Becoming More International

Norma J. Harrison, CEIBS, President, DSI

I start my term as president of the Decision Sciences Institute with a sense of honor and responsibility. The members have elected, and have entrusted this position to, the first non-American, non-resident of the U.S. I hope to be worthy of this trust and that this constitutes the beginning of many such elected positions as the DSI progresses towards a truly international organization. Much has been mentioned in recent years about the internationalization of the DSI.

Just before submitting my first president’s letter to the Decision Line editor, a tragic incident occurred in the country I now reside in and call “home.” The earthquake in Sichuan Province, China, had a great impact in its suddenness, the many lives it claimed, and the devastation and sorrow it created. What was remarkable though was the massive, quick decision making and response by the government, army, and civilians in the rescue efforts. This relief effort was a splendid illustration of effective logistics, operations planning, and quick execution of disaster recovery. Effective mobilization of the rescue mission involved the use of water channels when road and rail were damaged and under repair, the use of mobile telephony through satellite when telephone lines were down, the sourcing and delivery of food and tents, organization of national and international funding (aid), not forgetting the presence of leadership as when both the president and premier were at the helm of control at the disaster sites, nor the recognition that professional counseling and care of survivors were crucial for recovery.

Very important, in addition to the marshalling of resources, was the evidence of prioritization of decisions. For example, once the rescue efforts turned to recovery, a top priority became the draining of lakes created by the collapse of mountains to prevent the bursting of their banks and destroying of life and property downstream.

See PRESIDENT’S LETTER, page 34
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FROM THE EDITOR

KRISHNA S. DHIR, Editor, Berry College

This issue brings you the inaugural letter from our new president, Norma Harrison of CEIBS, China. Norma has the distinction of being the very first president of our Institute from outside the United States. Her election marks an exciting milestone in the evolution of the Decision Sciences Institute. In her letter, she outlines the goals and objectives that will guide the Institute during her tenure at the helm.

Our Institute has come a long way since 1969, when 16 visionaries, spearheaded by Dennis E. Grawoig of Georgia State University, created the American Institute of Decision Sciences. This issue brings you a lively conversation between Clay Whybark of the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill and Natasa Christodoulou of California State University Dominguez Hills. This interview gives us a sense of what motivated the founders of our Institute to come together and create this fine association of academics and practitioners. It reminds us of the motivations and vision of the founders, and describes the early culture of our Institute. It is appropriate to reflect on these things as a new team takes charge of the leadership of the Institute.

We include in this issue the paper that made Thomas Triscari, Jr., of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute a finalist for the 2007 Instructional Innovation Award. Triscari describes developing decision-making capacity through an experiential and engagement coaching (EXEC) approach. He states, “Where some traditional approaches to teaching ‘quantitative methods for decision making’ begin at problem solving, the EXEC approach seeks to complement problem solving by empowering students to confidently approach, identify, define, and solve problems through immersive, experiential, engagement exercises. . . .”

In the January issue of Decision Line, Research Issues Feature Editor Miles Nicholls of RMIT University provided us with a glimpse of various challenges associated with managing academic research in Australia. In the current issue, Brian Lehaney of Coventry University and Steve Clarke of the University of Hull describe the management of research and research funding in the United Kingdom.

Our Institute has finally appeared on Wikipedia! In the Ecommerce feature column, Feature Editor Ken Kendall of Rutgers University describes how he developed an article on the Decision Sciences Institute on Wikipedia and also offers helpful suggestions to our readers for creating their own articles.

In the Deans’ Perspective feature column, Bin Jiang of DePaul University reports on his findings that firms with former business school professors in executive positions perform better than those that do not have such executives. This is especially the case in smaller firms. Jiang states, “Whereas professors lack the generalist orientation of a CEO, . . . VPs and professors are similarly specialized. It is worth noting that in practice, VPs frequently guide and counsel CEOs. They serve as sounding boards, give focused insights, and help CEOs make better management decisions.” He discusses implications of his finding for doctoral education.

We hope you will enjoy this issue of Decision Line. Please let us hear from you with suggestions and comments. Happy reading! ■
Over the course of a lively conversation held in December 2007, Natasa Christodoulidou of California State University Dominguez Hills interviewed Professor D. Clay Whybark of the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill. Professor Whybark talked about his involvement with the Decision Sciences Institute, discussed his long association with the Institute, and provided insights into its early years and future potential. [Krishna S. Dhir, Editor]

A Conversation with…
D. Clay Whybark
by Natasa Christodoulidou of California State University Dominguez Hills

Natasa: How did your association with the Decision Sciences Institute begin?

Clay: In the early 1950s and 1960s, there was an Operations Management interest group in the Academy of Management. We met as part of its meeting in Cleveland, Ohio. In addition to me, there were two other individuals interested in the area at the meeting. We had observed that there was not a lot of interest for the operations perspective at the Academy of Management. We wanted something that better suited our academic needs. Unfortunately, there was nothing to satisfy us at that time. Fortunately, this need became one of the foundation stones for the Decision Sciences Institute early in its formation.

We wanted the Decision Sciences Institute to be distinct from other academic organizations in one particular way. We wanted it to be an organization that was multidisciplinary, inclusive of different disciplines and not exclusionary like some of the other organizations that were then in existence. Again, it is important to understand that there was nothing that met our needs at that time. We needed something that was managerial but also cross-disciplinary in its orientation, not like the alternative organizations that were then promoting old-boys-club networking within narrow areas. The only organization that existed at that time which came anywhere close to resembling what we sought was The Institute of Management Sciences.

The Decision Sciences Institute started as the American Institute of Decision Sciences with 16 people. The operations management component was added with about 20-25 people. Soon, the Institute ended up with a membership of about 100 people during its early stages of formation. Please bear in mind that I joined the Institute one or two years after it was officially founded; that is, I was not part of the initial group of founders who created the Institute.

Natasa: How did the Decision Sciences Institute influence your career?

Clay: Being a member of the Decision Sciences Institute has been a tremendously positive experience. There are primarily three aspects of my career that the Decision Sciences Institute has influenced over the years. These are meetings, growth, and networking.
**Meetings.** The meetings have provided a good forum for academic feedback and criticism. These components sharpened my research and that of many people within the Institute.

**Growth.** The Decision Sciences Institute has allowed a broad range of its academic members to be part of its administration. Its members have developed as academics, but with an understanding of the administrative perspective. The Decision Sciences Institute has given a number of its academic members the opportunity to be involved in various administrative duties and receive experience in that domain.

**Networking.** The Decision Sciences Institute has provided the opportunity to its academic members from different disciplines to be involved in all the Institute’s activities, increasing the size of the network. The camaraderie that has been created over the years has had huge impact on the development of individual academic careers.

**Natasa:** What factors/trends contributed to the development of Decision Sciences Institute?

**Clay:** Two very influential factors contributed to the development of the Decision Sciences Institute. These are the diversity of disciplines and being open to everyone.

**Diversity of disciplines.** The Institute has been a broad home for academics with interests in aspects of management education. From the early years of its formation, the Decision Sciences Institute has welcomed marketing, operations, information systems, accounting, finance, and people from many other disciplines as well. In the early years, having a multidisciplinary environment in an academic association, instead of being narrowly focused, was quite unique. The diversity of disciplinary attributes among the Institute’s members resulted in a very good number of able presidents, administrators, and committee members. This helped the organization to be effective and to move forward over time.

**Open to everyone.** I take a lot of personal pride in the fact that when the Decision Sciences Institute was created it was open to anyone who wanted to join in. There was no implicit or explicit blackballing. Anyone who wanted to join was welcome to do so. In the early years, academic organizations were viewed very critically by their own members as being exclusive and tightly knit. Academic associations were perceived as being quite closed and it was very hard to get involved in institutes such as The Institute for Management Sciences, Operations Research Society, and (perhaps less so) the Academy of Management. It was very hard to become involved in any of these organizations unless you knew people or you were known by them. Whether the perception was right or not, did not matter at that time. Most people believed that it was very hard to gain access to these organizations. Since it appeared to be awfully hard to get into any of these closed networks, many were looking for other outlets to expand their academic horizons. As mentioned earlier, the Decision Sciences Institute started with 16 people and we now have over 1,300 active members. The Decision Science Institute has grown because of the openness and the diversity that the membership has brought to the Institute.

**Natasa:** How do you see Decision Sciences Institute evolving? How would you like it to evolve?

**Clay:** We have been very fortunate that throughout its evolution, the Decision Sciences Institute has avoided chasing rabbits. We have not gone off on tangents or down narrow paths. The Institute has effectively incorporated what we think are important elements of managerial thinking. It has been proactive. For example, when we noticed the growth in Information Systems and the Cognitive Sciences, we included those areas among our fields of interest, as important components of our organization. We did so 20 years ago! These very important managerial areas are now very much a part of the Decision Sciences Institute spectrum. We have achieved this by considering articles in these areas for the Decision Sciences journal, by having tracks for these fields in the annual meetings, as well as organizing special sessions in the areas as part of the Decision Sciences Institute conferences. The Institute continues to incorporate substantive issues of management education and theory as part of its mission. I would like us to continue to be inclusive of new business disciplines in the future. I believe it is very important for us to continue to evolve as an organization and incorporate new issues as they become important in our disciplines.

The international dimension is an important aspect to continue to nurture. We have now created international divisions of the Decision Sciences Institute that move us beyond the U.S. geographical boundaries. We have welcomed people into the organization who teach...
subjects like international business. However, we still have not incorporated into our administration the way international management is practiced. At the present time, we do not appear to know how to research or teach international business effectively. So, over time, these are areas we need to work on.

Finally, the management of non-profit organizations is currently not heavily represented in our Institute. There are humanitarian organizations such as the Red Cross, the United Nations and its agencies, and the World Trade Organization that have special management challenges that aren’t addressed in schools of public administration. These types of organizations require management talent. But currently we are not studying them. We are not developing materials either from a research perspective or a teaching perspective for the non-profit sector.

Natasa: What is the future likely to be for those who are just starting their academic career today?

Clay: Within the Decision Sciences Institute, it appears that the more-experienced folks need to work with the new faculty—the new management researchers—to make sure that we evolve professionally in our business schools and management programs in broad, not narrow, ways. Let me be more specific about this. I am extremely concerned about business education and mentoring in its current state. We may end up like law schools. We need to evolve more like medical schools. That means, we need to develop a balance of practice or a balance of art, science, mentoring, and teaching in its current state. We may end up like law schools. We need to evolve more like medical schools. That means, we need to develop a balance of practice or a balance of art, science, mentoring, and teaching. We currently lack such a balance in business schools. We produce deans who are bean counting and deans and associate deans who are looking for simple metrics to manage complex situations. The young faculty need us to help fight off those trends and to ensure that they are not forced into a mold. We need to change the current situation so that young faculty can have a career that fits the skills and personality of individual faculty. The Decision Sciences Institute tries to deal with these issues by offering sessions and programs at its conferences where issues such as the development of new faculty are covered.

The Decision Sciences Institute can help mould the academic future of management education and to do so requires leadership from the young people. I’m not the only guy crying wolf about this issue. We need a rich and diverse approach to training managers, not a narrowly focused approach. We need people to champion these approaches. The Decision Sciences Institute is probably well positioned to develop such champions. It is better positioned to do so than the Academy of Management because of the broad nature and diversity of our membership.

In addition, the future for the faculty that is currently going through the tenure cycle is different than the tenure cycle that faculty went through 10-15 years ago. It has already changed and it has changed in ways that I do not particularly like. For instance, we had to make some odd moves here at my university. At my school we could not promote our executive education teachers under the old criteria. The research these educators conduct is highly applied. They do not place their works in the journals preferred by our associate dean. So, to keep them on our faculty, we have put them on contracts that make them look like second-class citizens.

I think that the promotion and tenure criteria at many universities, both in the U.S. and abroad, are increasingly narrow. The criteria are certainly appropriate, but remain insufficient. I want to see a broader portfolio of human talent in business school faculties than a group of people publishing in journals with narrow areas of interests. The academic landscape has certainly changed.

Finally, it also appears that there is a lot of tension regarding new faculty’s involvement in the Decision Sciences Institute. There is very little accommodation in tenure credit now for people who invest themselves in professional organizations such as the Decision Sciences Institute. I think that having young faculty members involved at conferences in a broad set of academic activities such as creating sessions, presenting and discussing scholarly works and such is important. However, business schools are now telling the new faculty members not to waste their time at such activities because investing energy in these types of activities will not get them tenure or promoted.

