating operations management knowledge to most of these other areas, in the sense that we cannot yet write a definitive ‘handbook,’ can we? We collectively have some solid foundational ideas, but cannot yet describe detailed conditions and generalizable relationships between variables, much less ‘best practices’ for different contexts.

Now to the interface of OM with human resource management (HRM), which I loosely and practically interpret as attracting, motivating, keeping and developing people to be the best they can be in achieving organizational goals. My proposal that operations management includes ‘conducting’ the operations, clearly includes people as the key element being managed. Most OM practitioners (from plant managers to call center managers) tell us that they spend most of their time and effort on ‘people issues.’ We clearly have researched some issues in this domain well, and interface fields such as ergonomics, process, and facility design are useful, yet I propose that the management of people towards the achievement of great levels of efficiency, quality, flexibility, innovativeness, etc., are under-researched by POM scholars. These matters are often left to human resource management scholars, who may not understand the OM implications of various HR parameters. Just how the pure ‘people factors’ interface with issues of facilities location and design/layout, capacity management, process design, technology choices, insourcing/outsourcing levels, various forms of ‘lean’ and quality management, Six Sigma, business excellence frameworks, supply chain designs, and many other factors is of central interest to practitioners, but because it spans research discipline boundaries, we have not done enough solid research on it. There is a lot of new knowledge about ‘human factors’ in terms of what makes for high-performing organizations that I believe should be integrated with mainstream OM research, if not even contained within it. It’s a big claim to suggest that operations management is indeed line management, or that OM actually includes line management as a subset of it, or is it? The many line managers I know who are effective are so at least substantially because of their success in motivating and coordinating their shop floor people, as much as their technical systems. Ask any competent line manager whether (s)he would prefer to get better at lifting morale and staff engagement or applying waiting line queue models and what answer would you expect? We should be researching both types of challenges. How about rewards for staff: this is an area where much more work is needed to understand how extrinsic rewards combine with intrinsic rewards to impact the behavior of staff within operations and the resultant performance outcomes.

We should also be doing more and better on the relationship between financial performance measurement and operations management. The degree of refinement of knowledge is low on the relationships between OM variables and various measures of financial drivers and outcomes, such as asset turns, inventory turns, margins, overhead cost allocations, cost of quality/waste, return on assets, etc. Measures of some of the more complex outcomes of operations such as flexibility and innovation are under-researched. Few would deny the importance of measures in organizations, but how much do we precisely know about exactly which measures work best and in what context, and at what level of aggregation? Accounting professors are teaching balanced scorecard approaches now and are researching how these scorecard and dashboard performance metric systems can work, but they mostly don’t have the detailed understanding of how operations actually work on the ground, and they need our help, or at least our joint efforts.

A key input to operations improvement is information and knowledge, probably more so today than ever. Yet, most knowledge management and information system management researchers do not span the boundary in their work. In the fully digital world, we have E-everything, but not all that much integration of information and knowledge management research in operations management studies. How does knowledge management as a field of progress best contribute the feedback necessary to drive operations performance forward? What method of knowledge management works best in various operational context? What forms of information, level of aggregation of information incentives for using it, work best? What are the knowledge management strategies and systems that best complement various operations or process types?
Sustainable development (SD) is another growing area of interest and concern for managers, including operations managers. By SD, I mean both the correct balancing of short-, medium- and long-term outcomes and perspectives in resource allocation, and the balancing of outcomes for all the organizations stakeholders. Operations managers increasingly need to consider these matters in designing and running their systems. In mining, it’s increasingly about the environmental outcomes and the social and local community outcomes, as well as the productivity, cost and quality of the mineral ores extracted. It’s about the mine’s footprint these days, as much as purely the profit. Since these issues are of major concern to mine site managers, we should be researching these challenges and guiding them. And the same applies to every other industry. No longer is the problem of designing operations just about the pure profit outcomes for the facility owner/operator, but we must increasingly include the other two bottom lines as well as the financial: namely, the environmental and social/community outcomes. Have we adequately researched these new demands on operations managers and how best to deal with them? I would say that we have got about as far as ‘scratching the surface.’ In all these matters, this is not to say that there are absolutely no studies addressing these issues, rather the point is that we have not developed theories and field studies that are comprehensive.

My final suggestion for doing a better job on researching key challenges related to OM is somewhat different: namely, that we have cranked out a generation of statistical analysts and survey hounds who do a lot of field studies using perception data and running very sophisticated statistical models on that data, finding things that mean relatively little to the advancement of the field. I have done at least my share of this, speaking, for example, as immediate past president of the Global Manufacturing Research Group, which does important survey-based research better than most. What happened to the stream of good work that came from model building in the decision and management sciences? That work still goes on, but it feels increasingly disconnected to what the top OM journals look for. It’s still hard to get case study research done really well, and even when it is done well, it’s hard to get it accepted in ‘great’ journals (perhaps due to the lack of a root mean square statistic). My question here is whether we have collectively in our work efforts and top journals orientation lost the balance of what a variety of research approaches can bring in the way of valuable insights. As one who has done a fair amount of mathematical modelling, statistical analysis of survey data, and case study work, I’d hate to see us lose the diversity of value and knowledge brought by any of these three types of contribution. This is not an argument for going back to tweaking the EOQ model or queuing theory, but neither is it an argument to not do useful mathematical modelling and case study work that answers real problems and challenges as part of valued OM research.

Journal editors, deans, and department heads can collectively keep an eye on what is being worked on and actively encourage a refocus where it is needed. For example, special issues of influential journals can effectively stimulate research in ‘gap’ areas. Even better, top OM journals could specify inclusion of a broad range of categories, including interface issues as discussed above, and methodologically diverse studies as a way of affirming a collective commitment to these things, if they are considered valuable. In summary, we have collectively come a long way forward in a couple of decades, from EOQ to sophisticated supply chain models and field studies, to cover services, too, and now is the opportune time to thoroughly research how best to connect the operations engine of the organization to the surrounding and connected functions and activities. We will be able to really drive maturity into the field of operations management when we can clearly trace quite precisely, and under different conditions, just how OM connects to marketing, financial management, knowledge management, Human Resource Management, sustainability, and other aspects of how organizations conduct themselves and create value in societies and economies. I look forward to seeing all that in a handbook! ■

13th Annual Asian-Pacific Decision Sciences Conference Brisbane, Australia July 2-5 2008

Are you looking for an opportunity to attend a meeting with other experts in decision sciences? The 13th Annual Asian-Pacific Decision Sciences Conference is being held in sunny Brisbane, Queensland from the 2nd to the 5th July 2008. Papers on decision making are being presented in a variety of disciplines. (Submission deadline was March 31, 2008.)

Full conference registrants will be provided dinner and entertainment at the Australian Outback Spectacular and a trip to the Lone Pine Koala Sanctuary. On the Saturday after the conference, a trip to the Sunshine Coast is planned. On this trip delegates have the option of a free tour of the Sunshine Coast including a visit to the University of the Sunshine Coast (a major sponsor of the conference) or being dropped off to spend some time at Steve Irwin’s Australia Zoo (cost $49 per person) or the local Ginger Beer factory (cost $10.95 per person for the tour).

As well as the refereed conference proceedings, relevant papers from the conference will be considered for further publication in highly ranked international journals including the Australasian Journal of Information Systems, the Journal of Electronic Commerce and the Artificial Intelligence Review. Other refereed journal outlets are also possible in various specialised areas. In addition, papers submitted in the area of digital security will be considered for a book chapter scheduled for publication with IGI Global. To learn more about the conference or to submit a paper or book chapter visit:

More often than not, we find that the intersection of human behavior and software is worthwhile in the way it facilitates communication, improves decisions, and bolsters infrastructure. Unfortunately, Web-based human-computer interaction also provides ample room for confusion, errors, and even fraud. In this month’s exciting column, our contributor Tim DiVito explores an all-too familiar problem of the growing proliferation of passwords needed to conduct secure ecommerce transactions on Web sites. In this instance, both humans and software bear responsibility where ecommerce Web site security is at stake. Our contributor examines current solutions for authorization and authentication, and then investigates a new technology called OpenID that shows great potential to solve some of the authentication problems, which only show signs of increasing over time. While OpenID exhibits promise, Tim offers valuable insights into the barriers to implementation that lie in wait for the unsuspecting adopter. [Kenneth E. Kendall, Feature Editor]

OpenID: A Potential Authentication Technology
by Timothy DiVito, Rutgers University

How many username and password combinations do you use on the Web, 10, 25, 100 or more? OpenID is an emerging technology that provides an easy way to take all of these passwords and combine them into a single set of credentials that you can use on any OpenID-enabled Web site. OpenID is not a specific kind of authentication, but a framework that allows Web developers to program their sites to pass on the job of authentication to an external trusted OpenID provider who then passes back the authenticated user for authorization.

