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PRESIDENT’S LETTER

The academic “Steady State”—Is it good for us?

by Norma J. Harrison, CEIBS, President, DSI

I am sure that most of you enjoyed the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting in Baltimore as much as I did. Many thanks to Program Chair Mark Schneiderjans and his team, the track chairs and coordinators, as well as the DSI Home Office in organizing the conference. We also had the good fortune to hear industry leaders such as John Janney of Independence Blue Cross and Theo De Kool of Sara Lee Corp, who presented views of management from their companies’ perspectives. I would also like to sincerely thank the chairs and members of the various DSI ad hoc and regular working committees. I was able to attend most of these meetings during the conference and was most im-
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Decision Line, January 2009
FROM THE EDITOR

KRISHNA S. DHIR, Editor, Berry College

We are witness to history. Erstwhile Senator Barack H. Obama has become the 44th President of the United States of America. Eloquence in telling of a story helps its understanding. Moved by the weight of history, U.S. Representative John Lewis, an associate of Martin Luther King, Jr., said that it was too much to contemplate. “What is happening is going to change America forever. I see this as a significant down payment on the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.,” he said.

We are upon a season of renewal. Our Institute will soon elect new leaders as well. In her letter, President Norma Harrison takes an informal measure of the Institute membership on such basic issues as the state of the Institute today, what has been accomplished, and what are the potentials and possibilities. Discovering a preference for risk avoidance, she urges the Institute to be daring, take risks, and nurture self-motivators who would “make a difference to the economy and to the welfare of the global society.”

Once again, we offer our readers a set of excellent, thought-provoking essays by experts. Jay Heizer of Texas Lutheran University, Barry Render of Rollins College, and Kevin Watson of University of New Orleans collaborate in the feature column, In The Classroom, to discuss the use of web-based software to aid and assist instruction. They find that these web-based systems improve student learning and enrich teaching experience as well. In the feature column on Production/Operations Management, Ceyhun Ozgur of Valparaiso University and J. Randall Brown of Kent State University discuss “obstacles that limit the application of quantitative scheduling techniques.” They suggest strategies and ideas on how to overcome these obstacles.

Kenneth Kendall of Rutgers University, in the feature column on Ecommerce, uses the sports metaphor to drive home lessons of disaster planning. Through disaster preparedness and recovery planning, companies “can diminish the potential for loss of assets and maybe even prevent the loss of entire business.” For The Deans’ Perspective, Saleha Khumawala presents a model for microfinance-supported education program. She suggests that “there is a need to combine the work that has been done in microfinance business efforts with educational development.” In the Doctoral Student Affairs feature column, Michael Hitt of Texas A&M University, Parthiban David of the University of Oklahoma, and Tim Holcomb of Florida State University offer their views on what it takes to succeed in a doctoral program of study.

Have you contributed essays to Decision Line lately? Please consider sharing your ideas with other members of the Institute. Send us your essays of about 2,500-word length to either Hal Jacobs, respective feature column editors, or me. In the meantime, happy reading!

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

by Jay Heizer, Texas Lutheran University; Barry Render, Rollins College; and Kevin Watson, University of New Orleans

As most DSI members know, homework and exams can now be administered using Web-based software. Such software is delivered as a stand-alone package or via Blackboard or Web-CT. These software packages have been adopted by textbook publishers such as McGraw-Hill, Wiley, and Prentice-Hall. The authors have evaluated a version of this software and found it a powerful educational tool. Specifically, we have documented that Web-based software can be used for both homework and testing to improve the teaching/learning process.

The vehicle we tested is sophisticated commercial software developed by Brownstone, a subsidiary of Horizon Winba. This particular software has been adopted by publishers to supplement their offerings in disciplines that include statistics, accounting, finance, and other quantitative fields. The version of Brownstone’s software discussed here is the one distributed by Prentice-Hall under the name Prentice-Hall Grade Assist (PH Grade Assist or PHGA) and included with the Heizer Render Operations Management text. After extensive use by all three authors in their respective OM classes, we can make several major points regarding usefulness and student learning.