Natasa: Thank you, Professor Whybark, for sharing your thoughts with me.

Concluding Remarks

The interview concluded on a constructive tone with Professor Clay Whybark’s impeccable optimism for the future of the Decision Sciences Institute. As one starting out in an academic career, I was delighted with my interaction with Professor Whybark and glimpse his experience, knowledge, and passion for the Decision Sciences Institute. Many times, knowing the background and the evolutionary history of an organization helps one to form a better understanding of its character. Professor Whybark provided me with an understanding of the Institute’s past culture and future potential. Naturally, it remains to be seen what the future holds for younger faculty like me; however, having these useful insights may help us be effective contributors to our academic disciplines and to the Decision Sciences Institute.
EXEC: An Interactive Learning Approach to Developing Decision Making Expertise in Business and Management Programs

by Thomas M. Triscari, Jr., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and LMI Research Institute

Each year, finalists of the DSI Instructional Innovation Competition Award are invited to share their valuable contributions with readers of Decision Line. We would like to express our appreciation to Thomas Triscari, Jr. of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute for the following article on the EXEC approach. [Krishna S. Dhir, Editor]

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

by Thomas M. Triscari, Jr., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and LMI Research Institute

The last decade has been marked by rapid change, new and disruptive technologies, globalization, and increased competitiveness. The basic foundation of thinking about the world is shifting from one of underlying stability and orderliness derived from Newtonian thinking to one of uncertainty and entropy. Accordingly, decision making has become increasingly complex, fraught, with uncertainty and increased risks.

What an incredible opportunity for “Decision Sciences” to make significant contributions to preparing professionals to face such formidable challenges! Our contention is effective decisions—and decision science practitioners—will be those employing decision strategies from an arsenal of analytical tools and cumulative insights to address the dynamic and highly competitive global business environment.

Yet, many traditional decision science courses in business schools continue to focus on theory, algorithms, and “number crunching,” the so-called “hard skills,” to allow students the time to develop a command of techniques that are certainly necessary skills for global managers, but perhaps not sufficient or indicative of executive aptitude and/or success (Livingston, 1971; Mintzberg, 2004). Often, the development of critical “soft skills” is left to be gained through individual experience and professional practice.

Pedagogically, an alternative approach described within, referred to as the “executive approach” or EXEC (for EXperiential and Engagement Coaching), shifts from an approach of solving “given” problems as an individual to finding, defining, and then solving decision situations via interaction with other (more or less experienced) student groups. The EXEC approach leverages, in an innovative way, diverse student groups (undergraduates, MBAs, executive MBAs, non-credit executive participants, Ph.D. students) to provide a dynamic engagement and learning environment for both decision science and practice. Experiential learning offers students the opportunity to develop both hard and soft skills in a safe and stimulating environment (Saddler-Smith & Shefy, 2007). The EXEC approach seeks to address three issues of concern in educating future decision makers through immersive and interactive engagement exercises with diverse student groups: “Problem Solving without Problem Finding?”; “Optimization without Considering Implementation?”; and “The Real World is Tougher!”
Problem Solving without Problem Finding?

As stated above, many decision science courses in business schools, particularly at the undergraduate level, focus on theory, algorithms, and solutions, not on the process of problem finding and problem structuring. For many reasons, including time constraints associated with covering a vast array of techniques, students in a typical “quantitative methods” course are provided with fairly well-defined problems “to work.” However, in the EXEC approach, the student must first be able to find and define the problem before solving it. Problem “finding” can be as important as problem “solving” in executive decision making, and, in some cases, perhaps more important (Livingston, 1971).

Optimization without Considering Implementation?

Even in more advanced decision science courses, students are frequently able to develop strategies (based largely on complex analyses) but often without full “situational awareness” of the interests of various decision stakeholders or the challenges of implementing an “optimal solution.” In the EXEC approach, an engagement scenario is used with other student groups (MBAs, EMBAs, or Ph.D.s) to simulate “decision stakeholders.” These engagement exercises are modeled after “live fire training” used by the military to prepare individuals for combat (“train as you fight, fight as you train”). In the engagement exercise, when faced with putting their solutions into action and responding to real-time challenges to their decision strategies, students often report an “eye-opening” experience.

The Real World Is Tougher!

We find in many business schools, at undergraduate and graduate levels, the required “quantitative decision making techniques” courses are often taught using text books and fairly rigid experiential exercises (i.e., case studies, scripted exercises with minimal context). Although instructional, this material often falls short of conveying critical contextual information and cues necessary to develop and implement effective real-world decision strategies. Furthermore, the quantitative or decision science courses are, at best, taught in parallel with other courses emphasizing soft skills (e.g., strategy, psychology, organizational behavior). Lacking proper linkage, many students may attempt to solve real-world problems using a predominantly “stove pipe” approach instead of a holistic and synergistic approach.

The EXEC Approach—Roles of Engagement

The EXEC approach has four primary educational objectives: (1) improve the understanding of the executive decision-making process and improve problem finding and defining skills; (2) effectively apply decision science material, practice “problem solving” techniques, and gain insight into the “value and limitations of analysis”; (3) provide an environment conducive to the development of students’ situation awareness and key insights necessary for developing and implementing effective decision strategies; and (4) develop students’ confidence in approaching, identifying, defining, and solving problems in a dynamic and challenging global business environment.

The EXEC approach is based on three premises concerning the development of executive decision making prowess: (1) “Train as you fight, fight as you train”—hands-on, immersive, and interactive participation in real-time engagement exercises; (2) Achieving situation awareness is essential—understanding critical contextual information and cues for analysis and decision making; and, (3) Coalition Building—acknowledging globalization is here to stay—meeting the challenging demands of a global environment often implies multiple stakeholders in the decision process. Through “live fire training,” achieving situation awareness, and leveraging student diversity, the EXEC approach allows students to better understand business decisions, determine and define the driving cues and patterns, build and share mental models, and develop mental simulations to better understand the situations and develop real-world solutions to real-world problems (Klein, 2003).

“Train As You Fight!”

The EXEC approach addresses the decision-making process from “problem finding” through “problem definition” to “problem solving” in a safe, but engaging environment. Real-time role-playing—or engagements—is a feature of “training as you fight” and the EXEC approach. The “roles of engagement” for each exercise are not scripted and are loosely defined. In many instances, aside from a “title” (e.g., member of management team), the roles are defined and executed by students. This latitude allows the students to define, develop, and execute their roles, apply decision techniques learned in class, and, at the same time, gain valuable insight into and confidence in their individual roles in the decision-making process.

Situation Awareness “refers to the degree of accuracy by which one’s perception of his current environment mirrors reality” (Aviation Schools Command, 2006). Students must exercise situation awareness not only to identify, define, and solve problems, but to enact their decision strategies in real-time—to be able to “think on the fly” and respond. In enacting their decision strategies, students must be continually cognizant of critical contextual information and cues in order to defend their analyses and findings, advocate their “point of view” to other stakeholders, and make adjustments for factors such as level of education, experience, expertise, cultural/language barriers, and biases.

Coalitions and Collaborations—Put Diversity to Work!

At a meta-level, students—one of a university’s greatest assets and resources—have traditionally been and typically still are isolated from each other (i.e., undergraduate, MBAs, EMBAs, and Ph.D.s). These diverse student sets represent a true cross-section of real-world
stakeholders that students, as future decision makers and executives, will face. The EXEC approach leverages existing university resources at little or no additional cost by enlisting other students as agents within the “action-oriented” engagement scenarios and projects. The EXEC approach is geared primarily toward undergraduate-, graduate-, and executive-level students in business and management programs, utilizing all these diverse student groups, as well as Ph.D. students, in engagement scenarios and exercises. For example, during the 2005-2006 academic year, the EXEC approach involved 178 students: 123 undergraduate students, in three class sections, taking a required decision science course; and as decision stakeholders, 33 full-time MBAs/70 percent international; 3 Ph.D. students/67 percent international, and 19 executives/100 percent international.

Employing “live fire training,” real-time interactions with other diverse student groups acting as decision stakeholders, focuses students on how to develop and exercise situation awareness under various conditions and constraints. Consequences resulting from these engagements (e.g., stakeholder feedback) sharpen attention.

Building an EXEC Course—A Real Experience

The EXEC approach is taught through a series of engagement scenario projects, each of which highlights different decision science theory, algorithms, and hard skills, as well as offers underlying soft skill lessons. That is, students gain an understanding of the importance and impact of problem finding, implementation issues, and cultural differences on business decision making. A popular “decision science” text book is used as a primary reference on specific quantitative techniques. However, the projects are the main vehicle used to “set the stage” for real-time engagements among the student groups to learn both the hard and soft skills.

The organization of the EXEC approach is based on three principles: (1) engagement location—outside of the traditional classroom setting for engagement exercises (e.g., university offices, off-campus); (2) focus on active learning situations versus lectures by the instructor; and, (3) interaction among diverse student sets. Typically, the EXEC approach revolves around decision situations between “analysts” and “executives” outside the classroom setting but within a common context (i.e., the engagement scenario or “project”). The decision situations come to life through the engagement and interactions with and among various stakeholders with the instructor in the background (or not present), thereby allowing students to focus on the experience. Prior to the actual engagement exercises, students are provided hand-outs, taken on-site (e.g., a negotiation room), and/or lectured. The projects, described to the students in a 1-3 page document, are created by the instructor from common management experiences, personal interests, and imagination. Deliverables are communicated up front (and are sometimes updated as part of the exercise itself) and consist of meetings/presentations with other stakeholders (students) and reports in a professional format (e.g., memo, executive summary) in order to emphasize the realism of the exercises. Additionally, this format emphasizes understanding the stakeholders’ expectations and needs to provide actionable information in a professional manner. During the engagement exercises among the students, the instructor functions largely as an observer. After the engagement exercises, the instructor and students discuss (debrief) the engagement exercise. Project evaluations (“After Action Reports”) are designed and utilized to assist students to not only gain insight into the experience but to develop key insights necessary for effective decision making.

The projects are structured in progressively more challenging situations from “problem finding” through “problem definition” to “problem solving” in realistic decision settings. This approach affords students an opportunity to practice both hard and soft skills and achieve situation awareness through “live fire training” with diverse student sets.

The EXEC approach has been assessed by the typical final course evaluation scores (see Table 1). Common themes of the student comments were: added insight gained from the engagement exercises; interaction with other groups of students; degree of realism; feelings

Figure 1: Organization of engagement exercises (projects) for the EXEC approach.
of confidence and empowerment; and, positive impact of the EXEC approach. A few of the student quotations are telling: Provided great insight, Amazing learning experience, [The executives] gave us real world insight, This course was very uncomfortable at first, but by the end it was very empowering. I think that it was one of the most beneficial courses taught in my curriculum, and, they [executives] played tough and demanding.

Conclusion

The EXEC approach has a high degree of transferability within most institutions of higher education. The engagement exercises can be created by the instructor and are often based on the instructor’s interests, experiences, and imagination. The EXEC approach utilizes a cross-section of business school students—undergraduate, full-time MBAs, EMBAs, Ph.D.s, and non-credit executive program participants—which are present in most if not all universities. There is great value in utilizing diversity in preparing global executive decision makers!

Where some traditional approaches to teaching “quantitative methods for decision making” begin at problem solving, the EXEC approach seeks to complement problem solving by empowering students to confidently approach, identify, define, and solve problems through immersive, experiential engagement exercises, thus giving students the opportunity to build their own arsenal of analytical tools and cumulative insights for global decision making.

Table 1: Course evaluation scores.

| Number of Respondents/Enrollment Number | 110/123 |
| Overall Course Score (1-5) | 4.4 |
| “Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)” | 4.5 |
| “Learning to analyse and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view” | 4.3 |
| “Related course material to real life situations” | 4.8 |
| Involved students in “hands on” projects” | 4.8 |
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The following essay outlines some of the major structures, policies, issues, and challenges in managing research and gaining research funding in the U.K., especially England. It follows up on a previous article about managing research in Australia. The funding bodies for higher education in the U.K. are separate in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, so direct comparisons are challenging, though there are some similarities and commonalities. If you find this article to be relevant or appealing, please write me so that the scope of interest can be gauged.

[Miles G. Nicholls, miles.nicholls@rmit.edu.au]

The Management of Research and Research Funding in the U.K.

by Brian Lehaney, Coventry University, U.K., and Steve Clarke, University of Hull, U.K.