OpenID is a technology developed by Brad Fitzpatrick, formally of LiveJournal, to simplify the user experience by allowing one single set of online credentials to control many different accounts online [9]. This technology may not yet be ready for high-value accounts like banking institutions and credit card companies and does not currently have many active sites; however, this emerging technology is definitely worth using to create accounts that are currently available.

This technology, if implemented, should make it easier for users to keep all of their credentials safer and more secure. Because OpenID lets users choose which provider they wish to use, they are allowed to single out a provider that is trustworthy, thereby making their information safer. Furthermore, since users only need to give a secure password to a single site, their password is kept more secure than if they had given it to many different sites. This should ultimately lead to a more seamless user experience for all users of OpenID.

How Web Site Authentication Works

Before explaining how OpenID works, it is important to understand how the process of Web site authentication works. There are two separate processes that occur when a user attempts to sign in using a username and password on a basic Web site. First, is the process of Authentication, which is a "process of attempting to verify the digital identity of the sender of a communication such as a request to log in" [6].
How OpenID Authentication Works

OpenID is solely designed to handle the Authentication part of the process [5]. When users enter their OpenID URL, they are instantly forwarded to their personal OpenID provider, who then authenticates them using whatever method they choose. Once the site is satisfied that the user is who he is asking to sign-in as, he is forwarded back to the original site, along with any information the user wants to send to the site, like email, phone number, address, and so on.

Andrew Conray-Murray [1] from InformationWeek gave a very concise example on the basic technical process in which OpenID operates:

OpenID 2.0 has three basic elements: a user with a Web browser (User Agent); a Relying Party (the Web site the user wants to log on to); and an OpenID Provider, which asserts that the user owns a particular URL. The OpenID Provider may also possess a variety of identity elements, such as a user’s name, date of birth, and e-mail address (see diagram, p. 64). When a User Agent signs on to a Web site with an Identifier (a URL), the Relying Party contacts the Provider for an assertion that the user owns the Identifier. Messages are exchanged using HTTP Post and Get. OpenID uses Diffie-Hellman key exchange to negotiate a shared secret to sign communications.

When a Relying Party contacts the OpenID Provider, the OpenID Provider asks the user to authenticate, then confirms which identity information it should send to the Relying Party. If the user consents to provide the identity elements requested by the Relying Party, the OpenID Provider sends them. The Relying Party processes the elements, and the user is logged in. [1, p. 64].

OpenID version 2.0 is currently in the process of being implemented. It has a more detailed set of directives that can be called by the relaying party for more specific information.

Benefits of OpenID Authentication

OpenID is beneficial to the end users in the following ways: First, users are able to use a single set of credentials for the majority of their Web accounts, eliminating a great deal of confusion, as well as the time needed to try multiple username/password combinations until the correct one is found.

Second, users are able to choose their own OpenID provider. The framework is open source, so there are an unlimited number of possible providers. Users are even able to set up their own OpenID system, given the proper technical skills. This means that the user is able to place their trust in a specific provider, maybe one with a long-standing history, a company like VeriSign or AOL, instead of some random, possibly unreliable site.

Third, the security of the user’s password itself is enhanced. Since most people do not use a new, separate password for each and every online account they have, it would be inherently more secure to expose your password to one trusted provider instead of many different Web sites, each with varying levels of security.

Potential Barriers to Implementation

The OpenID framework has many potential downsides. They include the already pervasive use of username/password combinations already in use as well as the vulnerability of the system to Phishing attacks.

According to an article in The Times of India, before removing the exact number of pages that it indexed, Google boasted over 8.16 billion Web pages in its index [4]. In the highly unlikely event that Google stopped indexing any new pages on that day, and only one hundredth of those pages required login credentials, each having no more than 250 user accounts, there would be over 20.2 trillion different user accounts in the world today.

The general public has become complacent with the current process of authentication, and it is going to be difficult to change minds, as well as perceptions, on how the technology should function. In addition, even after the average Web surfer is convinced of the
benefits of the system, they still have to wait for the Web sites themselves to spend the time and money to convert their system to using OpenID, which leads to problems in and of itself.

If potential customers want to create an account on a Web site, and they do not yet have an OpenID, is the site going to start forcing people to obtain an OpenID before using the system? Will that drive people away? Even if the end user is content with creating an OpenID, is the site going to recommend a specific provider, or just let people try to find one on their own? What happens if the site recommends a provider that proves to be untrustworthy? Is the site then liable for damages to all of the end users affected should something go wrong? Clearly, OpenID needs to be implemented slowly, so that users are encouraged to embrace the technology and not forced to use it, even at their own peril.

Ever since computer viruses first came to light around 1982 [5], hardware and software designers have been plagued by malicious programs designed specifically for wreaking havoc on computers. In 1990, a new kind of cyber attack, called Phishing, entered the arena. Its first instance was tracked to America Online, where AOL users tried to get other users to give them their AOL passwords by using tricks to make the user think that they were actually talking to a real AOL representative, even if their passwords were being compromised [2, 3]. Recently, Phishing has become a serious problem.

Spammers are sending messages to millions of accounts, hoping to get account passwords and credit card information. It has gotten so bad that now programs can be purchased with the sole purpose of looking for Phishing attacks. OpenID is vulnerable to these attacks as well. The difference, however, can be drastic if the user is using the technology heavily. It would be bad enough to find out that a single user account has been hacked, but unthinkable to discover that your OpenID password has been stolen, opening your account on many different Web sites. So, the barrier to implementation of OpenID in this case is the risk that a single stolen password can be used to compromise many different accounts all at once. Of course, this risk is minimal if most users use only a single password to sign in to all of their accounts anyway.

Alternatives to OpenID
There are a few different alternatives to the OpenID process that also try to enhance the user experience of authentication. Automatic form fillers are the first example. These are programs that are installed on a single computer that allow the user to use a single master password to manage all of their accounts on that computer. Roboform (www.roboform.com) is one of the most popular form fillers. It was originally designed to be installed on a single computer, but has now expanded to a portable application that can be placed on a USB drive and taken to multiple computers. Password Safe is another program similar to Roboform but is available for both Windows and Linux operating systems. These programs do not suffer from Phishing attacks, but can be hacked or mutated by viruses and spy-ware and have their own security concerns.

In addition to third-party programs for password security, most modern Web browsers will save passwords previously entered into their browser, some even have this feature turned on by default. The biggest problem with this feature is the inability to use the passwords on other computers. OpenID can be used from any computer at any time, while browser-based passwords can only be used on a single computer, and are not easily transferable. In addition, users would be locked into using that browser if it has the saved password information and would be unable to change to another browser without re-entering the information.

OpenID is able to be used from any browser that will support Web-based forms. This not only includes Windows, Mac and Linux, but also mobile phones and portable handhelds that are unable to have software installed on them. Microsoft has also committed themselves to this technology by adding it to their newest version of Windows, Vista, with a program called Card Space. OpenID even works on the iPhone!

Recommendations
Since OpenID is a free service, available to anyone, there is no reason not to get an OpenID now. How many times have you tried to sign up for an account on a Web site, just to get your potential username rejected because someone already has it? It is important to do research on some of the main providers of OpenID. If, for example, you have an account with AOL or AOL Instant Messenger, you already have an OpenID which is available at http://openid.aol.com/screenname

This is also the case with LiveJournal, Technorati, Vox, and WordPress, which are all OpenID providers. If you want a new account, here is a list of well known providers from the OpenID Web site.

- VeriSign Labs (https://pip.verisignlabs.com/)
- ClaimID (https://claimid.com)
- Myid.net (https://myid.net)
- MyVisopp(https://myVisopp.com)

Go to openid.net/get to get a full list of providers.

One of the advantages to choosing VeriSign Labs as your OpenID provider is their commitment to an enhanced process called two-factor authentication. Two-factor authentication uses more than one piece of information to authenticate you. For example, I was able to purchase, for a small fee, the small key ring dongle shown in the photo below.
When the button on the dongle is pressed, a number is generated that VeriSign is expecting. After 30 seconds, that number is not valid and a new one needs to be issued to login. This makes it almost impossible for a hacker who is remotely stationed in China to gain access, even if they were able to get both your password and your secret code.

This type of authentication combines ‘something you know,’ which is your password, with ‘something you have,’ being the dongle itself. VeriSign also offers a way for users to register their cell phone to receive a text message with this type of code in the event that they lose their dongle and need access to their account. Other OpenID providers may be doing similar things, but so far, it seems that VeriSign is one of the most secure providers available.