System Usefulness: Efficiency and Grading Integrity

From the instructor’s perspective, PHGA is a highly efficient system for creation and grading of homework and exams. This software allows randomizing problems, algorithmic variation of numbers within problems, automated grading, worked-out explanations, and a variety of administrative options. Additionally, the assignments can be generated by problems from the instructor, the text chapters, and the text test bank. The process of creating an assignment is simple: Pick a few problems from an extensive library, establish a few parameters, and click to send them to the students. Then wait for the grades to arrive. Tests are prepared in minutes and there is no time spent grading.

The system also adds integrity to the testing/grading process. Given the current pervasive academic dishonesty (McCabe et al, 2006) this can be a significant issue. PHGA curtails academic misconduct because the problems can be randomized, presented one at a time on the computer screen, and most significantly, the data values within problems may be generated algorithmically and, therefore, be unique. Accepting that it is the instructor’s responsibility to avoid dishonest systems, automated and randomized algorithmic testing is an excellent way to add integrity to the system.

A system that faculty find efficient (i.e., one that requires less time making and grading tests), combined with a reduction in student collaboration (i.e., cheating), is very appealing. Given that we can also document improved learning, faculty rationalization for use of the software is an easy next step.

Student Learning Outcomes

The system does improve learning. Nail cites earlier use of on-line quizzes in his engineering course that led to improved performance.

The total percentage of students failing the final examination dropped from approximately 25% to 7%...
The level of improvement in performance varied among the students. In general, it was approximately a letter grade higher in the final analysis. (Nail, 2006)

These conclusions are consistent with the experience of the authors, who have been using PHGA for several years. There are many ways to utilize the software package to teach and evaluate student performance. The following three successful approaches using this technology have been used to improve student learning.

First, the system can be used to administer and evaluate homework assignments. Students often subvert the purpose of the homework assignments by not doing them, by obtaining answers via fraternity files, or by simply copying the work. Additionally, the homework may be turned in wrong. And even when grading is done promptly, the feedback to the student is typically delayed by days. However, students like immediate feedback—and immediate feedback supports learning. Feedback delayed, whatever the cause, may be education denied. PHGA not only provides unique homework assignments, but immediate grading with detailed explanations.

PHGA not only provides instantaneous feedback and also permits, at the instructor’s discretion, repeated efforts to work and rework problems until mastery. When used in this manner, PHGA allows a number of good things to happen: (1) the faculty does not get in the way of feedback to the student, (2) the student gets instantaneous feedback, (3) the faculty is not burdened with grading papers, but most importantly, (4) the student learns. Table 1 below, based on research at the University of New Orleans, indicates student homework performance via this approach. Note that both graduate students and undergraduate students average about two tries to get their work correct. The result is a 15.3 percent to 34.9 percent increase in their performance.

A variation of the homework approach was reported by Mandernach (2003). This approach had students taking online weekly cumulative reviews. On average, these students used 3.17 attempts to reach mastery on the cumulative review assignment. This approach yielded final exam scores of about 75 percent vs. 66 percent for those not participating in the weekly reviews. This increase in performance is consistent with the one letter grade improvement reported by Nail as noted above and the experience of the authors.

A second way PHGA can be used is to provide pretests for upcoming classes. With this approach, students may be assigned a selection of objective questions (True/False or Multiple Choice) and introductory problems that are representative of the text material. By specifying a cut-off time and date immediately prior to the class where the material will be covered, PHGA motivates the student to prepare for class. Again, the student is provided with immediate performance feedback without intervention by faculty. This approach has been addressed historically by “pop quizzes.” Pop quizzes may have helped, but they absorb class contact time and add to the grading burden Mandernach (2006). The judicious selection of questions for pretest can increase student motivation, class discussion, and stimulate true inquiry about the material. Students like the PHGA system and they do come to class with some knowledge of the material—an exciting prospect for the instructor. The class is the richer for it.

Finally, both homework and exams can utilize PHGA. This model was evaluated via the performance of two classes at the University of New Orleans. One MBA class had assignments using PHGA while students in the MBA control group did not. They were different students, but they were selected into the same program using the same criteria. With minor differences, the assignments were the same. The PHGA group was slightly more demanding, as Queuing was an added topic. Additionally, the PHGA group had all quizzes and homework graded for accuracy via the automated system, while the control group turned in material with homework counting for 30 percent of their grade based on completion, not accuracy. These distinctions make the PHGA class slightly more rigorous. Additionally, the control group received a grade curve of over 20 points and a weighting in the final grade of 30 percent for homework graded for effort (not accurate, just complete). In spite of the greater demands placed on the PHGA group and a significant curve for the control group, the control group scored much lower (nearly 10 points) on their.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM Class</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Attempts (Average number)</th>
<th>Attempts (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Student homework performance via the PHGA approach (based on research at the University of New Orleans).
overall average than the PHGA group. These findings are consistent with the work of Professors Nail and Mandernach cited above.