There are a number of factors and agencies that influence research, research funding, and research output in the U.K. It is our contention that the focus is on research funding and outputs as opposed to research per se. It is hoped that this may become apparent in this feature. To avoid repetition, please note that this article refers to the U.K. unless otherwise stated.

Research outputs can take many forms. In general those of most value are refereed papers in good quality journals. Note that the papers do not necessarily need to be of good quality. The medium of publication tends to be the more important factor. One might argue that a good quality journal will publish good quality papers, and as a rule of thumb that is true. It is, however, a rule of thumb, and we have all seen papers of lesser quality in ‘good’ journals and papers of good quality in lower-ranked journals.

The potential and reality of research outputs are very much affected by the management of universities in general. All universities are equal but some are more equal than others. Research deliverables are strongly connected to teaching loads, and these loads vary enormously from institution to institution. Research deliverables also vary enormously and more funding goes to universities with greater quantities and quality of deliverables. There are a number of structural factors that affect these issues and these should be understood if research and its management are to be understood. These structural factors are related to the development of universities, and a brief history of this development will be discussed in the next section.

Brief History

The oldest university in the English-speaking world is Oxford, founded in 1167, with Cambridge founded in 1209 and St Andrews in 1410. The University of London was formed in 1836 (and was the first to admit women). Following this a number of civic universities were formed in the Victorian era, and these became known as the Redbrick universities. The original six Redbricks were Birmingham, Bristol, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and Sheffield. Subsequently the term Redbrick has become more nebulous and would typically include pre-Robbins universities founded in the late 1940s and 1950s, such as Hull, Nottingham, and Southampton.

Following World War II, there were only nine universities and less than 1,000
full-time university students in Britain. Based on the Robbins Report on higher education in the early 1960s, a number of other universities (so-called Plateglass universities) were formed. These included Essex, Kent, Lancaster, and Warwick. The expansion of higher education in the 1960s also led to the formation of a number of polytechnics. These institutions’ degrees were not self-regulated but were under the validation authority of the Council for National Academic Awards. In 1969 the Open University was formed to provide wider access and distance learning.

From 1992 the binary divide between polytechnics and universities was removed and polytechnics (with certain other higher education institutions) became universities. These institutions are often referred to as ‘new universities,’ though this term was originally applied to the Plateglass universities. There are now around 160 universities, 7 university colleges, and 30 colleges of higher education, which totals approximately 200 higher education institutions with degree-awarding powers. The term ‘approximately’ is used because the exact figure depends on how the count is done. For example, the University of London could count individually as one university, but London has a number of autonomous affiliates such as London School of Economics, Birkbeck, Goldsmiths, and London Business School. Each of these could also count as a university in its own right.

Given this diverse history, it is not surprising that there is a wide range of organizational structures and cultures across universities. This is compounded by an array of government agencies, with a plethora of remits. It is further compounded by huge disparities in institutional sizes, with the University of Buckingham having around 750 students, Abertay around 4,000 students, Coventry and Hull Universities around 19,000 students each, and the University of Manchester with around 40,000 students. The Open University is the largest with around 160,000 students, but is not directly comparable because of its scope and remit. The University of London has around 135,000 students, but again is not directly comparable because of its structure. To add to the complication, governments, regardless of political party, have tended to introduce legislation that significantly affects the funding of universities and of their students, with the result that it is difficult to form coherent and cohesive strategies.

These structural issues create all sorts of challenges and tensions in the sector and will be discussed next.

Structures

The following is a glossary of some structural features that are relevant to this article. How these affect research, research outputs and the management of research will emerge as the article progresses.

Student and University Funding

The funding system in the U.K. has changed considerably over the past 20 years. Previously, students could receive government grants. Now, students must pay what are called ‘top up fees,’ but these are not necessarily payable on entry to a course. To complicate matters, students may receive government financial support through various means-tested schemes. In addition, international students pay full fees. ‘Home’ students are classed as those from anywhere within the European Community. There is a government-sponsored student loan scheme that assists home students with fees in various ways. It is too early to determine the impact of these funding differences, but it may be apparent that universities that tend to take students from higher socio-economic groups will be least affected by the changes. A counter to this is that those students who come from lower socio-economic groups are most supported by funding schemes, so universities that have a higher proportion from these groups will benefit.

Universities obtain HEFCE (see below) funding for each home (EC) student enrolled. International students pay full fees and no HECE funding is received for such students.

Student Staff Ratios and Teaching Versus Research

Student Staff Ratios (SSRs) affect workloads. It is not simply the teaching of students that matters, but also the preparation, assessment, marking, and administration that matter. ‘Administration’ is used here in the British sense of clerical work rather than the American sense of management. SSRs vary enormously from institution to institution. Official figures show a range from 1:1 to around 30:1. The practice is different. Very often a new university may have a nominal SSR of 30:1, but the student experience is anything from 45:1 to 60:1. Why does this happen? Very simply, the SSR is calculated on nominal staff and students. If four full-time equivalent members of staff from a department of 15 are involved in other duties, such as program management, overseas delivery, timetabling, and so on, the reality is that only 11 members of staff are actually available to teach the students at the home institution. The official (nominal) calculation is based on all 15 members being available. The higher the SSR the more time members of staff have to spend on teaching and the less time there is available for research. Since research funding follows research outputs, the institutions that produce the research outputs gain higher research funding and those that do not get less. This tends to preserve the status quo.

Higher Education Statistics Agency

The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) was established as the central source for the collection and publication of higher education statistics. These include numbers of students, nature of students (gender, disability, etc), and performance indicators. Universities tend to have information systems that are geared towards providing this data. These information systems are not the same as those that might be required to support teaching and research. Typically, the information system that is used to provide HESA data is the one that will be used ostensibly to support academic work. There are obvious issues with this.
The Higher Education Information Database for Institutions (HEIDI) is a web-based management information service that provides quantitative data about higher education. HEIDI is run by HEFCE.

**Higher Education Funding Council for England**

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) has been responsible for the distribution of funding to universities and colleges of higher and further education in England since 1992. In 2007-08 HEFCE allocated £7.1 billion in public funds from the U.K. government to universities and colleges in England. HEFCE funds the institutions and does not give grants or loans to individual students. It also helps develop and implement higher education policy. HEFCE’s remit includes widening participation; developing links between higher education institutions and business and the community; and enhancing leadership, governance, and management within the sector. Unistats is a source of statistics that is run and owned by HEFCE.

**Quality Assurance Agency**

The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has a remit to ensure the quality of education delivered in universities and other institutions of higher education. This is carried out by means of institutional and subject reviews. These reviews involve the production of self-evaluation documents by the institutions and audit visits of the institution by QAA auditors. The work involved in producing such documentation cannot be underestimated.

**UCAS**

UCAS administers the centralized undergraduate admissions service, with over half a million potential students per annum. Potential students wishing to study for first degrees in the U.K. must apply through UCAS. This applies to all applicants, whether home or international students. Applicants submit a single application via UCAS with a list of up to five courses for which they are applying, in no order of preference. All five choices are confidential during the application process so universities and colleges considering an application cannot see any of the candidate’s other choices. Applications must be completed by the middle of the January of the year that the student wishes to start university (in September).

**Research Councils**

There are seven research councils:

- Arts and Humanities Research Council
- Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council
- Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council
- Economic and Social Research Council
- Medical Research Council
- Natural Environment Research Council
- Science and Technology Facilities Council

The research councils are government agencies responsible for co-ordinating and funding their individual areas of research. They have a number of functions, but for academics a main area of interest is that they provide grants for research. These grants are competitive. Universities that have low SSRs, are funded well by RAE (see following section) and by previous research council grants have the resources and the reputation to make stronger cases. Universities with high SSRs and less of a track record find gaining research council grants difficult. The councils have a combined annual budget of around £2.8 billion. Of this over £1 billion is spent on research grants and training in higher education institutions. Research council grants currently support around 50,000 researchers through 18,000 grants, and about 8,000 PhDs are awarded annually as a result of their funding. The councils employ around 13,000 people directly, of which 9,000 are researchers and technicians working in institutes.

**Research Assessment Exercise**

The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is undertaken approximately every five years on behalf of the four U.K. higher education funding councils (HEFCE, SHEFC, HEFCW, DELNI – England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland) to evaluate the quality of research undertaken by higher education institutions. RAE submissions from each unit of assessment (subject) are given a rank by a review panel. The rankings are used to inform the allocation of quality weighted research funding each higher education institution receives from its national funding council. The decision as to how funds will be allocated is taken after the rankings have been decided. Previous RAEs took place in 1986, 1989, 1992, 1996, and 2001. The current allocation is set for 2008 and the future is dependant upon government decisions.

One of the outcomes of the RAE is the way it affects the position of research-active staff in the U.K. For each RAE up to 2008, research outputs have been judged on the basis of four outputs (which in general terms may be journal papers, book chapters, or books) from each nominated member of staff. Clearly, any academic with four high-quality outputs is going to be of value to an institution, and a lot of effort goes into ensuring that staff have the requisite publications. While this may in many ways be seen as positive (encouraging quality and so on), it has also been argued that it can distort research in academia. In the simplest sense, this distortion can result from an overemphasis on quality outputs at the expense of other research activity to which the RAE gives less weight (for example, income from research projects), but at its worst it gives rise to the “poaching” of “high quality” researchers just prior to the RAE. Since research assessment is based on the outputs of those staff in post on a given date, the rewards for engaging staff just before an assessment date may be out of all proportion to the costs involved.

We know from our many contacts with researchers from other parts of the world that this is often seen as a very odd way of managing research!

**European Community Funding**

European Community (EC) funding is largely considered via the Seventh
Framework Programme (FP7), which is the EC’s main program for funding research over the period 2007 to 2013. It aims to:
- gain leadership in key scientific and technology areas,
- stimulate the creativity and excellence of European research,
- develop and strengthen the human potential of European research, and
- enhance research and innovation capacity throughout Europe.

The total budget for FP7, including the non-nuclear research of the Joint Research Centre, is 51 billion euros over seven years.

**Individual Institutions**

The term ‘faculty’ is used here in the British sense of a group of cohesive academic departments rather than the American sense of a group of academically cohesive individuals.

Having provided some history and sector context, how is research managed in individual institutions? This is not a major problem for the older universities, in that they tend to do well in the RAE: they have significant reserves, funding opportunities come to those who already have funding, and the SSRs of older universities tend to be much lower than those of new universities with the concomitant enabling of time for research. As an indication of this, in new universities it would be typical that 15-25 percent of academic members of staff enter material for the RAE. In older universities this may be as much as 100 percent.

The issue for new universities is how to manage the relatively large SSRs and the lack of reserves, while attempting to encourage research outputs. This is not an easy task, but it does require a clear message from senior management and clear structures and lines of reporting. In fact, the messages are often mixed and the structures blurred. Research deliverables are often simply a matter of individual choice.

A typical new university structure would have something like the following: a vice chancellor, three pro vice-chancellors, seven deans of faculty, four associate deans per faculty, eight heads of department within each faculty, and fifteen academic members of staff reporting to each head. In addition, the infrastructure will have various functions such as registry, marketing, international office, and so on. Each faculty will have a registrar, who might well report to the university registrar rather than to the dean. The associate dean for research will have a remit to deliver for RAE but will have no line management control over the members of staff who are to provide the outputs. To add to the complexity there will be research centers, with directors, located within faculties, which draw on departmental resources but with no means for the department to claim back any resource drawn in this way—with the result being that heads may well be inclined to hang on to their resources for teaching, rather than letting them go to engage in research.

To add to the challenges, the U.K. has a number of higher education league tables. Students and their parents and advisors are now very used to using these to help select a university. Typically league tables weight research highly, as a result of which students with higher entry grades will tend to go to the universities higher in the league table. The knock-on effect of this is to increase or maintain the position in the league table as entry points are also used to determine positioning. The higher the entry grades the more likely it is that students can work independently and the less teaching required. The converse is also true, and the new universities face the difficult challenge of freeing time for research while teaching less-motivated and less-qualified students.

**Summary**

It is difficult to summarize what is a complicated historical and institutional mix. The history of the sector and its funding is such that bigger players remain as bigger players. New universities struggle to resource teaching and are caught between the desire to achieve research outputs and the necessity to have someone in front of a class. The complexity of organizational structures within new universities exacerbates the situation, as does the confusion of mixed messages from senior management.

In essence, it is a very challenging area with very few new universities breaking through and the older universities using existing reserves and reputations to maintain their positions in the research hierarchy.