Conclusions
The OpenID framework has been designed to give end users an easier way to manage multiple accounts online while also giving them a choice as to whom they will trust with their most sensitive information. This emerging technology should make signing into minor accounts much easier, but it is questionable whether it is a technology that can be implemented for sites containing sensitive information such as credit card statements and banking information. The potential for that kind of pervasiveness is there, but it would require an enormous amount of trust from the end user to actually make this happen.
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Isn’t it Time to Stop Making Clones of Ourselves?

by George E. Stevens, College of Business Administration, Kent State University

Deans, especially those who are leaders of professional schools, face a myriad of challenges. Leadership requires the acts of encouraging, leading, supporting, and implementing change within their own business schools.

Business school deans, among professional school deans, have witnessed major upheavals in the faculty marketplace with sharply escalating salaries and now “packages” being presented by mint-new faculty members who have never proved themselves. They must gear up their business schools to face challenges presented to them by AACSB—no, not the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). That’s the old one! The new one is a different organization, an overdue rebirth of an important institution that was focused predominantly on one continent—North America. Fortunately, AACSB International (AACSB stands for Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) is an organization that serves business units on a global basis but the higher education context within which that management education exists. For deans who love a long-term comfort level of 10 years between accreditation visits, there is no such luxury under the five-year visit and ongoing continuous quality improvement approach of the new standards or the accountability challenges of the Assurance of Learning section of the current standards.

The backdrop above is necessary to understand why I am very concerned that many business schools in the U.S. are rapidly losing ground. As an “old hand” with AACSB International in the role of peer-review team chair, mentor, and consultant, I travel around the world (e.g., Abu Dhabi, Bangkok, Belo Horizonte, Quebec City, Montreal, Dubai, London, Normandy, France, Clermont-Ferrand, France, Hong Kong, Mexico, Sao Paulo, Saudi Arabia, Shanghai, Singapore, Tainan (Taiwan), Tokyo, and Venezuela, among other places). I will generalize: I am seeing faculty who appear to work longer hours, serve more students, more fully integrate theory and practice, and who are paid less than professors in the U.S. The faculty are research productive and hang their collective hats on intellectual contributions but are not married to
using Cabell’s and counting of citations for their academic peer-reviewed journals in determining their own academic worth and self esteem. Many of the faculty equally value discipline-based work and contributions to practice research. In fact, France’s Grand Ecoles work with regional chambers of commerce and businesses to match the needs of the region to the academic and professional programs they develop. The students put in longer hours in the academic setting, are more respectful of the faculty, are focused less on working countless hours in fields totally unrelated to their perspective fields and more on learning and studying, are better educated, and have a global perspective. In addition, students are multilingual or at least bilingual. Often they learn how to do business in other countries. Books such as Kiss, Bow, or Shake Hands are great resources to help business students and business people learn about traveling and doing business abroad. Many programs outside the U.S. (OUS) include management curriculums that require multiple international experiences, application of the theoretical knowledge they have gained through professional apprenticeships, junior consultancies, internships, and projects. Some of the business schools outside of the U.S. require that their graduate students create viable companies that sell a product or service. I am pleased to note that many U.S. business schools are moving beyond typical study abroad programs in locations of interest to various faculty members. As Karin Fischer notes in a recent article in the Chronicle of Higher Education, “Traditionally, American higher education has relied on study-abroad programs to supply students with many of the international perspectives they need: An understanding of other cultures, economies, and political systems . . . .” However, U.S. employers note that recent graduates lacked the skills to succeed in a global economy.

Change will be important for AACSB and for our business schools in that the ability to change the future in academe hinges upon our ability to turn out a new breed of professor who approaches today’s world differently. They must not be clones of current faculty who are typically, if engaged in doctoral programs, rooted chronologically in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Most of these individuals are teaching the way they were taught, espousing values that they have embraced for decades (e.g., “if the doctoral student is mostly interested in students and teaching, he or she does not belong in our doctoral program”). Doctoral learning can only occur at the altar of abject poverty and supplication because all students must be willing to give up their life of comfort and earnings to be mentored at our feet. (Translation: Only full-time programs count.) At the top of the heap are the elite schools that want to shape young minds. Older, experienced students need not apply. Students who cannot help us lift our GMAT scores to the stratosphere need not apply. Research and ratings are king. When (or if) we allow you to pass through our hallowed portals, we offer you a Ph.D., the “true” research degree, and a belief that you obtained a G.O.D. in the process. In my mind, only medicine’s output, the M.D., is worst in the latter regard of garnering greatness for mining to the greatest depth an important but narrow slice of knowledge. If we are honest with ourselves, that is what dissertations represent; mining subject matter to the greatest depth possible, although the breadth of the knowledge is not very broad.

Business schools embrace the value that teaching, research, and service represent critical activities that we do in our profession. However, it is my sense through it all, that many, many business school faculty members fail to practice what they preach. They fail to teach the soon-to-be faculty members how to value teaching or the rudiments of doing it. Many students are not prepared for the diverse student environment of this decade or century, nor are they prepared to facilitate learning for working adult learners (especially those who work as managers and executives, who are willing to challenge, think they have something to say, and absolutely believe if they pay the tuition, you owe them your (undivided?) attention. It is an interesting time where continuing studies/education units are begging for the faculty members who can engage in active learning processes. Private, for-profit schools and business schools that are entrepreneurial seek out faculty members who have high-level work experience of significant duration to participate in management development and executive education programs. Rollins College takes care of business—executive education. The College hires professors who have lots of corporate experience, corporate training, and savvy so that the professors facing the students in their MBA, management development and executive education programs can facilitate learning and learn from their students. Some of the business schools are actually taking a closer look within their classrooms only to discover that the traditional students as we used to know them are harder to identify or find. An even closer look reveals another trend that apparently the Homeland Security Department and Immigration and Naturalization Service have not quite figured out: Higher percentages of our graduate and doctoral programs are peopled by students (if they can get into the country) from places such as Thailand, China, and India. Business school leaders abroad are thanking us in the U.S. for making it harder for these students to be admitted here.

On the one hand, there are faculty members who act like independent contractors, pretending to need no one, to report to no one, and to answer to no one. For example, sections of a course are taught by four faculty members teaching from three or four different books, taught from different academic perspectives, without consultation with each other as to learning goals, objectives, and outcomes. Just give us the budget we want. Just pay us the salaries we want. Just give us the reduced loads we want. Regional accreditation bodies and AACSB are demanding that our academic enterprise practice as-
These agencies are requiring accountability. Why in heck would we want to be accountable for what we say?!

Sadly, the verbal message is that research is really important. If you fail to do good research, you will likely remain unemployed, underemployed, or turned out by the academy. Is there any accountability here? No, doctoral students are assigned to someone for the purpose of doing a dissertation (if they reach that stage), but beyond taking research methodology classes, writing papers, being a “go-fer” (a research assistant who runs data analyses as instructed or does other ‘grunt work’), it is not clear that Ph.D. programs really work with the students to help them understand what this “research” thing is, how it works, how to do it, who to work with, how to interpret reviewer comments, how to address those comments, and the importance of timely turnaround or, more critically, how they can be successful when they are assistant professors pursuing tenure and promotion.

What I hope folks within the academy can do is debate these points, suggest a reality that people can perceive and embrace, and recognize the challenges we face, but also understand what the implications are if we do not change.

Clearly, as an example, internationalizing the college experience is a huge challenge for all institutions. Can we afford not to internationalize? My response would be an emphatic “No!” My own campus is a blended mix of several thousand students in residence on our largest campus and twice as many who commute to campus. Many of these students are less interested in tours at our Geneva or Florence campuses or places where we have partners (e.g., Laval University in Quebec City, Canada or the University of the Americas in Puebla, Mexico among other locations). Therefore, we work to change general education offerings, look closer to home at businesses that are tied to global services and trade, and discuss job opportunities that have an international focus. Every academic discipline and every department or other academic unit must accept responsibility for providing an internationalization of the curriculum. Students and faculty members need to understand how globalization affects their disciplines, majors, or other fields of study. Although globalization should not be left to international studies or foreign languages departments, such units have an opportunity to adjust their thinking and their curriculums to entice more students to engage in global or international activities. For example, most foreign language departments focus on language, enunciation, and grammar in their teaching. I am convinced that students, especially business students, will be “hooked” if they readily see that there is relevant information that helps them. Students who learn how language, enunciation, grammar, time orientation, goal orientation, culture play a role in success or failure in conducting business in a country or part of the world of interest to them are more likely to see the value of learning Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Portuguese, Spanish, French, or other more popular languages. A collaborative effort by faculty, students, staff, and administrators can make this globalization a reality for all, but it requires change in both our language departments and our business schools.