**Students Like the System**

Students like immediate feedback. These Web-based systems provide immediate grading and clear explanations. In addition to the positive classroom experience noted by the authors of the present study, we note that Mandernach (2006) found that:

> all findings agree that students learn more in classes that utilize computer-based instruction than in classes that do not, computer-based instruction is more efficient than traditional instruction, and that students generally have more positive attitudes toward instruction when it incorporates computer-based material.

Additionally, there are indications from course evaluations that students using PHGA take responsibility for their grades in a manner that evaluates teaching not on the student’s particular outcome, but on his or her opportunity to learn.

**Conclusion**

The Brownstone/PHGA Web-based technology is ushering in a new, improved way of teaching—and learning. All indications are that these systems do improve learning. At the same time, they allow faculty to enrich the course through scholarship and improved instruction, rather than spending tedious hours preparing tests and grading.

**Endnotes**

1. Authors Heizer and Render include the Brownstone (PHGA) system as a supplement to their texts (Operations Management, 9th edition, and Principles of Operations Management, 7th edition, Prentice Hall, 2008). All three authors have used the Brownstone/PHGA software as part of their Operations Management courses.

2. A recent article by Susan W. Palocsay and Scott P. Stevens, “Empirical research: A study of the effectiveness of Web-based homework in teaching undergraduate business statistics,” Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, (6,2) (July 2008) found differences in student performance in classes using several different Web-based software, but all classes used some version of a Web-based system, and results were overwhelmed by variations between instructors and experience. In this study the instructor variable was held constant.
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A sudden, unexpected event occurs. If the consequences are significant we refer to this damaging, unpredictable event as a disaster. Information systems are vulnerable to computer attacks and viruses, disruption of telecommunication services, vandalism, power outages, and an assortment of natural disasters. Large firms with information resources and all firms that do business electronically need to anticipate events, be prepared if and when an event occurs, and take the necessary steps to keep the business going and recover from adversity. Since it is so difficult to predict disasters and often it seems futile to prepare for one that never occurs, CIOs and IT practitioners need examples regarding how disasters happen and what they need to do to prepare for them. This month’s article ponders whether examples from the baseball diamond can help IS professionals identify the hurdles they need to clear to prepare the business for a disaster and its aftermath. [Kenneth E. Kendall, Feature Editor]

**Rules and Rainchecks:**
Can Ecommerce Firms Learn about Disaster Planning from Baseball?

by Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University

When is half of an event worth more than a whole event? When it is the fifth, and possibly final game of the World Series. For those of you who haven’t been keeping track of America’s pastime, every year in October the two best teams in Major League Baseball (MLB) play a best of seven game series to determine the championship team. This year was a little different than other years. The Philadelphia Phillies met the Tampa Bay Rays for what appeared to be an unremarkable series. But in the fifth game, played in Philadelphia, it started to rain. It seemed as though the players would try to endure the elements and finish the game, but it soon became apparent that the game had to be stopped, at least temporarily.

Lack of Information in a Crisis
Yet no announcement was made. Nothing came over the loudspeaker. No authority figures made their presence known. The crowd looked to those in uniform (ushers, food vendors, and maintenance crews) for a clue about whether to stay or leave. Another large group of fans were huddled around a television set hoping to get word from another group of authority figures, the local sportscasters and meteorologists.

I thought that I had the answer. Since I had my iPhone at the game and was receiving a play-by-play description from the **MLB.com At Bat app**, which included graphical images of a batter and each pitch thrown, color-coded for balls, strikes, and hits. But the MLB app simply froze on the last batter. (I received no other messages until the game restarted, and then the image changed to the player that was currently up to bat.)

A couple of our friends headed for the exits only to give away their tickets to a “couple of college kids,” not realizing the game would be resumed in a couple of days, and that only original tickets would be honored for re-admission. When they arrived home, they heard that the game was suspended. Their tickets were like those being sold on e-bay for a pretty price.