**Related Links**

Individual university websites may be accessed by using
www.universityname.ac.uk
(e.g., www.brunel.ac.uk). Other sites that may be of interest include the following:
www.qaa.ac.uk
www.hefce.ac.uk
www.cordis.lu
www.rae.ac.uk
www.ucas.ac.uk
www.hesa.ac.uk

**Journal Editors Attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting**

Check out “Activities” at the link below for an alphabetical listing of editor-in-chiefs and regional editors who have expressed interest in attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting. Many other area editors, managing editors, and associate editors will also be in attendance.

www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/
Since completing my term as president, I have a little more time to reflect on current topics, so I decided to write this month’s column myself. Over the last few years this space has been used to introduce the DSI membership to electronic commerce in profit and nonprofit enterprises, as well as chronicling interesting emerging hardware and information technologies. This month we explore using the Internet to simply inform others. In particular, I discuss how I authored an article on the Decision Sciences Institute and published it on Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia that anyone can edit. [Kenneth E. Kendall, Feature Editor, Rutgers University]

Wikipedia and DSI: Building a Decision Sciences Institute Knowledgebase

by Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University

By now you have probably used, viewed, critiqued, or shared content on Wikipedia on many topics. Some entries are general, some esoteric, some even dealing with decision sciences topics such as information systems, supply chain management, and organizations. Wikipedia is an online, open source, collaborative encyclopedia. It has over 10 million articles in over 250 languages (2.2 million separate entries in English) created by thousands of contributors. It is edited by tens of thousands of volunteers and yet the operating staff of this nonprofit has only recently grown from 10 to 15 people. As a nonprofit organization founded on the concept of a collaborative group of volunteers, it shares some common features with DSI.

The Google link for Wikipedia notes, “A free encyclopedia built collaboratively using Wiki software,” (www.Google.com, 2008). Wikipedia, the online, open source encyclopedia, was created by Jimmy Wales, Larry Sanger, and others in 2001. It has more than “2.2 million separate articles in English, (and had) 52 million unique visitors in December 2007 from the U.S. (comScore Meida Metrix—as cited in Cohen, 2008). Cohen also describes Wikipedia as “one of the top 10 most visited Web sites.” Wikipedia is run by the Wikimedia Foundation and accepts no advertising. It is funded through donations, and this year its annual budget is $4.6 million.

Wikipedia’s slogan is “The free encyclopedia that anyone can edit.” Their current status is listed as a “perpetual work-in-progress.”

One chief advantage of Wikipedia is that it is free and available to anyone with an Internet connection. Additionally, almost anyone with that same connection can edit Wikipedia contributions.

Some of the criticisms of Wikipedia can be found on its own entry on Wikipedia.org. “Critics target its systematic bias and inconsistencies” (Sanger, 2004). Other criticisms concern preferring “consensus over credentials in its editorial process” (Boyd, 2005). The upshot of this is that popular figures may get much more space devoted to their entries than is commensurate with their true historical importance. The balance afforded by a professional editorial team is not necessarily available in this model.

Additionally, Wikipedia has been criticized for its lack of reliability, its inaccuracy, the adding of unverified information, and susceptibility to vandalism (Wikipedia entry on www.Wikipedia.org, last accessed April 12, 2008).

Decision Line, May 2008
However, the very nature of open source projects (see Verma, 2008) means that these problems are being worked through not just by the tiny Wikipedia staff but by thousands of volunteer editors and contributors.

Wikipedia is just one way to post user-generated content. Other well known ways are via discussion boards, blogs, chat rooms, and social networking sites such as Facebook, MySpace, YouTube, and Flickr. The drawbacks of Wikipedia are similar to the other methods for user-generated content. Contributions remain there for others to see and may exist in an electronic form longer than the user originally intended.

**DSI Finally Appears on Wikipedia**

In March, I contributed an article to Wikipedia on the Decision Sciences Institute. I decided to begin with a simple article, one that can be modified when information changes. I made it a length that was similar to articles about other societies, and provided a link to the official Decision Sciences Institute Web site in case viewers wanted to find out more about DSI.

Several Wikipedia entries now refer to the Decision Sciences Institute. They are:

- Academic conferences
- Academic organizations
- Information systems conferences
- Professional associations

In organizing the article on DSI, I used the following outline:

1. DSI’s Mission
2. Disciplines Included
3. Journals of the Decision Sciences Institute
4. Regions of the Decision Sciences Institute
5. DSI’s Home Office
6. A Brief History of the Decision Sciences Institute
7. Presidents of the Decision Sciences Institute
8. DSI Annual Meetings
   8.1 Future DSI Annual Meetings
9. External Links

This allowed me to tell a story about how the Institute began as the American Institute for Decision Sciences, as well as to look into the future by informing those of you who view the entry about upcoming annual meetings.

---

The Decision Sciences Institute is now an entry in Wikipedia.org.
One of the features of Wikipedia is that the user can easily look up the meaning of words within an article by clicking on a hyperlink. I set up a few hyperlinks to begin with. Here is a partial list:

- professional association
- professors
- quantitative research
- qualitative research
- academic organization
- business schools
- academic conference
- mission statement
- decision making
- learned society
- professional development

I even made a hyperlink to the Wikipedia entry for the J. Mack Robinson College of Business at Georgia State University, where the Institute’s Home Office is housed.

The viewer can return to the Decision Sciences Institute entry by clicking the back button.

Next, I described the topics covered by the Institute. I based these topics on the tracks for this year’s annual meeting and proceeded to hyperlink all of them to Wikipedia definitions:

- Accountancy
- Business Ethics
- Decision Analysis
- Decision Theory
- Decision Support Systems
- Ecommerce
- Expert Systems
- Finance
- Hospitality Management
- Information Security
- Innovative Education, Instructional Design, and Pedagogy
- International Business Studies
- Knowledge Management
- Leadership
- Manufacturing
- Management Information Systems
- Management Science
- Operations Management
- Operations Research
- Organizational Studies
- Project Management
- Quality Management
- Service Management
- Statistics
- Strategic Management
- Supply Chain Management

All of the above have Wikipedia entries except “Innovative Education.” Does anyone want to contribute an article on that subject?

Writing Your Own Article

Let’s say you take up my challenge to write an article on Innovative Education. What steps do you need to take?

The first thing is to check to make sure whether there is already an article on the subject on Wikipedia. Sure, I already told you that there wasn’t an article about innovative education there, but my information is from March 2008, the last time I searched for the subject. With so many entries being added daily, it is possible that an entry on innovative education was added since then. Check it out before you invest the time.

Next, go to www.wikipedia.org and establish an account. Once you have an account, you can assemble the information you need to write an article. Make sure that you actually write an article. If you copy something verbatim from a Web site, the guardians of Wikipedia will find out and your article may be deleted.

I recommend going to
where you will get both help and tutorials that explain how to write an article. This article will explain how to gather references (a necessary task), things to avoid, and things to be careful about. It also explains how to create a page.

I recommend using the sandbox, a place that allows you “play” with your article to see how an entry looks before you actually publish it to the rest of the world. Since the markup language can be tricky, you will want to make sure that the article looks the way you want it to look. Take your time to use boldface, hyperlinks, and headings properly. Style is as important as content.

Whoever creates the article on innovative education, please e-mail me. I will reply by thanking you for your contribution.
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A review of corporate productivity expressed as a ratio of annual revenues to total workforce reveals that firms with former business school professors in executive positions perform better than those that do not have such executives. Also, researchers have found that this effect is more reliable in small companies than in the large ones, perhaps because the influence of individual executives is less diluted in small organizations. In the following essay, Bin Jiang of DePaul University explores the reasons for this effect. [Krishna S. Dhir, kdhir@berry.edu]

Business Professors Do Create Value for Tomorrow’s Managers

by Bin Jiang, DePaul University

Those who can, do; those who can’t, teach, is a long-lived adage. And probably no group has come to be more sensitive about it than the faculties of schools of business. Lately we have heard it a lot.

As business school professors, we would like to think that our academic expertise should generate value in the business world. However, in recent years the relevance of these academic institutions to the real world of business has been called into question repeatedly, not only by managers and the public but by some of the world’s most respected business professors. Most telling, perhaps, has been criticism that business faculties are so intent on scholarly rigor that we have lost touch with what is important to the performance of actual companies. Yet, despite the attention, no empirical inquiries go beyond the educational product of business schools to focus on the “producers” with the benefit of data. Thus, there are no defensible findings pertaining to the familiar stereotype that business school professors cannot make it in the real world. Formally evaluating how well business professors who teach students to manage businesses could actually manage businesses themselves is one way to examine relevant evidence.

An Unprecedented Research

When my research team and I put that “familiar stereotype” to a test in a way never done before, we found that this stereotype turned out to have little validity! The findings derive from an analysis of data drawn from Dun & Bradstreet’s Million Dollar Database (MDD), a vast compilation of information on North American public and private companies that have more than 20 employees or more than $1 million in annual revenues. To identify companies with former business-school professors in top management, my team searched executive biographies for such words as “professor” and business disciplines (accounting, business administration, finance, management, marketing, and economics), and then examined each search result individually to ascertain that the individual had the title “Dr.” and was from a business school rather than another part of a university. The final sample consisted of 215 matched pairs of companies.

The professors assessed company performance by dividing annual revenues by total workforce, a common way of measuring productivity. We found that firms with former business-school professors in executive positions had a mean productivity index of about $217,000, compared to about $178,000 for firms without professors at a statistically significant level (p-value is less than...
We also found that the result was more reliable for small companies than big ones, further evidence of individual professors’ effectiveness, since it is in small companies that a single person is likely to have the greatest impact.

What accounts for the superior performance of companies that have former professors in their top management? We concede the possibility that professors who migrate to the business world might be a special breed, to be distinguished as a group from the great majority that remains in academe. Yet, the two groups have much in common, we believe. Almost all doctorate-holding business professors go through similar hiring processes based on academic selection criteria. It is reasonable that the former professors would then share some of those criteria with current business-school professors. We then examined companies run by former professors from university areas other than the business school. This auxiliary analysis investigated whether business school expertise accounted for performance and not merely the personological factors (e.g., intelligence, conscientiousness) associated with completing a doctoral-level education or high academic proficiency. We accessed and searched the MDD again and constructed 27 paired observations based on the same controls. Due to the small sample size, we executed Wilcoxon signed rank and quantile tests for median differences between former professors from business schools versus their counterparts from other university areas. The results show that companies with former business school professors as executives perform better than those with ones from other university areas as executives. We also allow for the possibility that the better-performing companies in our sample preferred to hire professors to be executives. Yet, the widespread stereotyping of academics as a breed remote from the realities of the business world leads us to doubt this is the case.

More Insights

We executed a logistic regression analysis to examine specific aspects of companies in the sample. Table 1 summarizes the results. Due to turbulent variable scores, we operationalized performance as a dummy variable indicating whether a company performed better or worse than its control. Results (β = .644; p = .049) show companies with former business school professors in VP positions performed the best of all. Results (β = .249; p = .039) also show companies led by executives who exited academic careers early performed best.

Facing the significant result that executives who exited academic careers earlier managed better performing companies, we believe that recency of expertise and greater knowledge of current scholarship make for better performance as an executive in a specific business area. We can offer several alternative explanations for this finding. First, younger faculty members may have not yet become accustomed to being a professor in a business school. Thus, once they entered a company, it required less adjustment in terms of orientation and inertia. Second, early career exits may have been more likely to discover that work in a university did not suit them. Thus, their performance as an executive may have been better because the career was more attractive to them, and they were willing to develop new skills and competencies. Third, younger faculty members are sometimes more recently from the business world (i.e., before undertaking their doctoral program). For example, one may have chosen to go back to school to earn a Ph.D. from a college of business, and then become a professor, but ultimately recognized that he or she was more competent in a business organization. Fourth, early career faculty members are pre-tenure. The early academic career exits may have sought positions in industry for reasons related to the pursuit of tenure. For instance, they may have been denied tenure and thus pursued a career in industry, or perhaps they made a personal choice not to undertake the process of earning tenure. Finally, it is reasonable to ask whether being trained as a professor versus actually being a professor adds unique value to performance as an executive.

To analyze the data more fully and illustratively, we undertook a correspondence analysis to help assess expectations.
for academic specialization and executive position (see Figure 1).