Noting in particular, that as Homeland Security and the Immigration & Naturalization Service intervene in our efforts to look abroad for bright talent in places such as Japan, China, and India among other places, we have become less attractive to the raw material we need for our graduate and doctoral program. My point: Before thinking about all that went before, we face a serious “pipeline problem” that has begun to encourage the outstanding international students to look in directions such as Europe and Australia. We have the internal challenge for our graduate and doctoral students that our stipends are too low. We hold rigidly to the idea that Ph.D. programs are for those willing to sacrifice to do them on a full-time basis despite the evidence that Capellas University, Walden University, The University of Phoenix, and so many other private, for-profit universities present us. In fact, we have created this whole, not-so-new industry. I remember when Arizona State University colleagues learned of the University of Phoenix back in the early 1980s. The faculty members at ASU said what many people at mature industries say, “There is plenty of room for everyone. We are certainly not afraid of the University of Phoenix!” In writing this article, I realize that for our industry that old saying is true, “We have met the enemy and it is us.” We are a very mature industry in a most dynamic, global environment. We must change to recognize and adapt to that fact and the double whammy of respected schools abroad (many earning “our” accreditation), and bright students who are determined to come to the U.S. As with textiles, rubber, steel, chemicals and other (now rust belt) industries, we must change. Are we, like those industries just named, going to be the last to recognize the need to do so?

Endnotes

1. Faculty members familiar with a particular country have long driven where business schools establish global partnerships for international exchange programs. Today, some business schools are thinking more strategically in terms of study abroad programs, research partnerships, and entrepreneurial academic programs.

2. Source: Association of American Colleges and Universities employers’ survey.

3. Note AACSB’s 2003 standards and the several standards built around accountability and assessment captured as “Assurance of Learning.”

4. If people doubt the maturity of the U.S. business school industry note that many of the elite schools are now located across the country from their original city of residence and in countries with plenty of students, a willingness to pay, and a desire for the prestige an elite American brand name brings them. AACSB is very busy with accreditation but note that the major activity is coming outside of the United States.
FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Is One of these Texts Right for Your Business Forecasting Course?

by Barbara Price and Xiaolong Zhang, Georgia Southern University

The success of today’s companies relies more than ever on an accurate knowledge of the quantity, quality, and variety of products that customers demand as they clamor to add value through supply chain optimization. As a result, forecasting has increasingly become a shared and collaborative activity in order to balance the demand and supply equation and coordinate supply chain operations more effectively. The cross-boundary outlook of current businesses presents an opportunity for us to take stock of available introductory forecasting texts on the market. Our purpose is to provide a frame of reference for business faculty members who are at the beginning of their academic careers and are assigned to deliver a forecasting course.

In our combined careers, we have taught forecasting as part of management science or operations management curricula and have consulted internally or externally with large corporations on forecasting projects. Readers will get a more comprehensive picture from texts focusing exclusively on business forecasting. Therefore, operations management and management science texts with selective (often limited) coverage on forecasting are left out, as well as econometric and statistical texts that devote little attention to forecasting. Seeking input from colleagues and surveying the numerous texts on the market, we have made the decision to narrow our list to texts that have, in a way, stood the test of time with at least four editions and have been recently updated. Four texts that survived our rough-cut screening are listed below along with their abbreviations used in this review:

- Business Forecasting, by John E. Hanke and Dean W. Wichern, (HW)
- Elements of Forecasting, by Francis X. Diebold, (Diebold)
- Forecasting, Time Series, and Regression, by Bruce L. Bowerman, Richard T. O’Connell, Anne B. Koehler, (BOK)
- Business Forecasting, J. Holton Wilson, Barry Keating, and John Galt Solutions, Inc., (WKJ)

This short list is obviously influenced by our preferences and is not meant to be all inclusive. It does cover, however, a wide spectrum of possibilities for an adopting faculty, which in our view is a minimal criterion to justify any such list. In the remainder, we first present an overview of these texts, followed by more detailed evaluations of strengths, weaknesses, targeted audience, and interesting or unique content of each text. We conclude with our thinking on the current state of affairs and the future of business forecasting as an area of instruction.

Overview

The four texts are distinct in scope and depth of coverage, the degree of integration with forecasting software, and the availability of supplemental materials. To quantify the scope of coverage, we aggregated and categorized important topics from the four texts and calculated the number of pages devoted to each topic and the associated proportions as a percentage of the total pages of a book (excluding appendices, statistical tables, and index). We designed a rating scale from 0 to 3 for measuring the depth of coverage and the interpretation of the scale is as follows:
0: The text has no or a nominal coverage of a topic

1: The text presented key terminology and concepts on a topic

2: 1 plus illustrative examples

3: 2 plus analytical, evaluative, and insightful discussions

To facilitate comparison, we constructed the included table in which the key characteristics of each text are tabulated (see Table 1).

The body of the texts ranges from 353 to 673 pages long, the prices range from $129.00 to $168.95. All texts except BOK are tied in with a specific software platform, and accompanying datasets are readily available in multiple forms. Solutions manuals are available either online or in print.

Diebold is the only text that assumes a prior knowledge of regression and focuses almost exclusively on time-series topics. All other three texts devote an equal number of pages to regression and time-series methods. The depth of coverage on each topic varies from text to text, with BOK maintaining a more consistent rating across topics. The choice of topics and depth of coverage are diverse enough in our view to provide the necessary freedom of choice for an adopting faculty.

Summary of Each Text's Unique Features, Strengths, and Weaknesses

Business Forecasting and Student CD Package, 8/E
John E. Hanke, Eastern Washington University, Emeritus
Dean W. Wichern, Texas A&M University
Prentice Hall, 2005, 608 pp

The text is an excellent overview of time series forecasting beginning with a discussion of the interplay among forecasting process, historical data, exploratory graphical techniques to identify underlying patterns in data, measures of forecasting accuracy, and model. The coverage then moves to specific methods in the order of smoothing methods for stationary, trend and seasonal patterns, decomposition, simple linear and multiple regression, ARIMA, and an overview of judgmental forecasting and neural networks. Each topic is clearly presented including concepts and excellent worked examples that reflect realistic business scenarios and application areas. The text is easy to follow, and the outputs can easily be replicated.

We found from the publisher's website that the ninth edition of this text is in press with an estimated availability date of 1/18/2008. The advertised upgrades from the eighth edition appear to be updating the computer applications and adding additional cases and problem sets. The table of contents indicates that the topic coverage will essentially remain the same and, thus, a review of the eighth edition material and approach should provide information to assist in a decision of whether to adopt the ninth edition of HW.

Strengths of the text include clear, concise explanations of methods that tie well to application examples and emphasize conceptual understanding rather than mathematical derivations. In addition, each chapter includes relevant problem sets and cases that allow readers to reinforce their learning, extend their understanding of the method, and appreciate its applicability and value for managerial decision making. The authors are able to include somewhat complex concepts like intervention analysis and series transformations in a manner that flows smoothly and is comprehensible to readers with mathematical backgrounds that need not go beyond college algebra and basic statistics.

Weaknesses include the following: (a) the software applications in the eighth edition were for Excel 2000 plus Crystal Ball Predictor 2000 and an older version of Minitab. The promotion materials on the ninth edition indicated that these software applications would be upgraded. Unfortunately, the upgrades will be outdated on publication as schools begin to migrate to Windows Vista and Office 2007. Other coverage was not as current or complete as we would like. For example, the statistics review lacks Excel applications and uses large sample/small sample theory. Forecasts for smoothing methods are limited to point forecasts. Additionally, regression identification relies on correlations rather than scatter diagrams, which could lead to misidentification of a trend. Occasionally things are oversimplified. For example, MR model building is based on $R^2$ and regression models are claimed to be always causal.

Overall, this is a text we would consider an appropriate candidate for an undergraduate BBA or MBA elective course and a viable quick reference tool for a practitioner if the authors and publishers can correct the application software issues.

Elements of Forecasting, 4/E
Francis X. Diebold, University of Pennsylvania
Thomson Southwestern (now Cengage), 2007, 458 pp

In the fourth edition, this text is most appropriate for a forecasting course offered through an economics department or programs that contain substantial econometrics content. The text begins with brief chapters covering an introduction to the book and recommendations of useful resources, statistical review focused on simple linear regression, guidelines to successful forecasting, and graphics for forecasting. Following that, the body of each main chapter contains fundamental coverage, examples, and Exercises, Problems, and Complements that build upon and extend the chapter coverage. The additional coverage introduces new theory and topics. The methodology content integrates regression and Box-Jenkins. The presentation is mathematically rigorous and concise, embedded with ap-
plication examples that illustrate the key techniques and appropriate interpretation.