**Rules Are Made to be Applied**
There was no special rule for calling off a game that would declare the champion before the ninth inning. But why...
wasn’t there a rule? Ending a game before each team had a chance to win the game within the full nine innings would not be satisfying for fans on either side and would result in the dreaded asterisk (*) in records books until the end of time.

Ending a game prematurely was apparently unthinkable. No one thought that this would ever be a possibility, from its beginning in 1903 when baseball was played in fields, then parks, then stadia, and until now, when post-stadium era baseball is once again played in ballparks.

Even the experience gained in the 1989 Loma Prima earthquake didn’t seem to help the authorities consider how to handle a suspended game. The earthquake struck at 5:04 p.m. before Game 3 of the 1989 series was scheduled to begin. The series was delayed for 10 days. According to an article on Wikipedia about the 1989 World Series, Baseball Commissioner “Fay Vincent had made the decision to postpone Game 3 without telling anybody first. As a result, the umpires filed a formal protest of Vincent’s decision.”

One would imagine that someone had thought of the possibility that a game might need to be suspended in the middle of a game and continued at a later date. Perhaps they thought that the rule that “if a game is called after five innings have been completed it is a regulation game,” would cover it. While fans agree that this rule applies in a regular season game, it does not seem to work in a championship series, especially in this case, where the series would end and one team would be declared the winner.

**Can Examples from Baseball Help CIOs and IT Managers?**

Any unexpected event can have a major impact on business in this new electronic world. In some ways, the network of computers has made it more likely that something unpredictable might occur.

This article resolves to determine what we can learn about three stages of an unanticipated disaster:

1. Predicting if and when a disaster will occur.
2. Preparing for a disaster if and when it occurs.
3. Planning for disaster recovery if and when a disaster occurs.

**Predicting If and When a Disaster Will Occur**

Let me begin by defending Major League Baseball by pointing out that the rain event can be placed in the category of a Black Swan event. In a 2007 book, Nassim Nicholas Taleb defines a Black Swan event as one that exhibits rarity, extreme impact, and retrospective (not prospective) probability.

In other words, a Black Swan event is an outlier; something unpredictable and perhaps unimaginable based on our past experiences.

According to Taleb, other Black Swan events include the introduction of the personal computer, the creation of the Internet, and disasters such as World War I and 9/11.

**Preparing for a Disaster If and When It Occurs**

Crisis can be man made or natural, and they can range from inconvenient to crippling. According to Hecht (2002), a thorough business continuity management plan should be completed and supported by the highest levels of management.

Most of us are more familiar with the concept and actuality of disaster preparedness. In essence it includes the steps employees should execute in the event of a crisis.

Even disasters that seem rather mild (a power outage on a hot, summer’s day) do not have to be catastrophic to cause dramatic disruptions in a business. Typical occurrences that cause disruptions, but can be prepared for include power outages, power spikes, power surges, under-detected computer viruses, failures of computer hardware and bomb threats against a particular facility.

It is difficult to prepare for the Black Swan event. When one does not know the nature of the disaster, it is hard to describe the actions one needs to take in response.
ergency, taking care of the personal needs of employees, and restoring the main environment, if possible.

Companies have a lot to lose when serious events occur. Of course, there is the disruption to everyday operations, but along with this a company stands to lose revenue, their reputation, assets of their clients, proprietary assets of their own; certainly, employees and customers are vulnerable to loss in a disaster event.

This is where baseball comes in. Major League Baseball and the Phillies handling of the 2008 World Series can teach IT professionals about handling disasters, specifically about disaster recovery when faced with a Black Swan event.

Now Is the Time to Act

Even though baseball didn’t perform very well in the first two phases of disaster prediction and disaster preparedness, it went into full swing during the disaster recovery phase. Despite the initial chaos and uncertainty, MLB and the Phillies organization came back to win the day with their swift recovery from the disaster of the first part of Game 5. Each employee working in the ballpark for the final game understood and executed their role completely. Baseball made the fans, the teams, and the people of Philadelphia happy with the actions that were taken.

When companies do the right thing, through disaster preparedness and disaster recovery planning, they can diminish the potential for loss of assets and maybe even prevent the loss of entire business.