Figure 1 shows relations between academic area of specialization and executive position. Coordinates representing former professors with general backgrounds in business administration plot closest to the point representing CEO, whereas points representing more specialized areas are more proximal to the point indicating VP, indicating correspondence based on competence breadth, and consistent with study expectations.

Although intellectual prowess is thought to occupy a narrow sort of expertise, it is arguable that a business school professor could manage a functional business area well because its specialization reflects that of his or her academic area. In fact, the areas of executive management in organizations reflect the departments in business schools and the editorial boards of academic journals. Whereas professors lack the generalist orientation of a CEO, the logistic regression and correspondence analyses in our study both supported the notion that VPs and professors are similarly specialized. It is worth noting that in practice, VPs frequently guide and counsel CEOs. They serve as sounding boards, give focused insights, and help CEOs make better management decisions. Indeed, not only did companies with professors as VPs perform the best in our sample, but professors also tended toward VP positions in the correspondence analysis. This result is particularly strong as such an effect is generally difficult to discern statistically. We believe dimensional correspondence between academic expertise and VP position requirements helps account for this finding and holds promise for future research on the importance of business academia to practice.

Implications for Doctoral Education
How could those former professors become good managers? We believe the fundamental reason is that their knowledge can help them resolve complex and uncertain business issues when common sense is unreliable. It has been noted explicitly that no amount of experience will ever prepare a rising manager for all of the challenges he or she will face as an executive. The business world is wrought with uncertainties and requires personal interpretations that can, and often do, lead to colossal mistakes. Theory or knowledge enables one to parse cause and effect from intricate arrays of information. When a theory is germane to the phenomenon in question, it is instrumental for sorting out the causal linkages.

In addition to carrying out extensive statistical analysis, we solicited the views of executives in the sample about the study’s findings, and several of their comments suggest that their mastery of a corpus of knowledge and their ability to create new knowledge helped them in the real business world. One participant said: “The year in academia exposed me to different ways of thinking about business problems; especially I have the capability of research when I face a complex problem.” The scientific method, academia’s basic paradigm for developing theory or knowledge, is emphatically more than experiments and trials and er-

![Figure 1: Correspondence analysis to help assess expectations for academic specialization and executive position.](image-url)
rors. In addition, existing literature thus enables those former professors to work in a way that is exceptionally smart.

The above arguments reflect that there is nothing wrong in pursuing academic rigorousness in our doctoral education. By focusing on academic rigorousness, our doctoral programs certify that the recipient has not only mastered a body of knowledge (usually demonstrated by the passing of qualifying examinations), but that he or she has also contributed to that body of knowledge (usually demonstrated by the writing of a dissertation). Of course, academic rigorousness may turn to focus very narrowly. Someone might question that since a manager should span a broad scope of a company’s operation, how could a narrowly focused professor coach tomorrow’s managers? Nevertheless, the neglected fact is that our MBA students are taught by different professors from different disciplines rather than one. If we treat an MBA student as a CEO and his/her professors as VPs, then we would see a typical management scenario in reality: whereas specialized expertise may run the risk of neglecting certain organizational areas as a CEO, where breadth is important, the depth of such expertise may lead to exceptionally effective management decisions as a VP in the appropriate functional area. Poor dimensional fit between executive position and expertise based on depth and area can result in poorer performance for a whole company.

In our follow-up interviews, some executives also believed that “apart from expertise in a content area, business-school professors seem to have a unique sort of communication competence.” As one of the participants, a female vice president of finance at a middle-sized company, said: “It’s challenging to be a business school professor. I was nervous when I started teaching because when I was younger I was introverted. So I prepared a lot for my classes . . . . When I became a manager in the finance organization I had already learned how to effectively communicate finance and accounting concepts in understandable ways in MBA classrooms. So I was a natural at making presentations to large groups and communicating with clients, the executive team, employees, and staff. It’s not just finance expertise from my academic experience that made me an executive. It’s communication skill—the ability to make complex concepts understandable.”

While there has been a great deal of misguided rhetoric on the tensions between research and teaching, through which PhD students quickly learn that one does not get tenure by teaching well, the above interview results confirm that preparation for teaching should be an essential part of the doctoral experience. If business schools are truly committed to offering professional education of excellence, our preparation of management educators ought to reflect that commitment more fully and in ways that train our doctoral students to impart their knowledge base to tomorrow’s managers in our MBA classroom.

ANNOUNCEMENTS, from page 26

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

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: http://www.cit.gu.edu.au/conferences/apdsi08/index.html
In the following article, Eric Olsen reviews a new book by Richard Schonberger, who received the Shingo Prize for Excellence in Manufacturing, an award in manufacturing management from the Institution of Production Engineers (UK), and an award in production and inventory control from the Institute of Industrial Engineers. Schonberger is a former Holmes Professor at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

A Deeper Look at Lean Best Practices
by Eric O. Olsen, California Polytechnic State University

I had the pleasure of being at the inaugural meeting of the Lean Educators’ Academic Network (LEAN) in August 2005. The meeting consisted of about 25 professors, consultants, and industry representatives who had set about the work of figuring out how to incorporate lean thinking into operations management curricula at the university level. It was a high-powered group with Jim Womack and several other lean authors and leaders in the audience. At an early stage of the meeting, when introductions were called for, each participant was asked to share his or her personal lean journey. It was surprising to me—though it should not have been—that a quarter to a third of the participants shared that their lean journeys started with their exposure to the works of Dick Schonberger. That is where my own passion for lean started.

As a new manufacturing engineer for Hewlett Packard in 1989, I was struggling to make sense of my job. Perhaps it was not all about fighting fires. A remote satellite transmission class held on site (an early predecessor to the now ubiquitous free Webinars on lean), talked about a book called World-Class Manufacturing: The Next Decade by Richard Schonberger (1986). I got a copy of the book and was hooked. I started sharing the “principles” of world-class manufacturing with my colleagues at brown bag lunches and experimenting with applications. Even though Hewlett-Packard is often cited as an early adopter of just-in-time (JIT), it was a big decentralized company. In the Components Group, of which I was a part, we moved into Southeast Asia early (1967) to take advantage of abundant low-cost, skilled labor. We did not need to “undertake lean first and foremost to survive” (p. 23), but the description of best practices and underlying principles of world-class manufacturing were like a life-line to many of us trying to make sense of manufacturing’s role in a global economy. Eventually we got Schonberger to spend some time with us at various HP sites in the U.S. and in Southeast Asia, and he and I became friends and fellow

Eric Olsen
is an assistant professor of industrial technology at California Polytechnic State University’s Orfalea College of Business. He has over 20 years of industry experience in engineering and manufacturing management and received his PhD in operations management from the Ohio State University. His research interests include lean thinking and performance measurement.
eolsen@calpoly.edu
http://www.cob.calpoly.edu/faculty/profiles/olsen.html
solution-seekers. That he had visited many companies in the book both in the 80’s and more recently, provides more credibility for his observations.

Since his first book, Japanese Manufacturing Techniques: Nine Lessons in Simplicity (1982), Schonberger has been on the forefront of bringing forward what we now call “lean.” If one thinks about it, lean is a fairly improbable name for a paradigm that has had various incarnations as JIT, time-based competition, Japanese manufacturing techniques, and world-class manufacturing. In his new book, Best Practices in Lean Six Sigma Process Improvement: A Deeper Look, Schonberger (2008) is again sharing his insights on over two decades of study, analysis, and consulting in the field we now call lean six sigma. The main premise of the book is that “there are many ways to become lean” (p. viii). By a “deeper look,” Schonberger observes, as have others (Womack, 2007), that lean is not easy to sustain. Even icons of lean like Toyota and Danaher have not sustained one of the key financial indicators of lean success: inventory turns. His message is rich with examples, speculation, challenges to the status quo, and best practices that show that lean is not a fait accompli. There is more to learn about what makes a lean company successful in a given circumstance.

The book is broken down into six parts. Each part looks at lean six sigma from a different perspective. The first part sets up the financial criteria for leanness and begs the question, “Can a company be lean if it does not practice the ‘lean core’?” The lean core is identified as practices that have mainly originated in Japan with Toyota, namely, “cells, kanban/pull system, quick setup, small lots, supplier partnership, total productive maintenance, and so on” (p. ix). Schonberger argues that leanness is ultimately determined externally in the eyes of the customer. He offers the “golden goals” of “ever-better quality, quicker response, greater flexibility, and higher value” (p. 10). By setting up the argument in this way, companies can be lean by not explicitly implementing all the lean core or the Toyota Production System (TPS). This is a refreshing reminder, as we in the lean field tend to accept the validity of the TPS and have become implementers, or worse yet, apologists for lean as the answer to all manufacturing’s problems. What do we do when lean becomes the “establishment”? Can best practices take us beyond lean? Schonberger points out that in terms of performance there are several companies who we would inherently consider lean, such as Dell and Wal-Mart, that do not have explicit lean programs and then there are lean icons like Toyota and Danaher. By looking at the practices of these companies, Schonberger helps us understand the practices or lack of practices that make a company “lean with a capital L” (p. viii).

The key financial performance measure, and surrogate for externally determined lean implementation used by Schonberger, is inventory-turns. He correctly observes that improvement in inventory-turns has been the only financial measure constantly associated with lean in the research literature, and that other, more bottom-line financial measures have been less consistent (i.e., Biggart & Gargiua, 2002; Boyd, Kronk, & Skinner, 2002; Kinney & Wemme, 2002). Schonberger devises a grading system of A, B, C, D, and F based on the number of years in improving or declining inventory trends. An analytical empiricist might find fault with both the limited number of performance measures and the crude measurement scale. My conclusion, after reading the book, was that the inventory-turn data, if not made a point of fixation, provides a compelling plot device to keep the story moving forward. The simple ABC classification system provides an easy way to differentiate company performance. Enough additional data were always provided in graphical form and in ample endnotes to tell a more complete story.

As always, Schonberger’s observations on best practices are some of the best parts of the book. These observations brought back fond memories of book study groups (p. 180) when we were experimenting and trying new ideas right on the factory floor. When we were told, “We have found the answer and it is lean,” there was a shift in research to understanding and implementing lean as a cohesive holistic, rather than a shifting and evolving set of ideas to be added to and perfected. We were guilty of the lean sin of jumping to cause, and stopped asking the bigger question. Even now that we are digging deeper into why and how lean works, we are in danger of acting out that old joke about losing your keys in the dark, but looking for them under the street lamp because the light is better. We are getting to the point where there are many companies implementing lean and the light is getting better. Schonberger points out that a fair bit of data are already in and it shows that lean is very hard to sustain.

Part Two of the book gives Schonberger an opportunity to do the other thing that he does best: challenge sacred cows. In conceding the positive aspects of the lean core, he takes on extremists who view the seven wastes as finite and definitive by offering up additional wastes such as “analyzing the waste” and “costing the cost reductions” (p. 49). He differentiates true kaizen from the type of “discontinuous improvement” represented by “kaizen blitzes” (p. 50). He is also harsh on going to “gemba” or the “action zone” if it is limited to upper management or becomes a code word for micro-management. Best practices include “full engagement” of the entire workforce and “competitiveness training” (pp. 51-53). Our mis- and over-reliance on even a reduced set of lean metrics also takes a hit in this section. Although positive and upbeat about the inroads made in lean accounting, Schonberger warns about unlean practices such as “replacing conventional profit-and-loss (P&L) reporting with lean, activity-based P&L reports . . . Lean means less” (p. 58). The call for fewest controls and controllers adds to an underlying theme for this book. The best companies doing lean are able to see beyond the standard rhetoric and practices to develop a unique capability that gets lean results without adding work, even if it is a lean practice.
Growth has been especially problematic for some lean companies. Toyota’s sales have risen 5 percent per year for 20 years and its inventory turns have decreased by 4 percent per year mostly due to increases in finished goods inventory. Harley Davidson, another lean adherent, has seen the opposite effect. It has grown sales 5.3 percent per year and improved turns by 3.9 percent over about the same time period as Toyota. Changes in leadership have often been cited as a reason for lean decline and resurgence. Schonberger provides historical perspective on the management changes and the effect on the process improvement programs at Milliken, GE (white goods), Westinghouse, Wiremold, American Standard, and Steelcase. “Capacity deprivation” (p. 143) is another condition that puts the brakes on lean. It is paradoxical that when lean practitioners say “lean means less” they should immediately follow that with the caveat: “except for capacity.” High capacity utilization due to increased sales can be one result of lean success. Schonberger highlights how lean companies must find ways to increase capacity to maintain low inventories and flexible, responsive systems. The final way to put the brakes on lean is by “knowledge mismanagement” (p. 147). Schonberger provides best practice examples and cautionary tales from companies that have invested in acquiring lean knowledge and have maintained or lost it to varying degrees.