Strengths of the text include an insightful chapter entitled, “Six Considerations Basic to Successful Forecasting.” In addition, the material on the use and power of statistical graphics is pertinent, offering excellent guidelines on style and a delightful example. From this point onward, the coverage moves to modeling. The trend chapter was interesting, and we found many instances of clear, well-stated, useful forecasting wisdom embedded in the mathematical treatment of topics. The last two chapters, one on unit root processes and one on GARCH models, explain the modern and more advanced concepts with insight and intuition, and they are a must read for students who want to pursue further studies in the forecasting area.

Diebold presents a unique interpretation of cycles – “All we require is that there be some dynamics, some persistence, some way in which the present is linked to the past and the future to the present.” (See page 112.) This broad interpretation of cycles sets the stage for using ARIMA models to describe cycles underlying data, long or short, and it is not easily appreciated without a basic understanding of difference equations or the frequency domain. As noted in the text, this forms a sharp contrast with the conventional notion of cycles (termed rigid cyclical patterns in the text) that typically have durations much longer than the cyclical patterns that many ARMA processes can generate. Students may find it curious that the forecasts of Canadian employment (Section 8.5) based upon ARMA models converge to the unconditional mean and no obvious cyclical patterns exist in the long forecasting horizon, a property shared by all ARMA models. They may have welcomed a more tangible demonstration that links the ARMA processes to the conventional notion of cycles, given the emphasis of the text on this broad interpretation.

Although Diebold has used his text successfully at Wharton for both undergraduate and executive education, we feel that the style of presentation may be formidable to students in other AACSB accredited programs. The text, we believe, best serves the needs of those who are more prepared quantitatively or those who have the ambition to pursue advanced degrees in quantitative areas such as econometrics, applied statistics, or finance.

**Forecasting, Time Series, and Regression, 4/E**
Bruce L. Bowerman, Richard O’Connell, and Anne Koehler, Miami University of Ohio
Thomson Brooks/Cole (now Cengage), 2005, 672 pp

BOK seamlessly blends application and technical rigor. All key chapters begin with a substantive and well-designed example to motivate a forecasting model, introduce key concepts, and illustrate the business implications from model results. Rigorous technical presentation usually follows with more numerical examples to demonstrate how sophisticated formulas work, which may even appear overly detailed for some readers. The coverage is well balanced on regression and time-series approaches, actually containing sufficient material in each for a two-semester sequence, one primarily devoted to regression and one to time-series. The text can also serve the needs of a one-semester introductory course that surveys the basic methods of regression and time-series methods. Or it can be adopted for an advanced forecasting course in which topics like model building in regression, non-stationary time-series, intervention, and transfer-function models can be covered.

One of the strengths of BOK lies in its pedagogical features. Most examples and exercises are designed and motivated with convincing scenarios from business on why the forecasting results are needed. They are then solved in steps with meticulous detail to reveal the process of implementing a forecasting technique and the logical connection between steps. BOK freely embeds output from a mix of popular software including SAS, Excel, and Minitab. This emphasizes the fact that the logic behind a forecasting method is self-contained and can be implemented in any software platform. BOK presents and discusses interval forecasting estimates for every forecasting technique along with their point estimates, as an interpretative tool as well as a visual representation of forecasting accuracy. It is the only text we reviewed that presents the complete formulae for calculating forecasting error variance for the popular smoothing methods. The more advanced and mathematical treatments are usually boxed and self-contained, which affords an instructor the flexibility to pick and chose the appropriate level of rigor.

One weakness of BOK is its lack of coverage on more recently developed methods such as forecasting combination, time-varying conditional variance, and neural networks.

The application-focused design and the adaptable level of rigor and depth make BOK appropriate for a number of audiences. With careful selection of the boxed mathematical content, the book can be used for an undergraduate forecasting class. By focusing on its applications, it can serve the needs of an MBA class. In its entirety, BOK is suited to a course in which students are expected to develop expertise in forecasting and maintaining forecasting projects, an audience that may encompass master-level economics students, an applied statistics program, or MBAs in majors such as finance and operations with strong quantitative training.
### Table 1: Key characteristics of each text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Sets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data sets for Matlab, Excel or other programs are included on the text CD and available on the website.</td>
<td>Data Sets for Matlab, Excel or other programs are included on the text CD and available on the website.</td>
<td>Data Sets for Matlab, Excel or other programs are included on the text CD and available on the website.</td>
<td>Data Sets for Matlab, Excel or other programs are included on the text CD and available on the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Available on the website, downloadable for free by adopting faculty.</td>
<td>Solutions are available to all exercises and the associated data sets are available to adopting faculty.</td>
<td>Solutions are available to all exercises and the associated data sets are available to adopting faculty.</td>
<td>Solutions are available to all exercises and the associated data sets are available to adopting faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor's Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Available on the website, downloadable for free by adopting faculty.</td>
<td>Solutions are available to all exercises and the associated data sets are available to adopting faculty.</td>
<td>Solutions are available to all exercises and the associated data sets are available to adopting faculty.</td>
<td>Solutions are available to all exercises and the associated data sets are available to adopting faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Coverage/Proportion of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Coverage/Proportion of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Coverage/Proportion of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Coverage/Proportion of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Coverage/Proportion of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
<td>2 / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages of Coverage/Proportion of Text</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
<td>2 / 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Depth Evaluation: 0 = No or minimal coverage, 1 = Terminology and Key Concepts, 2 = 1 plus illustrative examples, and 3 = 2 plus analytical, evaluative, and insightful discussion.
WKJ is fully integrated with Forecast X, an Excel add-in for forecasting. The technical material starts with simple smoothing methods, followed by two chapters on regression, a chapter on decomposition, a chapter on ARIMA models, and a chapter on combining forecasts. In each topic, Forecast X is used to chart and manage data, generate forecasting results, and make canned reports. The ease to generate quick forecasts represents a strong selling point of this book. The book did the best to avoid the black box approach by giving a reader enough technical background on why and when a method works.

One specific area that we find lacking is the construction of interval forecasts based upon the standard measures of accuracy for smoothing and ARIMA time-series models. The majority of the data used for the exercises are real-world; however, most exercises, themselves, are content with obtaining point forecasts. One does not get a sense of why the forecast might be important in the first place or how it might be used, something that is important for the intended audience of this text.

The text contains a GAP case that is analyzed continuously in each chapter to showcase the forecasting methods presented, a unique feature termed “Integrative Case” in the book. For example, in Chapter 3 in which smoothing methods are covered, the Integrative Case predicted GAP’s overall sales using quarterly data form 1985 to 2004 that exhibits both nonlinear time trend and seasonality. In Chapter 5, in which multiple regression is presented, seasonal dummies and time trend variables are used to predict the same series. The continued case allows students to apply various forecasting techniques in a familiar context and appreciate that forecasting is not a mechanical or robotic exercise, but rather a managerial task that requires skills, knowledge of the business and, most importantly, the appropriate fit of a forecasting method to data on-hand.

The text is best suited for an MBA audience that wants to acquire a solid understanding of important forecasting techniques and how they work. Given the limitations of the exercises mentioned before, an adopting faculty may be forced to supplement the exercises with additional cases or more comprehensive problems that illustrate the process of forecasting beyond simply generating the point forecasts.

A Tentative Assessment

Based upon our reviews, discussions and experience, each of the texts has unique strengths and weaknesses that make it appropriate for a course that you may be planning. The preferred state of the art for teaching forecasting can be assessed through the demands of today’s companies. When quick and simple forecasts of individual data series are required for making decisions, all four texts with the exception of Diebold will sufficiently prepare a student for the task. Simple smoothing methods and regression can be implemented with minimal cost even if the number of data series is large. When accurate forecasts are needed for critically important products and services, BOK, HW, and Diebold are up to the task as they cover advanced techniques and model evaluation tools. None of the texts, however, provides tools that can generate efficient forecasts that involve multiple dependent variables or multiple information streams. This void will become more visible as companies with complex supply chain operations demand collaborative or shared forecasts. There may be demand for a text that can bring more advanced topics in multivariate and collaborative forecasting to the undergraduate or MBA level.