The World Series is the championship of baseball, the American pastime, the game. Perhaps baseball can be of help to us in the real world if we learn lessons from the game. Even a casual observer can realize that team building, cooperation, customer service, media distribution, accepting judgments, and other practices can be used as examples of good practices. Successful disaster recovery can now be added to the list.
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Gerald Horton, a long-time friend of DSI Executive Director Carol Latta, died on October 29, 2008. Horton was a member of the Georgia General Assembly (in the words of a friend, “he was absolutely good-natured, whether you were arguing or agreeing with him”). He went on to a successful career in public relations, including two years as chairman and chief executive officer of the Ogilvy & Mather public relations group in New York City. He also served as executive vice president of Georgia Power Company and became Executive Professor of Management and founder of the non-profit Management Program at UGA’s Terry College of Business. He also taught at Georgia Tech, Atlanta University, the New School for Social Research in NYC, and other academic institutions. Horton was a friend to many DSI members and past presidents, and Carol Latta missed the closing day of the 2008 DSI annual meeting to be at his memorial service, which was also attended by The Honorable Andrew Young and other distinguished guests.

Marcos F. Massoud, The Robert Day School of Economics and Finance at Claremont McKenna College, has been honored with the establishment of the Marcos F. Massoud Endowed Chair in Accounting in recognition of Professor Massoud’s “many contributions to the College and his profession.” Currently the Robert A. Day Distinguished Professor of Accounting, Marc has been a member of DSI since 1970 and was the president of the Western Region during 2000-2001. Also, he has been the president of the Congress of Political Economists International since 2007.

marc.massoud@claremontmckenna.edu
The microfinance movement has spread across the globe in an unprecedented effort to reduce poverty. The concept of lending credit to the impoverished is making its way into the public eye, with 2005 being named as the ‘Year of Microcredit’ by the U.N. and the 2006 Nobel Peace Award being given to the father of microfinance, Mohammed Yunus. Yunus (2006) is a staunch proponent of socially focused private firms, to the point that he advocates societies should set up separate industries for these areas. Microlending firms are on the cusp of becoming mainstream discussion for the daily business news.¹

Much has been documented in recent research about the impact of microfinance in alleviating poverty,² however, more can be done than merely optimizing the process. Capital, knowledge, and opportunity are the three key items that will help in empowering the poor. While microfinance has begun to provide capital, there is a lack of adequate resources to provide knowledge and opportunity. It is the goal of this research to determine the impact when knowledge is provided to those in poverty.

According to Sperling (2005), national economic advisor under the Clinton administration, in the world’s developing nations, 110 million children (60 percent girls) between the ages of six and 11 did not attend any school in 2005. In 2005, 150 million children dropped out before completing primary school. In many developing countries, the majority of populations are younger than 25. In India, for example, the UN estimated that in 2005, 52.3 percent of the population was 24 or younger, where 11.2 percent was 0 to 4 and 21.8 percent was 5 to 14.³ Combine this data with a 15 percent ROI seen in national education efforts and the result is a great lost opportunity. To date, there are only a few documented cases with regards to how credit for the poor impacts their educational development. In addition, there is even less information with regards to how microfinance could also finance and subsequently deliver education.

Much work has been done to improve the process of extending and regulating a microfinance loan,⁴ whether it is through the use of joint-liability lending or other contract restructuring, improving efficiencies by loan officers, instituting techniques for mitigating moral hazard, and or centralizing administrative tasks, etc. This paper proposes an area where enhancements can be made to improve the purpose of the loan itself and develops a program that provides a framework for microfinance clients to educate their children. Loan enhancement can be achieved by creating an education fund for a client’s child with the purpose of funding current and future schooling with a portion of the client’s payments, along with a matching amount from the MFI, to go toward the fund’s balance. Clients who join the education program would receive normal microfinance business loans but would then get interest rate incentives for joining. In addition, the loan is initially coupled with enough money to cover the cost of tuition for the children free of charge, in the form of a scholarship for a preliminary period. Going forward, there would have to be enough subsidies to keep the loans similar to how the payments are made after the education program is implemented. Then the client will continue to receive the discounted interest rate as long as the child attends school.
This study aims at intentionally stimulating educational development in the poorest areas of the world with more than just special program hand-outs for education by developing a theoretical framework for this program. We establish a plan after examining past programs, identifying factors critical for success, designing the loan to meet the needs of the client, and setting a structure to properly analyze the results.