In part five of his book, Schonberger offers new images of lean and ways to get it. In this section, Wal-Mart and Dell replace Toyota on the cutting edge of lean. It is not unexpected that two experts in supply chain management would dominate in a globally competitive landscape. They not only have big idea business models that thrive on process improvement, but they also have become experts at using information technology and supplier collaboration. The cartel-like keiretsu system used in Japan, once thought to be a strength and an enabler of TPS, is too protective of members. Dell and Wal-Mart “have elevated global standards for competitiveness” (p. 161). Other best practices that Schonberger highlights in this section are “importing/exporting lean expertise through acquisitions and mergers” (p. 170); offering challenging work to retain lean managers, staying true to the principle of simplicity as “lean initiatives, in large corporations anyway, are mind-numbingly complex” (p. 174); guarding against “model proliferation undoing leanness” (p. 176); and getting back to the days when “the old guard read everything . . . went anywhere and everywhere to learn lean and experimented extensively with acquired knowledge” (p. 180). There are sections on best practice design of lean facilities and production lines. Part Five concludes with an extended discussion of how the best companies are handling external linkages to customers and suppliers. It is an epilogue to Schonberger’s last book, Let’s Fix It: Overcoming the Crisis in Manufacturing (2001) where he describes opportunities for companies to improve in supplier/customer coordination, standardized designs, marketing-operations teamwork, and performance measurement.

Best Practices in Lean Six Sigma ends with a look at leanness across 33 industrial sectors. Schonberger once again finds interesting paradoxes in how well the usual suspects are doing on lean implementation and performance. In his analysis, electronics comes out in the lead even as Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) outsource to a booming category of electronic manufacturing services on a global scale. Although the motor vehicle industry was easiest to adopt lean, it still lags behind other industries in reaching its full lean potential. A surprising—and late—lean arrival is the aerospace-defense industry. OEMs are clearly on the lean bandwagon, although their suppliers are still struggling. Other industries, such as petroleum, pharmaceuticals and retail, are presented to highlight unique relationships to lean. Schonberger treats all his observations from the external lens of inventory-turns and a closer perspective of individual companies and best practices in lean.

This book can be used in several ways. It is not a beginner’s book on lean,
although high-level business managers and finance people (i.e., skeptics) may find it a friendly segue from their own paradigms. Implementers and researchers can renew their own skepticism about what works and what does not. Practitioners can scour the pages for best practices and insights on how to improve their own improvement programs. Researchers can apply more rigorous financial and statistical analysis techniques to test the premises put forward in the book. As more companies arrive at the lean frontier, we are back to a contingency-(best practice)-based approach that needs to be explored and understood. Finally, we can wait for history to unfold. Based on this update to the global lean journey for world-class manufacturers, we can wait and see. As Dick Schonberger says, “Best practices, as a whole, is about responding to the customer quickly, dependably, and well. Process improvement is not a short-term pursuit, nor a narrow one. It is never-ending” (p. 274).
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**NAMES IN THE NEWS**

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

**P. George Benson**, president of the College of Charleston, received an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree from The Citadel on May 4, 2008. Previously, Dr. Benson served as the dean of the University of Georgia’s Terry College of Business and Rutgers University’s Business School. He was named a Fellow of the Decision Sciences Institute in 2000.

[besong@cofc.edu](mailto:besong@cofc.edu)

**Thomas W. Jones**, University of Arkansas, received the 2008 SWDSI Outstanding Educator Award. Over the last 30 years, he has been recognized by the University of Arkansas with the College of Business Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching (1979), Outstanding Faculty Award for Classroom Instruction (1983), Outstanding Faculty Contributions to Teaching Award (1986), and Outstanding Teacher Award (1988); the Business Graduate Students Association Outstanding Graduate Faculty Member (1998); and the Student Alumni Board and Associated Student Government Recognition for Excellence in Teaching (2001). In 2006, based upon sustained excellence in teaching as well as exemplary service to the university and his profession, Tom Jones, a DSI Fellow, received perhaps the ultimate faculty recognition at the University of Arkansas when he was appointed as a University Professor.

[twjones@uark.edu](mailto:twjones@uark.edu)
**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 2009 International DSI Meeting will be held June 24-27, 2009, in Nancy, France. Paper submission deadline is February 1, 2009. Contact Program Chair Minoo Tehrani, Roger Williams University, Bristol, Rhode Island, USA, mtehrani@rwu.edu.

http://internationaldsi.org/

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 will hold its second annual conference at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, January 3-5, 2009. Submission deadline for extended abstract is July 15, 2008. For more information, contact Jatinder N. D. (Jeet) Gupta, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, guptaj@ual.edu.


The Mexico Region is still planning its next annual meeting. For more information, contact Antonio Rios, Instituto Tecnologico de Monterrey, antonio.rios@itesm.mx.

The Midwest Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on April 16-18, 2009, in Oxford, Ohio. See url below for more information.

http://www.fsb.muohio.edu/mwd-si2009/

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


http://www.nedsi.org

The Southeast Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on February 18-20, 2009, at the Doubletree Guest Suites in Historic Charleston, South Carolina. Submission deadline is September 19, 2008. The call for papers can be found at the link below. For further information contact Program Chair Wesley Jones, School of Business Administration, The Citadel, 171 Moultrie St., Charleston, S.C. 29409. Wes.jones@citadel.edu, (843) 953-7531. Fax: (843) 953-6764.

http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region held its 2008 (29th) Annual Meeting on March 4-8, 2008, in Houston, Texas, USA. Check back for more details on the 2009 annual meeting.

http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region will hold its 2009 (38th) Annual Meeting on April 7-11, 2009, in Kauai, Hawaii. Submission deadline for abstracts and papers is October 1, 2008. For further information contact Nafisah Heiat, Program Chair, programchair@wdsinet.org.

http://www.wdsinet.org

**Call for Papers**

Conferees

2008 International Conference on Business and Information (BAI2008) will be held July 7-9, 2008, in Seoul, South Korea. Organized by the Academy of Taiwan Information Systems Research (ATISR), the conference is sponsored by National Taipei University (NTPU), Shih-Chien University, and Hanyang University, Seoul. Submission deadline was January 31, 2008.

http://bai2008.atisr.org

http://ibacnet.org/bai2008

IEEE ICWS 2008 (6th IEEE International Conference on Web Services) will be held September 23-26, 2008, in Beijing, China. Abstract submission deadline was April 2, 2008.

http://conferences.computer.org/icws/2008

**Publications**

*International Journal of Technology Marketing* seeks articles for a special issue on “R&D, Innovation and Marketing - How to Convince Internal and External Stakeholders of Technological Innovations.” Guest editors are Dr. Alexander Brem, VEND consulting GmbH & Friedrich-Alexander University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany (brem@industriebetriebslehre.de); Prof. Dr. Liora Katzenstein, Israel School of Entrepreneurial Management and Innovation, Israel & Swinburne University of Technology, Australia (dean@isemi.org); Dr. Hashem Sherif, AT&T, USA (hsherif@comcast.net); and Prof. Dr. Kai-Ingo Voigt, Friedrich-Alexander University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany (voigt@industriebetriebslehre.de). Submission deadline for 1-2 page abstract is June 1, 2008; submission of manuscripts: September 30, 2008.


*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.ijoqm.org/Info_authors.pdf

See ANNOUNCEMENTS, page 21
“Improving Competitiveness through Information and Decision Sciences” is the theme of the Decision Sciences Institute’s 2008 Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland. The hallmark of any world-class organization is its ability to compete successfully. Today’s markets require timely information and effective decision making based on the information. In this paradigm, information becomes the product and the decision science becomes the process.

The Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) encourages the advancement of decision-making research in many ways, including the sponsoring of its annual meeting, where scholars and practitioners from all over the world are invited to share the latest decision-making developments. The DSI 2008 Annual Meeting invites basic, applied, theory, and case study research in the field of decision making, as well as proposals for panel discussion, symposia, workshops, and tutorials dealing with research or pedagogical issues. This meeting will include invited sessions featuring highly respected researchers, educators, and practitioners who will share their knowledge and experience on decision-making practices. The sessions will be organized into 23 tracks and various miniconferences. The meeting will also feature curricular issues, technology in the classroom, doctoral student consortium, grantsmanship, and faculty development programs for both new and senior faculty.

The DSI 2008 Annual Meeting offers much more than just a paper presentation conference! The meeting offers faculty opportunities to renew teaching/technology skills, learn how to use current methodologies to enhance research efforts, find employment, and establish networks that can last a career lifetime.

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

The 2008 DSI Annual Meeting theme is “Improving Competitiveness Through Information and Decision Sciences.”
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. Submission deadline was 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. Submission deadline was April 1, 2008.
E. Powell Robinson, Texas A&M University, e-robinson@tamu.edu

Best Case Studies Award Competition
The Case Studies Workshop serves an active role in the dissemination of new ideas with respect to case studies topics. Cases may be methodological in nature (i.e., crafted to support the learning of a specific technical skill) or integrative (i.e., designed to foster the integration of scientific approaches and analyses with real-world decision making). Submission deadline was April 1, 2008.
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

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.

Benedict Andrews, Roger Williams University, andersen@rwu.edu

Journal Editors Attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting
Check out “Activities” at the link below for an alphabetical listing of editor-in-chiefs and regional editors who have expressed interest in attending the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting. Many other area editors, managing editors, and associate editors will also be in attendance.
www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yair Levy, Nova Southeastern University, ljevy@nova.edu; Irma Becerra-Fernandez, Florida International University, becfer@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 was 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

Kristie Seawright, Brigham Young University, kristie_seawright@byu.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. Submission deadline was May 1, 2008.

William Johnson, Bentley College, wjohnson@bentley.edu

Rupak Rauniar, University of St. Thomas, rauniar@stthom.edu

Baltimore’s harbor at sunset.
2008 Doctoral Student Consortium
Creating successful career paths for students
Co-sponsored by McGraw Hill/Irwin, Beta Gamma Sigma, and DSI

DSI’s 26th annual Doctoral Student Consortium is an engaging, interactive professional experience designed to help participants successfully launch their academic careers. We are pleased to have the sponsorship of McGraw Hill/Irwin and Beta Gamma Sigma for this important event. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 22, 2008, at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Teaching Effectiveness: Harvey Brightman will return to the Doctoral Consortium for another post-retirement workshop in 2007. His sessions are simply not to be missed. Even experienced faculty members sit in on these dynamic and inspiring sessions.

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

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

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

Job Search Seminar: Should I target my job search on research-oriented schools? Teaching schools? Private? Public? What’s the best way to sell myself? What are the ingredients of a good job interview? This session will help participants answer these questions through insights drawn from a panel of faculty experts.

Join Us
The Doctoral Student Consortium does more than prepare individual students, it creates a community of colleagues you’ll know throughout your career. Please plan to attend the Consortium and also encourage your student colleagues to participate in this important program. Although many participants will be entering the job market for 2007-2008, others will appreciate the opportunity to get a better understanding of an academic career and how to approach the job market the following year.

Application Process
Students in all areas of the decision sciences are encouraged to apply for the DSI Doctoral Student Consortium. Those wishing to be included should submit:

1. A current curriculum vita, including contact information (e-mail in particular), your
major field (accounting, finance, marketing, management, operations management, MIS, management science, strategy, and so on), the title of your dissertation proposal or the title of a current research paper.

2. A letter of recommendation from your dean, doctoral program director, department chair, or dissertation chair. The letter should attest to the applicant’s qualifications and good progress in the doctoral program. Interested students are encouraged to apply early if they wish to ensure themselves space in the Consortium. Materials should be sent to Maling Ebrahimpour, Doctoral Consortium Coordinator, by July 30, 2008. Those who apply by this date and meet the criteria listed above will be accepted for participation. Applications received after July 30th will receive consideration on a space-available basis.

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

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

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

Baltimore’s scenic harbor.