SEDSSI Hosts Successful Meeting in Orlando

The 38th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Region of the Decision Sciences Institute was held on February 20-22, 2008, in Orlando, Florida. Chaired by Barry Wray of UNC-Wilmington, the meeting was attended by 162 members of SEDSSI and consisted of 121 papers in 40 sessions and 15 workshops/panels/tutorials. A Distinguished Service Award was bestowed on Hope Baker of Kennesaw State University for her record of service to the Southeast Region. In addition to an outstanding student paper award given to Samantha Lee of the University of Sydney in Sydney, Australia, three papers were recognized and received awards as the best paper in their track:

“The Influence of Math and Computer Self-Efficacy” by R. Franklin Morris, Jr. of the Citadel, and Evelyn H. Thrasher of University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth

“Analysis after Output II – Decision Trees” by Kenneth R. MacLeod of East Carolina 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 to 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
ANNOUNCEMENTS (see more information on related conferences and publications at http://www.decisionsciences.org)

Institute Meetings
The 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 22-25, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 21-31 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 July 2-5, 2008, in Brisbane, Australia (South Bank campus of Griffith University). Submission deadline was March 31, 2008.

http://www.apdsi.org
http://www.cit.gu.edu.au/conferences/apdsi08/

The Indian Subcontinent Region held its first conference on January 2-4, 2008, at IMT Ghaziabad, India. Planning is underway for the next meeting.

The Midwest Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on April 17-19, 2008, at the Courtyard by Marriott, Erie, Pennsylvania. Submission deadline was February 22, 2008. Contact Diane Parente, Program Chair, Pennsylvania State University, dhp3@psu.edu.

http://www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

The Northeast Region held its 2008 Annual Meeting on March 28-30, 2008, at the Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge Hotel in New York. Contact Snehamay Banerjee, Program Chair, Rutgers-Camden University, nedsiy@camden.rutgers.edu.

http://www.nedsi.org

The Southeast Region held 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 19). Contact Program Chair Barry A. Wray, UNC Wilmington, wrayb@uncw.edu.

http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region held its 2008 (29th) Annual Meeting on March 4-8, 2008, in Houston, Texas, USA. Contact Program Chair Kai S. Koong, University of Texas-Pan American, koongk@utpa.edu.

http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region held its 2008 (37th) Annual Meeting on March 18-22, 2008, at the Town and Country Resort, San Diego, California, USA. Contact Program Chair Mahyar Amouzegar, California State University, Long Beach, 562-985-8032, mahyar@jamds.org.

http://www.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers
Conferences
The Operations Management Division of the Academy of Management will hold its 2008 doctoral consortium at its conference in Anaheim, California, USA. This half-day event will be held the morning of Sunday, August 10, 2008. The AoM Conference is the premier venue for empirically-focused Operations Management research. The consortium follows an intensive research incubator format. Students present their research proposals to a panel of distinguished faculty that provides feedback and guidance on each proposal. To ensure the highest quality feedback, faculty also review the proposals prior to the event. This format has proven valuable as students refine and complete their dissertation proposals, and it is very engaging for the doctoral faculty as well.

Doctoral students working on any Operations Management topic may participate. Space is limited. Preference is given to students employing empirical research techniques in their dissertation work. Preference is also given to those students who are “mid-career” within their doctoral program; that is, those who have formulated a dissertation research proposal but have not yet carried through the bulk of the dissertation research. The research incubator format is generally less appropriate for students in the early stage, or concluding stage, of their doctoral program. Students may attend the consortium once during their doctoral career. Students who have attended other doctoral consortia find this consortium uniquely beneficial due to its sole and intensive focus on developing research.

Outstanding faculty with proven empirical research records serve on the consortium faculty panel. Students also interact with the doctoral faculty at a sponsored breakfast. Faculty and student participants from past consortia can be reviewed by following the hyperlinks below. Discounted lodging is available for students (see the conference website and reserve early).

Applications consist of the following: vita, your full contact information, your advisor’s contact information, one-sentence statement on your stage in the doctoral program, and a one-page summary of your dissertation research. Formatting instructions for the summary should be downloaded from the consortium chair’s website (url below). Electronic applications are required. Applications are accepted through April 25, 2008. Applications will be acknowledged via email by May 2. Please email the application to the consortium chair: Prof. Thomas F. Gattiker, College of Business and Economics, Boise State University, TomGattiker@BoiseState.edu.

http://itscm.boisestate.edu/tomgattiker/aom/
http://om.aomonline.org

Publications
A book edited by Dr. Al Bento and Dr. Anil Aggarwal (University of Baltimore, USA) seeks chapters related to “Threats of Cyber Warfare on Global E/M-Commerce: Strategies for Successful Information Security.” The book is scheduled to be published by IGI Global, www.igi-global.com,
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 in 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, see the link from the DSI annual meeting website (below).

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.


**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.

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

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 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

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.

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

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 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
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.

Yair Levy, Nova Southeastern University, levvv@nova.edu; Irma Becerra-Fernandez, Florida International University, becferi@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.

Binhshan 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.

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 DSIs 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
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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. **Furthers 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, 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:
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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/AI/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 Prahinski, 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 Kohers, 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
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

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

Supplemental Letter

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

Evaluation

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

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

All applicants, including the finalists, will be notified by June 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

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: ________________________________
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 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.
The Board of Directors took some bold steps at the January Board meeting by proposing a number of changes to our Constitution and By-laws. I applauded the Board for having courage. Proposing these changes is not easy, especially, as the above quote states, when you are proposing changes to your friends.

These proposed changes by the Board were made in the spirit of renewing the Institute. These issues were discussed in a special strategic planning retreat in August where no votes were taken. Charges and subcommittees were created at the conference and I assigned every Board member to at least one committee. The chairs of the committees were selected from those attending the meeting.

The charges that came from the retreat were published in the October issue of *Decision Line*, along with the names of the chairs and committee members. In November, we held our first ever Town Hall Meeting. At this meeting, we tried to seek the opinions of you, the membership, while encouraging you to contact the appropriate Board members with comments regarding any issues discussed during the retreat.

Renewal is not an easy process. The Board has proposed changes to our Constitution, which can be changed only if two-thirds of the membership who return their ballots agrees with the proposed changes as outlined in our Constitution. The DSI Constitution and By-laws can be found on our Web site at www.decisionsciences.org

At the time I am writing this column, the ballots are on hold. Seven of the 22 current DSI Board members have effectively stopped the ballots from going out to the membership by petitioning for a Board meeting, as is their right under the Constitution, to address the ballots.

In my opinion, the intent of the proposed changes was misunderstood, and the ideas brought forth by the Board were not given a chance to flourish. I hope that future Boards will still be willing to make difficult decisions and take them to the membership for approval. The work we all did at the Strategic Planning retreat and in committees thereafter will hopefully be fulfilled someday and make the Institute even stronger.

Ultimately, I want to thank those Board members who had the confidence and courage to not reverse their decision concerning the proposed changes. It was very difficult for them to hold their ground under pressure. Their articulate responses to their fellow Board members clearly showed their integrity. I would also like to thank our Executive Director Carol J. Latta for taking full responsibility for drafting the statement to the membership concerning procedures for making proposed changes to the DSI Constitution and By-laws. Carol is certainly courageous and has been an enormous help to me throughout my term as president.

In conclusion, with apologies to L. Frank Baum for borrowing his metaphor to title this column, I thank everyone who has helped build a better “Emerald City” this year; that includes the entire Board, the Program Committee and participants of the 2007 Annual Meeting, Alpha Iota Delta, the officers from each of our eight regions, and the Home Office staff, especially Eric Foston and Mary Redmon, who helped make everything run smoothly.

I also value and appreciate the editors of our journals and official publication who served this year: Vicki Smith-Daniels (DSJ); Barbara B. Flynn

See PRESIDENT’S LETTER, page 34
Newly Elected 2008-2009 Decision Sciences Institute Officers

**President-Elect**

**Ram Narasimhan**


**Treasurer**

**Christine T. Kydd**

is an associate professor in the Business Administration Department at the University of Delaware. She holds a BA in mathematics from Bucknell University, an MBA from Drexel University, and a PhD in decision sciences from The Wharton School of Business, University of Pennsylvania. She is the author of articles in *Information and Management, Journal of Computer Information Systems, Journal of Education for Business, Omega, MIS Quarterly*, and *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*. She is also a member of the Association for Information Systems and INFORMS.

**At-Large Vice President**

**Robert L. Andrews**

is an associate professor in the Department of Management at Virginia Commonwealth University. He holds a BS in mathematical statistics and an MA in mathematics from the University of Alabama, and an MS in statistics and PhD in statistics from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He is the author of articles in *American Statistician, Biometrika, Communications in Statistics, Decision Sciences, Journal of Economic Education, and Journal of International Accounting*. He is also a member of American Society for Quality, American Statistical Association, INFORMS, Phi Kappa Phi, and has served as chair of the VCU School of Business Faculty Council, president of the Faculty Senate for Virginia Commonwealth University, and president of the Faculty Senate for the State of Virginia.