Brief Literature Review

Until the past few years, offering loans to the poor has been performed by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the movement has largely been influenced and led by socially conscious, non-profit firms. The success of microfinance to date is due to NGOs. Goldberg (2005) offers a rigorous, collective summary of a large number of quality impact studies on the performance of microfinance throughout the world. This paper only reviews the relevant research studies related to various aspects of education and microfinance.

Card (2001) and Patrinos and Psacharopoulos (2004) provide useful background knowledge and techniques to begin developing a model for estimating educational performance. Card finds that marginal returns on education are highest for the poorest, previously uneducated segments of populations. Patrinos and Psacharopoulos research data from many studies performed to calculate the returns on education across a large number of countries. The results conclude that there are significant returns for education, and to a greater degree in developing countries.

Maldanado (2005) examined the educational effects that microfinance programs have on children of clients in Bolivia. Conclusions from the study include the need for incentives to be offered to clients to keep their children in school. Gonzalez-Vega et al (2002) examined the impact of education programs provided by microfinance firms on business performance and overall education levels of clients.

Amin and Arends-Kuenning (2004) researched three incentive-for-school programs in three different countries: PROGRESA in Mexico (Programa de Educacion, Salud y Alimentacion), Bolsa Escola in Brazil, and Food-For-Education (FFE) in Bangladesh. The premise of all three programs is to provide financial incentives for families to keep their children from working and continue their education. The study showed that all three programs were successful to varying degrees, where the number of children attending school increased and the average number of years of schooling increased at a greater rate for children in the programs than those not in the program. Patrinos and Psacharopoulos (2004) analyzed and compared marginal rates of returns for education in different countries and concluded that the highest returns were found in developing countries. Blom and Canton (2004) determined if increasing student loans for institutions in a country, in this case Mexico, would increase university accessibility to students and student performance. They found that undergraduates who received the loans had a 3 percent increase in their grade point averages, versus graduate students who showed no increase.

Blondal et al (2002) examined the importance of investing in human capital in OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) nations. This study uses a simple model to determine the rate of return on tertiary and upper-secondary education by comparing it with lower levels of education and concludes that investment in human capital provides higher returns than investing in other physical capital. Tooley (2000), based on results from the PROBE Report, makes the case that the governments of developing countries, to date, have been putting most educational public funds towards higher learning public universities, as opposed to primary public schools. As a result, the poor are left out of quality primary education and the rich actually get access to cheaper, higher education. An essay by Chowdhury et al (2004) on primary schools in Bangladesh confirms these conclusions.

Tooley’s (2005) survey of private schools in India, Ghana, Kenya, and China fared much better. His conclusions were that the privatization of primary schooling could be a solution to alleviate the schooling problem for the poor, because schools where microfinance is prevalent “generally” have a history of underinvestment, misallocation of funds, are short on quality, and lack accountability.

Government-funded public schools offer many challenges and obstacles. Reinikka (2004) sites that one concern is the amount of leakage occurring of monies designated for education. Teacher absenteeism is another major problem for public schools. Kremer, et al. 2005 study of 3,700 Indian public schools had three unannounced visits made to each of them and found only 45 percent of teachers actively engaged with their class (which required physical presence). Dixon and Tooley (2003) seek to show examples of private schools in a developing country that can service poor families. The importance of this study is that it shows how the poor students can overcome challenges in obtaining admission into private schools and proves that quality education can be brought to the poor, and demonstrates how they can pay for it.

Many programs have been designed to extend loans to students and have failed. Otienno (2002) documented a student loan program offered by the Republic of Kenya and the results displayed a history of failures to administer higher education loans successfully. The study reflects how many developing nations’ governments have similar types of programs but often don’t equip them with personnel who are well-trained at debt recovery. Salmi (1997) performed a study through the World Bank in 16 countries on their government and private-organization student loan programs and expressed the same sentiments brought up by the other authors for developing countries.

Based on the literature review, it is clear that there is a need to combine the
work that has been done in microfinance business efforts with educational development. While education improvements have always been linked to the development of countries and their economies, microfinance and primary education improvement have been thought of as separate issues. Even though education has proven to be profitable on a macro-level, specific educational programs, especially ones that require the poor to eventually pay by themselves, must be validated in their ability to achieve positive results. The Grameen Bank (Yunus 2003), and likewise many other firms following in Grameen’s footsteps, offer loans for higher education at interest rates of around 5 percent. However, research has not yet been performed to examine their performance or their effects on the clients.