2008 Track Chairs

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

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

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

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

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

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

Finance/Financial Management
Barbara Poole, Roger Williams University

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Marketing: Theory Applications and Practice
Effie Stavrulaki, Bentley College

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

Organizational Behavior/Organizational Theory
Robert Dengler, Benedictine University

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

Quality and Productivity
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University

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

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

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

Supply Chain Management
Sahin Funda, University of Tennessee-Knoxville

2008 DSI Annual Meeting
New Faculty Development Consortium

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

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

• What it means to be a faculty member today
• Learning the “rules” of the game—tenure and promotion policies at different types of schools
• Becoming an excellent teacher and how to documenting it
• Becoming an excellent researcher in various types of environments

• The role of service—departmental, institutional, community, and professional

See NEW FACULTY, next page

New Faculty Development Consortium Co-Coordinators
William B. Carper
College of Business
University of West Florida
Pensacola, FL 32514
(850) 474-2350 F: (850) 474-2314
bcarper@uwf.edu

Carl W. Gooding
Samford University

James A. Pope
Louisiana State University in Shreveport

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? __________________________________________________________

Decision Line, May 2008
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• Career path strategies, organizational politics, and the importance of networks and mentors
• Understanding that everyone does not receive tenure at his or her first institution and that this does not mean your career is over
• Building an academic portfolio that will serve you well
• Academic ethics
• Future trends in the academy

To apply for the 2008 New Faculty Development Consortium, please complete the application form and send it along with a copy of your current vita to the NFDC Co-Coordinator. All applications must be received by September 15, 2008. More specific information will be provided to those participants who are accepted for the Consortium.

Participation is limited to the first 50 qualified applicants. Each participant will be expected to register for the Institute’s 2008 Annual Meeting in Baltimore, MD. No additional fees are charged for the New Faculty Development Consortium.

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.

DSINFO Listproc

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

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

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

Professional and Faculty Development Program

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

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

In addition, the program will include a series of sessions related to research, teaching, publishing, and other professional development issues for faculty who are beginning their academic careers. Submission deadline was 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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Apart from the emotional effect this quake had on me, this was living proof that it is essential to have people who can manage and direct efforts such as this, and that these strengths would be beneficial, not only in situations of natural disasters but also for companies in competitive positions and concerned about their sustainability. As in the China earthquake incident, it is important to coordinate global supply chains effectively, ensure effective distribution and communication channels, obtain appropriate and sufficient funding and allocate these resources effectively, create a good leadership environment and presence, and care for all stakeholders involved or affected by company decisions.

Within our DSI community, our research, publication, teaching, and consulting needs to be supportive of the issues that are important and relevant to the business community, our governments, and global communities. Concentration on the global economy will be inevitable.

Over the last few years, the DSI Board has seen developments in the strategic planning process, right up to the Toronto strategic planning retreat in August 24-25, 2007, when the Board reformed the Institute’s vision and mission statements, examined its strengths and weaknesses, resulting in a list of strategic goals and accompanying charges. Although the Board is made up, primarily, of academic members on a collegial and volunteer basis, much energy was spent in producing a number of well-intentioned reports which formed the basis of action plans and implementations to improve our institutional standing, as well as our core values of quality, responsiveness, and professional development.

There seems to be two areas that should have been given more emphasis in the next 12 months so they do not form roadblocks in important decision making. These are (1) the recognition of a very important set of constituents in the Institute—the regions, and (2) clarity in governance—different interpretations and applications of the Institute’s constitution and by-laws, policies, and procedures. I have established ad hoc committees to address each of these.

If I return to the DSI objectives from 2005-06 and 2006-07, one of them in particular is enhancing the value of membership of the DSI. It is only in enhancing the value of DSI membership that we attract and maintain our members and allow DSI to become the institution of first choice to schools, deans, and decision-making professionals. This would have the flow-on effect to our journals and annual meetings. So in the context of the above, I offer the 2008-09 overall objectives and its related goals and sub-goals.

Overall Objective:
Enhance the value of membership in the Decision Sciences Institute.

To achieve this, the following goals and sub-goals are put forward:
1. Increase member satisfaction and participation
   • Improve quality of Annual Meeting;
   • Improve responsiveness, and perception of research excellence of the DSI journals, Decision Sciences and Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education;
   • Develop special interest groups based on inter/cross/trans-disciplinary platforms;
   • Enhance services offered by the Placement System, especially web-based;
   • Recognize different academic systems internationally and responsiveness of the DSI to these systems.
2. Leveraging off our constituent bodies and networks
   • Recognition of the roles that regions play in the DSI and vice versa, and nurturing a symbiotic relationship between the regions and DSI;
   • Collaboration with international academic and professional bodies.
3. Effective use of IT
   • Effective communication—enhance content, capability, and visibility of the DSI website;
   • Extension of website use from mere information source and transactional, to transformational and communication resource;
   • Enhance services offered by an improved Placement system.
4. Increase the global visibility and acceptance of Decision Sciences, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, and Decision Line.
5. Timely and easier decision making through clear governance structures and mechanisms.
   • Clarity and consistency in, and interpretation of, DSI constitution and by-laws vis-à-vis policies and procedures;
   • Recognition of different international governance systems in overseas regions;
   • Responsive and clearer financial reporting, and investment options, to enable continued funding of projects and responsible Institute operations and expenditure.

Many of these sub-goals are inter-related. There will be a heavy reliance on the workings of the committees, especially the ad hoc committees, development committee, and committees for regional activities, member services, IT, publications, programs and meetings, and many others. The Institute’s committees, and elected and appointed officials play important roles in the efficient functioning, growth, and development of the Institute. The charges to these committees and officials, and their recommendations regarding these charges, provide guidance to the Board of Directors in identifying and developing the future directions of the Decision Sciences Institute.

We have had a number of recommendations in the past through the production of fine reports that came from committee members, tasked with difficult charges. This year is probably not the time to spend too much effort collecting data, but the time to consolidate and clarify, and to re-build bridges between our important constituents, as well as to move forward and implement those worthy recommendations that were, and will be, offered.

Norma J. Harrison (海若琳)
This year the members of the Board extended themselves. Their dedication to the renewal of the Institute and their willingness to invest their time, thought, travel, and resources into moving the Institute forward were laudable.

At the beginning of the year, I asked each Board member and committee chair to help with our process of renewal by adopting additional core values (borrowed from agile modeling, one of my current research areas). These core values are: communication, feedback, simplicity, and courage. These are described further in recent Decision Line columns from July and October in 2007, and from January and March in 2008.

We began by examining and promoting six reasonable goals that could improve the Institute. Each committee was given charges to recommend anything in their domain that would move the Institute toward these goals.

The following is a brief review of these goals and the progress the Board and committees made during this past year:

1. Engage and communicate with our membership

Under the Board of Directors supervision, the Membership Services Committee chaired by Gary Hackbarth conducted a membership survey in July. Following the unique Strategic Planning Retreat held in Toronto, Canada, in August, 2007, the charges that emerged from the retreat were shared with the DSI membership in Decision Line. In November, we hosted the first ever Town Hall Meeting as part of the Annual Meeting in Phoenix, Arizona.

2. Increase attendance and quality of the Annual Meeting

At the 2007 Annual Meeting, the Home Office arranged for a barbecue dinner, an experience unique to DSI. The call for papers for the 2008 Annual Meeting in Baltimore has been circulated and Program Chair Marc Schniederjans has instituted changes to the reviewing process, based on comments expressed during the Town Hall Meeting.

3. Enhance journal quality and promote research excellence

At the Board’s request, I appointed a Blue-Ribbon Committee to evaluate Decision Sciences and discuss how it can maintain its superiority among other journals. Manoj Malhotra, a Fellow of DSI, chaired the committee, which included Paul Gray (Fellow of INFORMS and AIS), Kwei Tang, (Fellow of DSI), and Bob Zmud (Fellow of DSI and AIS) and effectively produced a report that was extremely helpful and constructive to our current editor, Vicki Smith-Daniels, as well as future editors of DSJ. Two Institute members began their terms as new editors: Professor Chetan Sankar is now editing DSJIE, and Professor Krishna Dhur is now editing Decision Line.

The Publications Committee and the Board of Directors evaluated the Decision Sciences journal editor Vicki Smith-Daniels, and extended her term as editor for two additional years. The Board of Directors also approved a procedure for proposing new journals for the Institute.

4. Clarify the DSI structure and relationships between the Board, the Home Office, and members

At the Strategic Planning retreat, the participating Board members broke up into subgroups and subsequently identified the areas that need to be explored. The Board recommended changes to the structure of the Board of Directors contingent on the approval of the membership.

For the first time, the Institute:

a. Utilized a professional, outside facilitator to focus the Board of Directors on strategic issues at the Board meeting in April of 2007. The Board then requested the consultant to facilitate the Strategic Planning Retreat in August. At this retreat, a new mission statement was developed:

“The Decision Sciences Institute advances the science and practice of decision-making. We are an international professional association with an inclusive and cross-disciplinary philosophy. We are guided by the core values of high quality, responsiveness and professional development.”

At the same retreat, the Institute’s vision was stated as follows: “DSI will be the premier society for decision-making professionals.”

b. Set up protocols for communication channels so that chairs of key committees could be “present” during key Board decisions via speaker phone.

c. Held its first ever Town Hall Meeting to garner feedback from the membership at the Phoenix, Arizona DSI Annual Meeting.

d. Has decided to outsource design of the Institute’s information systems and appoint liaisons to coordinate the development of new systems with the goals of the Institute.

In addition to the above, Bob Markland led a team (composed of former presidents of DSI and one member of the 2007-2008 Executive Committee), which conducted an onsite review of the Home Office, and which made recommendations that were approved by the Board of Directors.

5. Grow our membership

The Board, as well as the program chairs for the Annual Meeting, all assumed responsibility for making sure that our membership would grow. One approach was to engage the families of participants in the Annual Meeting, and we took a step in this direction by hosting a unique family barbecue at the Annual Meeting in Phoenix last November. Another approach included having representatives from the Board attend regional meetings and encourage participants in regional meetings to join DSI.

The Board of Directors approved upgrading of the Decision Sciences Institute Web site and the DSJIE Web site. In addition, it was agreed that all of the regions
would have access to the template for the Institute’s Web site.

6. Expand our global position and perspective

The inaugural Indian Subcontinent Regional Meeting was held at IMT Ghaziabad, India in January of 2008. DSI now has three regions outside the US: Asia Pacific, Mexico, and the Indian Subcontinent.

As a symbolic gesture of global positioning, the Board of Directors met for the first time outside of the United States this past year. The first ever Strategic Planning Retreat for members of the Board of Directors of the Institute was held in Toronto, Canada, in August 2007.

The Institute developed and posted the first Wikipedia entry about the Decision Sciences Institute. This is meant to encourage scholars from around the world to participate in DSI. We hope to cultivate a brand name that is recognized as a premier professional society around the world.

I would like to thank each and every DSI Board member for their dedication to the Institute. In addition, I would like to single out two individuals who understood the above goals and responded to each of these in such clear and useful ways: Clyde Holsapple, the chair of the Publications Committee and Vicki Smith Daniels, the editor of Decision Sciences. They understand how to position the Institute strategically.

Furthermore I am grateful to Vijay Sugumaran, who chaired the Information Technology Committee; Manoj Malhotra, who chaired the Blue-Ribbon Committee to Enhance the Quality of the Decision Sciences Journal; Bob Markland, who chaired the ad hoc Home Office Review Committee, and Krishna Dhir, who chaired the ad hoc Committee to Clarify Board Structure. These individuals worked tirelessly and presented their recommendations to the Board in a constructive fashion.

I am also thankful to Marc Schniederjans, the 2008 Annual Meeting Program Chair, who has been implementing changes proposed by the membership to enhance the quality of the 2008 Annual Meeting and who is an excellent example of a good communicator. Finally, I would like to once again thank Carol Latta, our executive director, and everyone at the Home Office for being the stable force behind DSI.

I am looking forward to working with the 2008-2009 president, Norma Harrison, and I welcome Ram Narasimhan, the president-elect. Ram contributed much to the 20007-2008 Board and will serve the Institute well.

I feel fortunate to have served with a Board that understood what it meant to participate in a Strategic Planning Retreat and who committed their time and energy (and in some cases personal funds) to do so. When the Board kept the concept of renewal in mind, we made progress. When the Board wanted to reinvent, rather than renew, the results met with resistance from the membership. I hope that future Boards will remember that renewal is the process of reinvigorating the membership and reaffirming the values upon which the Institute was founded almost four decades ago.