**At-Large Vice President**

**Shaw K. Chen**

is associate dean, professor and director in the College of Business Administration at the University of Rhode Island. He holds a BA in business administration from National ChengChi University, an MA in economics from the National Taiwan University, and a PhD in business administration from the University of Michigan. He is the author of articles in *American Statistician, European Journal of Operational Research, Interfaces, International Journal of Production Economics, Omega, and Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*. He is also a member of the American Statistical Association, Financial Management Association, and INFORMS.

**At-Large Vice President**

**Gary Klein**

is the Couger Professor of Information Systems in the College of Business and Administration at the University of Colorado, Colorado Springs. He holds a BS in industrial management, an MS in industrial administration, and a PhD in management from Purdue University. He is the author of articles in *Decision Sciences, Decision Support Systems, IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, Information and Management, Management Science*, and *MIS Quarterly*. He is also a member of the Association for Computing Machinery, Association for Information Systems, INFORMS, Project Management Institute, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and American Society for the Advancement of Project Management.

**At-Large Vice President**

**Marc Schniederjans**


**Asia-Pacific Regionally-Elected Vice President**

**Linda G. Sprague, Rollins College**

is the Thomas J. Petters Distinguished Professor of International Business at Rollins College. She was previously Professor of Manufacturing & Operations Management at the China Europe International Business School (CEIBS) in Shanghai.

**Midwest Regionally-Elected Vice President**

**Gene Fliedner**

is an associate professor in the Department of Decision and Information Sciences at Oakland University. He holds a BBA in marketing from Texas Christian University, and an MBA and DBA in operations management from Indiana University. He is the author of articles in *Decision Sciences, European Journal of Operational Research, International Journal of Production Research, Journal of Operations Management, Production and Inventory Management*, and *Computers and Operations Research*.

**Northeast Regionally-Elected Vice President**

**R. Daniel Reid**

is an associate professor of operations management in the Decision Sciences Department at the University of New Hampshire. He holds a BA from the University of Maryland, an MBA from Angelo State University, and a PhD from the Ohio State University. He is the co-author (with Nada Sanders) of *Operations Management: An Integrated Approach* (Wiley, 2007). He is the author of articles in *Academy of Management Review, Production and Inventory Management, The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administrative Quarterly, The OM Review, Mid-American Journal of Business*, and *Target*. He is also a member of the Academy of Management; APICS, The Educational Society for Resource Management; Phi Kappa Phi; and Production/Operations Management Society.*
publisher of the IGI Publishing (formerly Idea Group Publishing), Information Science Publishing, IRM Press, CyberTech Publishing, Information Science Reference (formerly Idea Group Reference), and Medical Information Science Reference imprints. Abstract submission deadline is March 30, 2008. Chapter submission deadline is June 16, 2008. Inquiries and submissions can be forwarded electronically (Word document) or mail to: Al Bento (abento@ubalt.edu), Merrick School of Business, University of Baltimore; A. K. Aggarwal (aaggarwal@ubalt.edu), Merrick School of Business, University of Baltimore.

IJOQM seeks articles for a special issue on “Improving Productivity through Effective Scheduling.” This special issue of IJOQM is dedicated to investigating how to make scheduling to become more competitive in today’s highly competitive business environment. All papers involving basic, applied, theoretical and case study research in the field of scheduling are invited. Guest editor is Dr. Ceyhun Ozgur, Valparaiso University (ceyhun.ozgur@valpo.edu). Submission deadline is October 1, 2008.

http://www.ijqom.org/Info_authors.pdf “Information for Authors”

Human Resource Management seeks papers for a special issue on “Human Resource Management and Supply Chain Management.” Examples of topics include cross-cultural management challenges in the supply chain and the management of co-located employees. Guest editors are Mary Graham, Clarkson University (graham@clarkson.edu); Sandra Fisher, Clarkson University (sfisher@clarkson.edu); Stephan Vachon, HEC Montreal (stephane.vachon@hec.ca), and Ann Vereecke, Leuven Gent Management School and Ghent University (ann.vereecke@vlerick.be). Submission deadline is November 30, 2008.

http://www.hec.ca/gop/ Call_for_papers_Human_Resource_Management.pdf

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)

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

---

**Faculty Position in Industrial and Systems Engineering**

THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST invites applications for a tenure-track position at the Assistant Professor level in the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering in the area of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research. A Ph.D. degree in Industrial Engineering, Operations Research, or a closely related field is required. We especially encourage candidates with interests in Healthcare Systems including Medicine, Biology and Bioinformatics and Systems or Services Engineering.

Faculty members are expected to develop a strong sponsored research program, mentor graduate students and contribute to the teaching and learning experience of undergraduate and graduate students.

The University of Massachusetts Amherst is situated ninety miles west of Boston in the vicinity of four vibrant liberal arts colleges in a region offering exceptional and diverse cultural and recreational opportunities.

Applications should, in a single PDF file, provide a statement of their teaching and research interests, curriculum vitae, names of at least four persons who may be contacted regarding the candidate’s qualifications and a brief abstract for a seminar to be presented if invited for an interview. The Department, with twenty four full-time faculty members (three female, two Hispanic) has a strong commitment to diversity and welcomes applications from women and candidates from other minority groups. Review of applications will begin March 3, 2008 and continue until suitable candidates are identified.

Applications preferred by email: ic_search@ecs.umass.edu
Mail: Chair, IE Faculty Search Committee, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, University of Massachusetts, 160 Governors Drive, Amherst, MA 01003-9265.

*The University of Massachusetts is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and members of minority groups are encouraged to apply.*

---

**Endnotes**


2. L. Frank Baum is the author of 52 novels including *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*, 1900.
2007 Independent Auditors’ Report
To the Members of the Decision Sciences Institute, Inc.

I have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. (the “Institute”) as of June 30, 2007, and 2006, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Institute’s management. My responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on my audits.

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

In my opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. at June 30, 2007, and 2006, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

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

James Dykhouse, CPA
September 26, 2007

---

### STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION
June 30, 2007 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$199,142</td>
<td>144,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>464,275</td>
<td>412,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, less allowance for doubtful accounts of $3,955 in 2007 and $955 in 2006</td>
<td>25,330</td>
<td>20,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>3,052</td>
<td>3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred charges</td>
<td>18,557</td>
<td>9,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>710,356</td>
<td>597,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, less accumulated depreciation of $129,173 in 2007 and $120,971 in 2006</td>
<td>18,767</td>
<td>9,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 729,123</td>
<td>$607,938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities and Net Assets |       |        |
| Liabilities – current: |       |        |
| Accounts payable | $ 23,924 | 25,284 |
| Accrued vacation expense | 23,354 | 23,354 |
| Accrued retirement benefits | 3,803 | 10,568 |
| Deferred revenue: |       |        |
| Convention deposits | 3,890 | 4,445 |
| Membership dues | 84,550 | 101,475 |
| Total current liabilities | 139,521 | 165,126 |
| Net assets - unrestricted | 589,602 | 442,812 |
| $ 729,123 | $607,938 |

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

---

Congratulations to Drs. Thomas F. Hawk and Amit J. Shah of Frostburg State University’s College of Business, who were recognized at the DSI 2007 Annual Meeting. Their paper “Using Learning Style Instruments to Enhance Student Learning” was named 2007 Best Paper in the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education.
Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. (the “Institute”), founded in 1969, is a not-for-profit professional organization consisting principally of researchers, managers, educators, and students interested in decision-making techniques and processes in private and public organizations.

(b) Principles of Combination

The financial statements include the combined operations of the Institute and six regional organizations. For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2007, and 2006, the accounting transactions of the regions were handled through Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. All material interregion balances and transactions have been eliminated.

(c) Basis of Accounting

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

(d) Basis of Presentation

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

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

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

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

As of June 30, 2007, and 2006, all net assets of the Institute are unrestricted.