---

### Decision Sciences Institute Budget Summary FY 2008-2009

**July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$ 71,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Revenues</td>
<td>246,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>442,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$760,407</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>$98,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Services</td>
<td>314,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>350,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$762,956</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue Over (Under) Expenses</td>
<td>(2,549)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Depreciation Expense (Not a cash expense)</td>
<td>9,842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue Over (Under) Cash Expenses</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Upcoming 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

- **November 19-22, 2011**
  - Boston Marriott Copley Place Hotel
  - Boston, Massachusetts

- **November 2012**
  - San Francisco Marriott
  - San Francisco, California
The Decision Sciences Institute holds an international meeting every two years that features presentations of original research papers; Ph.D. and new faculty development seminars; case studies, and other interesting innovations in the field of business (see tracks below). Best paper awards are given in several categories at the conference. The 2009 International DSI Meeting will be held June 24-27, 2009, in Nancy, France. Paper submission deadline is February 1, 2009. For more information, contact Program Chair Minoo Tehrani (Roger Williams University, Bristol, Rhode Island, USA, mtehrani@rwu.edu) or see the website at:

http://internationaldsi.org/

**Accounting**
Michel Magnan, Concordia University
Montréal, Quebec, Canada
mmagnan@msb.concordia.ca
May Lo, Western New England College
Springfield, Massachusetts, USA
mlo@wne.edu

**Business Ethics**
Samuel Mercier, Université de Bourgogne
Dijon, France
samuel.mercier6@orange.fr

**Business Law**
Susan Marsnik, University of Saint Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota, USA
SMSMarsnik@stthomas.edu

**Case Studies**
Christophe Vignon, Université de Rennes 1
Rennes, France
christophe.vignon@univ-rennes1.fr
Pamela Wynn, Bloomsburg University
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania, USA
pwynn@bloomu.edu

**e-Commerce**
Q. B. Chung, Villanova University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
q.chung@villanova.edu

**Economics**
Maurice Baslé, Université de Rennes 1
Rennes, France
Maurice.basle@univ-rennes1.fr

**Entrepreneurship**
Luis Rivera-Solis, Dowling College
Oakdale, Long Island, New York, USA
RiverAL@dowling.edu

**Finance & Financial Management**
Julian Gaspar, Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas, USA
jgaspar@mays.tamu.edu

**Health Care Management**
David M. Dills, Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee, USA
David.dills@vanderbilt.edu
Neset Hikmet, University of Southern Florida
Sarasota, Florida, USA
hikmet@mail.usf.edu

**Human Resource Management**
Sylvie St-Onge, HEC Montréal
Montréal, Quebec, Canada
Sylvie.St-Onge@hec.ca

**Information Security**
Doug White, Roger Williams University
Bristol, Rhode Island, USA
dwhite@rwu.edu

**Information Systems/DSS/AI/Expert Systems**
Manouch Tabatabaei, Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, Georgia, USA
mtabatab@GeorgiaSouthern.edu

**Innovative Education**
David Alis, Université de Rennes 1
Rennes, France
David.alis@univ-rennes1.fr

**International Business**
Joachim Wolf, University of Kiel
Kiel, Germany
wolf@bw.uni-kiel.de

**International Relations**
Mary Troy Johnston, Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
johnston@loyo.edu

**Knowledge Management (Use of Data & Data Mining Techniques)**
David Douglas, University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas, USA
ddouglas@walton.uark.edu

**Manufacturing Management**
Amir Hormozi, Texas A&M Corpus Christy
Corpus Christy, Texas, USA
Amir.hormozi@tamucc.edu
Dan Reid, University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire, USA
rdreid@christa.unh.edu

**Marketing/OMIS Interface**
Marketing Theory, Application & Practice
Jan Bodin, ICN Business School
Nancy, France
Jan.bodin@icn-groupe.fr

Rozenn Perrigot, Université de Rennes 1 and
ESC Rennes School of Business
Rennes, France
Rozenn.Perrigot@univ-rennes1.fr

**MS/OR: Techniques, Models & Applications**
Snehamay Banerjee, Rutgers University-Camden
Camden, New Jersey, USA
snehamy@camden.rutgers.edu

**New Product Development & Project Management**
Tomas Blomquist, Umeå University
Umeå, Sweden
Tomas.Blomquist@usbe.umu.se

**Organization Behavior & Organization Theory**
Deseré Koktd, Central University of Technology, Free State
Bloemfontein, Republic of South Africa
koktd@cut.ac.za
Edward D. Arnheiter, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Hartford, Connecticut, USA
arnhee@rpi.edu

**Quality & Productivity**
Sue Pariseau, Merrimack College
North Andover, Massachusetts, USA
Susan.Pariseau@merrimack.edu
J. Rungtusanatham, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
rung0002@umn.edu

**Service Management**
Mark Davis, Bentley College
Waltham, Massachusetts, USA
mdavis@bentley.edu
Fabrizio Salvador, Instituto de Empresa, Madrid
Madrid, Spain
Fabrizio.Salvador@ie.edu

**Statistics & Decision Analysis**
Reza Noubary, Bloomsburg University
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania, USA
rnoubary@bloomu.edu

**Strategy**
Krishna Dhir, Berry College
Mount Berry, Georgia, USA
kdhir@berry.edu

**Supply Chain Management**
Pedro Reyes, Baylor University
Waco, Texas, USA
Pedro_Reyes@baylor.edu
Cindy Wallin, Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah, USA
cynthia.wallin@byu.edu
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 nationally 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 recommendation to the Chair of the Nominating Committee, c/o the Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

The Nominating Committee is most appreciative of your assistance.

Office
Nominee’s Name & Affiliation

Statement of Qualifications

Nominator’s Name & Affiliation

FELLOWS’ NOMINATIONS

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

In order for the nominee to be considered, the nominator must submit in electronic form a full vita of the nominee along with a letter of nomination which highlights the contributions made by the nominee in 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
Bensim, Charles P., Stanford University
Beiglman, Harvey J., Georgia State University
Buffa, Elwood S. (deceased), University of California-Los Angeles
Congiuos, Vincent (deceased), University of Southwest Louisiana
Carret, Phillip L., Arizona State University
Chase, Richard B., University of Southern California
Chervany, Norman L., University of Minnesota
Clapper, James M., Aladdin Tempkite
Colton, Rodger, Drexel University
Couger, J. Daniel (deceased), University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummingo, Larry L. (deceased), University of Minnesota
Darden, William R. (deceased), Loyola State University
Davis, K. Roscoe, University of Georgia
Davis, Mark M., Bentley College
Day, Ralph L. (deceased), Indiana University
Digman, Lester A., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Dock, V. Thomas, Mau, Hawaii
Ebert, Ronald J., University of Missouri-Columbia
Edwards, Ward, University of Southern California
Evans, James R., University of Cincinnati
Fetter, Robert R., Yale University
Flinn, Dino E., Texas A&M University
Flynn, Barbara B., Indiana University
Franz, Lori B., University of Missouri-Columbia
Glover, Fred W., University of Colorado at Boulder
Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State University
Crawford, Dennis E. (deceased), Boulder City, Nevada
Green, Paul E., University of Pennsylvania
Grott, Gene G., Georgia State University
Gupta, Jatinder N.D., University of Alabama in Huntsville
Hahn, Chai K., Bowling Green State University
Hamner, W. Clay, Duke University
Hayya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State University
Henshaw, 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
Kevwon, 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., Maim University
Krajewski, Lee J., Notre Dame University
LaForge, Lawrence, Clemson University
Latta, Carol J., Georgia State University
Lee, Sang M., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Luthanes, Fred, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Maber, Vincent A., Indiana University
Malhotra, Narayan K., University of South Carolina
Malhotra, Naresh K., Georgia Institute of Technology
Markland, Robert E., University of South Carolina
McMillan, Claude, University of Colorado at Boulder
Miller, Jeffrey T., 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
Raiffa, Howard, Harvard University
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Reimnuth, James R., University of Oregon
Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College
Roth, Joseph V., Clemson University
Schaake, Lawrence L., University of Texas at Arlington
Schneiderman, Marc J., University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Schriber, Thomas J., University of Michigan
Schoedler, Roger G., University of Minnesota
Simon, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology
Shucum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist University
Sobol, Marnon 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
Troult, Marvin D., Kent State University
Uhl, Kenneth F. (deceased), University of Illinois
Vazenny, Andrew (deceased), University of San Francisco
Voss, Christopher A., London Business School
Wasserman, William, Syracuse University
Wemmerlov, Urban, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Wheeler, Steven C., Harvard University
Whitten, Betty J., University of Georgia
Whybark, D. Clay, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wickland, Gary A., Capricorn Research
Winkler, Robert L., Duke University
Woolsey, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines
Wortman, Max S., Jr. (deceased), Iowa State University
Zmud, Robert W., Florida State University

---
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### DECISION SCIENCES INSTITUTE

**2008 Annual Meeting Registration Form • Baltimore, Maryland • November 22-25, 2008**

All attendees must register for the meeting. Conference registrations must be postmarked by October 27, 2008, to avoid a late fee of $50. After October 27, requests for cancellation refunds will not be accepted. Mail form and payment for the registration fee to: Decision Sciences Institute, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303, fax 404-413-7714.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, (11/24)</td>
<td>Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, (11/25)</td>
<td>Strategic Management &amp; Policy</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, (11/26)</td>
<td>Manufacturing/Service Management</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, (11/27)</td>
<td>Technology and Innovation</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, (11/28)</td>
<td>Technology and Innovation</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, (11/29)</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, (11/30)</td>
<td>Public/Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, (12/1)</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, (12/2)</td>
<td>Thursday’s luncheon?</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, (12/3)</td>
<td>Strategic Management &amp; Policy</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, (12/4)</td>
<td>IS/DSS</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, (12/5)</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, (12/6)</td>
<td>IS/DSS</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, (12/7)</td>
<td>Sunday’s luncheon(s) @ $48 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Member and non-member fees for all registration categories include Sunday’s luncheon, Monday’s reception, Tuesday’s luncheon and online access to the Proceedings. The Annual Meeting Proceedings will be produced online after the meeting is held. The Proceedings will consist only of submissions accepted and presented at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting.**

- **Member registration**  $325.00
- **Non-Member registration**  $325.00
- **Student member registration**  $80.00
- **Student Non-Member registration**  $115.00
- **Emeritus Member registration**  $115.00
- **Emeritus Non-Member registration**  $150.00
- **Extra Sunday’s luncheon(s) @ $48 each**
- **Extra Tuesday’s awards luncheon(s) @ $48 each**
- **After October 27, 2008 (LATE FEE)**  $50.00

---

### CREDIT CARD INFORMATION:

- **Card No. _________________________________ Expires: ___ /___**
- **Card Holder’s Name _________________________ (Please Print)**
- **Signature _________________________________**
- **Billing Address _________________________________**
- **City/State/Zip _____________________________**
Deadlines:

**JULY**
July 15
The Indian Subcontinent Region will hold its second annual conference at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, January 3-5, 2009. Submission deadline for extended abstract is July 15, 2008. For more information, contact Jatinder N. D. (Jeet) Gupta, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, guptaj@uah.edu.

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 32 for detailed information.

September 19
The Southeast Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on February 18-20, 2009, at the Doubletree Guest Suites in Historic Charleston, South Carolina. Submission deadline is September 19, 2008. For further information contact Wesley Jones, Program Chair, The Citadel, Wes.jones@citadel.edu, www.sedsi.org

**OCTOBER**
October 1
The Western Region will hold its 2009 (38th) Annual Meeting on April 7-11, 2009, in Kauai, Hawaii. Submission deadline for abstracts and papers is October 1, 2008. For further information contact Nafisseh Heiat, Program Chair, programchair@wdsinet.org, www.wdsinet.org

**NOVEMBER**
November 22
The 39th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 22-25, 2009, at the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront Hotel in Baltimore, Maryland. See pages 27-33 for detailed information on activities in Baltimore. Contact Program Chair Marc Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, at dsi2008@unl.edu. http://www.decisionsciences.org

---

**Decision Sciences Institute Application for Membership**

- Name, Institution or Firm
- Address (Home or Business)
- Phone Number

**Dues Schedule:**

- Renewal
- First Time
- Lapsed

(circle one) **U.S./Can. International**

- Regular Membership
- Student Membership
- Emeritus Membership
- Institutional Membership

- You have been designated to receive all publications and special announcements of the Institute.

Please send your payment (in U.S. dollars) and application to:
Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION:

- Visa
- MC
- AmEx
- Disc.

Total amount $__________________
Card No. ____________________________ Expires: ___ /___
Card Holder's Name ________________________________
Signature __________________________________________

(Please Print)