(e) Cash Equivalents

Cash equivalents consist primarily of short-term cash investments and certificates of deposit with maturities of 90 days or less. For purposes of the statement of cash flows, the Institute considers all short-term, interest-bearing deposits with maturities of three months or less to be cash equivalents.
### SCHEDULE 1: COMBINING SCHEDULE OF REVENUE, EXPENSES, AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS INFORMATION

**Year ended June 30, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Northeast DSI</th>
<th>Southeast DSI</th>
<th>Midwest DSI</th>
<th>Southwest DSI</th>
<th>Western DSI</th>
<th>Asia DSI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$239,873</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>346,138</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>33,986</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>55,302</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>14,085</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and interest income</td>
<td>16,837</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized and unrealized losses on investments</td>
<td>19,098</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>4,631</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed support from affiliate</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>702,722</td>
<td>31,971</td>
<td>41,752</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>14,019</td>
<td>56,489</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>237,061</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>229,069</td>
<td>38,897</td>
<td>23,826</td>
<td>11,589</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>48,396</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>76,247</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>36,501</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>578,878</td>
<td>39,512</td>
<td>24,477</td>
<td>12,204</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>53,191</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in net assets</td>
<td>123,844</td>
<td>(7,541)</td>
<td>17,275</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>8,099</td>
<td>3,298</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>216,721</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>53,913</td>
<td>24,977</td>
<td>39,544</td>
<td>61,017</td>
<td>(3,693)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$340,565</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>42,792</td>
<td>71,188</td>
<td>25,802</td>
<td>47,643</td>
<td>64,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Home Office net assets differ from the Internal Financial Statements by the amount of accrued vacation expense, $23,354, and accrued retirement benefits of $3,803, for a total of $27,157. See accompanying independent auditors’ report.

---

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

**Year ended June 30, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Northeast DSI</th>
<th>Southeast DSI</th>
<th>Midwest DSI</th>
<th>Southwest DSI</th>
<th>Western DSI</th>
<th>Asia DSI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$204,630</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>327,544</td>
<td>24,795</td>
<td>27,645</td>
<td>14,520</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>77,240</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>52,466</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>23,826</td>
<td>11,589</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>48,396</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>8,965</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and interest income</td>
<td>11,256</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>(138)</td>
<td>19,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized and unrealized losses on investments</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed support from affiliate</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>617,055</td>
<td>27,158</td>
<td>29,953</td>
<td>15,573</td>
<td>3,835</td>
<td>79,278</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>261,884</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>3,488</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>215,988</td>
<td>34,301</td>
<td>23,095</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>58,985</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>88,639</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>56,272</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>622,884</td>
<td>35,085</td>
<td>23,879</td>
<td>16,183</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>64,473</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in net assets</td>
<td>(5,829)</td>
<td>(7,927)</td>
<td>6,074</td>
<td>(610)</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>14,805</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>222,550</td>
<td>58,260</td>
<td>47,839</td>
<td>25,587</td>
<td>38,256</td>
<td>46,212</td>
<td>(4,094)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$216,721</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>53,913</td>
<td>24,977</td>
<td>39,544</td>
<td>61,017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Home Office net assets differ from the Internal Financial Statements by the amount of accrued vacation expense, $23,354, and accrued retirement benefits of $10,568, for a total of $33,922. In addition, Board of Director Meeting expense, President’s Fund and Executive Director’s Fund have been reclassified from Member Services (as displayed in the Internal Financial Statements) to Supportive Services (Audit Report).
NOTES, from page 36

(f) Investments
Investments are carried at fair value as determined by readily available quoted market prices.

A summary of investments with cost and unrealized appreciation at June 30, 2007, and 2006 is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Unrealized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market fund</td>
<td>$52,098</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond mutual funds</td>
<td>104,150</td>
<td>(2,957)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stock mutual funds</td>
<td>302,270</td>
<td>8,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$458,518</td>
<td>5,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(g) Deferred Charges and Deferred Revenue
Deferred charges and deferred revenue, relating to conventions and membership dues, are charged to expense or recognized as revenue in the corresponding period of the activity.

(h) Contributed Support from Affiliate
Georgia State University (the “University”) provided office space to the Institute in the amount of $8,000 and administrative support totaling $3,000 in both 2007 and 2006. These amounts have been reflected in the accompanying financial statements. The Institute makes payments to the University for any other supporting services received.

(i) Equipment
Equipment is carried at cost. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the related assets. When assets are retired or otherwise disposed of, the cost and related accumulated depreciation are removed from the accounts and any resulting gain or loss is recognized in income for the period. The cost of maintenance and repairs is charged to income as incurred; significant renewals and betterments are capitalized. Depreciation expense is $8,202 and $6,244 for 2007 and 2006, respectively.

(j) Use of Estimates
Management has made certain estimates and assumptions relating to the reporting of assets and liabilities and the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities to prepare the financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

(k) Reclassifications
Certain 2004 amounts have been reclassified to conform to the 2005 presentation.

(2) Income Taxes
The Institute qualifies for tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (the Code) as a charitable organization, whereby only unrelated business income, as defined by Section 512 (a)(1) of the Code, is subject to Federal income tax.

(3) Pension Plan
All eligible employees of the Institute are participants in the Georgia State University Retirement Benefits Program. Participants in this benefit program must contribute 5% of their annual salaries to either the Georgia State University Retirement Plan (the “Plan”) or the Teachers Retirement System (the “System”), a multiemployer, cost sharing public employee retirement system. The University makes contributions to the Plan or the System, based on actuarially computed funding requirements. The Institute makes payments to the University based on the University’s estimation of the cost allocated to the Institute’s participating employees. Payments to the University for the Plan totaled $14,533 in 2007 and $17,547 in 2006.

In 2000, the Institute’s board of directors approved a retirement plan qualified under IRS code section 401(a). The purpose of the plan is to make up for the past absence of retirement benefits on supplemental salaries paid by the Institute. All full-time employees of the Institute that receive supplemental salaries and meet certain requirements for years of employment and vesting will receive benefits under this plan. The following payments were made under this plan for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2007 and 2006:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current years obligation</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>$1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to reduce unfunded liability</td>
<td>6,765</td>
<td>7,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total payments under the plan</td>
<td>8,354</td>
<td>9,469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 DSINFO 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, 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
Bontin, Charles P., Stanford University
Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia State University
Burda, Elwood C. (deceased), University of California-Los Angeles
Cangolosi, Vincent (deceased), University of Southwest Louisiana
Carter, Phillip L., Arizona State University
Chase, Richard B., University of Southern California
Chervany, Norman I., University of Minnesota
Clapper, James M., Aladdin Temples
Collins, Rodney D., Drexel University
Couper, J. Daniel (deceased), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummins, Larry L. (deceased), University of Minnesota
Darden, William R. (deceased), Louisiana State University
Davis, K. R., Roscoe, 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
Fetter, Robert B., Yale University
Flores, Benito E., Texas A&M University
Flynn, Barbara B., Indiana University
Franz, Lori S., University of Missouri-Columbia
Glover, Fred W., University of Colorado at Boulder
Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State University
Grauwoerg, Dennis E. (deceased), Boulder, City, Nevada
Green, Paul E., University of Pennsylvania
Groff, Gene K., Georgia State University
Gupta, Jatinder N.D., University of Alabama in Huntsville
Hahn, Chan K., Bowling Green State University
Hammer, W. Clay, Duke University
Haya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State University
Hershauer, 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-Colorado Springs
Koehler, Anne B., Miami University
Krajewski, Les J., Notre Dame University
LaForge, Lawrence, Clemson University
Latta, Carol J., Georgia State University
Lee, Sang M., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Luthans, Fred, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Mabert, Vincent A., Indiana University
Malihowtr, Manoj K., University of South Carolina
Malihowtr, 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
Raffa, Howard, Harvard University
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Renmuth, James R., University of Oregon
Ritman, Larry F., Boston College
Roth, Aleda V., Clemson University
Scheidke, Lawrence L., University of Texas at Arlington
Schniedern, Marc J., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Schriber, 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
Sorensen, 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, Kwei, Purdue University
Taylor, Bernard W., III, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Trott, Marvin D., Kent State University
Uh, Kenneth P. (deceased), University of Illinois
Vaizyorni, Andrew (deceased), University of San Francisco
Voss, Christopher A., London Business School
Wasserman, William, Syracuse University
Wemmerloev, Urban, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Wheelwright, Steven C., Harvard University
Whitten, Betty J., University of Georgia
Whybark, D. Clay, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wicklund, Gary A., 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
APRIL
April 8
Extended 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 21-31 for detailed information on activities. Submissions for nonrefereed submissions are due May 1st.

April 17
The Midwest Region will hold its 2008 Annual Meeting on April 17-19, 2008, at the Courtyard by Marriott, Erie, Pennsylvania. Contact Diane Parente, Program Chair, Pennsylvania State University, dhp3@psu.edu.

MAY
May 1
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 21-31 for detailed information on activities.

JULY
July 30
Submission deadline for the Doctoral Student Consortium, to be held at the 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute (November 22-26, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland). See page 30 for detailed information.

SEPTEMBER
September 15
Application deadline for the New Faculty Development Consortium, to be held at the 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute (November 22-26, 2008, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland). See page 30 for detailed information.

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