This research study proposes a possible solution to meeting these challenges. To improve the needs of the poor on a long-term basis, the financial benefits of microfinance lending programs must be combined with the assurance of their educational development. The key to this program is that it is designed specifically to stimulate clients to pay for their children’s education themselves. New programs must be monitored for performance in both areas of business and education and should help to validate the performance of individual education programs.

**Program Framework**

**Research Objective**

The objective of this research is to develop a model that provides a framework for microfinance clients to educate their children. The goal is to implement this program and determine the effectiveness of an educationally focused microfinance lending program.

**Proposed Model**

The aim of the lending program is to provide capital for business initiatives by the client and concurrently see that the client’s children receive the proper education in the process. The program will also provide the necessary incentives for the client to forego any additional income that a working child could provide in order to receive the loan. It will focus on clients who receive business loans that, in turn, qualify them for participation in the program.

The client will originally go through a trial period of receiving business loans to establish that they pay their loans back reliably. Once the program begins, the client will then begin to receive the loan at a discount. A scholarship fund will be created for the client’s child. In paying their loans back, a portion of this payment will go towards the scholarship fund. The MFI and potentially other sources will match the client’s contribution into the fund. The scholarship fund serves two purposes: pay the tuition of the child’s current schooling needs and save the remainder towards the child’s tertiary education. Tuition is paid directly to the school to ensure that the school is paid and to guarantee attendance.

The proposed model (see below) includes the following structural modification to the loan. The goal is to make the difference between the original payment ($P_o$) and the new payment ($P_e$) as minimal as possible. In this case, $P_o$ and $P_e$ should be as close as possible, if not nearly equal.

In terms of a timeline of the program, there are three milestones. After the trial period, the program begins and all the benefits of a scholarship fund balance, discounted interest rate, and contribution matching can begin as well. If the client attains economic sustainability and no longer requires loans from the MFI, then contributions can continue to be made to the fund for the children’s future, tertiary education. The funds would not be available for the current education, which would be the client’s responsibility. The MFI could still match the contributions as an incentive to the client while managing the fund. Once the child reaches a tertiary age, then the funds can be disbursed to those institutions. In many cases, MFIs are restricted from holding savings accounts and thus
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**Original Payment:**

\[
P_o = \frac{C(1 + R_o)^Y}{n}
\]

**New Payment:**

\[
P_e = \frac{C(1 + R_e)^Y}{n} + F_e
\]

R = Interest Rate, n = number of payments, Y = number of years for loan, F = Fund Contribution
creative measures will need to be taken to allow their clients to be able to deposit excess resources into something that will provide a return in the future. In the case of the education program, the funds would need to be distributed directly to the educational institutions; this allows for the return to be a ‘commodity’ and not cash in the same way a savings account would work.

Participants can, but do not have to, be a current microfinance client prior to entering the education program. If the client is already in a lending program, then their contract can be modified according to the needs of the education program contract. If the client is part of a self-help group, a joint-liability contract where each loan’s terms are the same should be used, so that each client in the self-help group can apply for the program; minor modifications will be made during those periods where the program client is utilizing the group’s loan.

The discrete terms for the contract design in the program are intentionally left ambiguous at this point. It is the intention of this program to collaborate with existing microfinance lending organizations that already have established contract designs and methodologies in place.

**Initial Considerations**

An important consideration is choosing someone to manage the fund. If the MFI can legally maintain the fund, this will provide for additional capital. The intensity of the subsidies will also play a major role in the discount of interest rates and the MFI’s ability to match. Other factors to take into consideration are: the increase in the MFI’s expenses to run the program, the current cost of tuition for children, and the costs for tertiary education. The challenge in all of this, from the MFI’s perspective, is to keep this sustainable in terms of funding the program. With respect to moral hazard related scenarios on how clients might respond to lower interest rates by “shirking” their end of their businesses, requiring the scholarship fund contributions upon threat of eliminating the fund’s existence should mitigate this risk.

In terms of government cooperation, partnerships could be developed with public schools by admitting large numbers of MFI client students. Government would realize subsidies for fund creations and contribution-matching incentives as a commitment by the MFI to support its investment in schools by supplying students who will consistently attend and participate. Partnership terms would require full teacher attendance and curriculum standards (potential MFI monitoring). The MFI can leverage its services for the ability to manage the scholarship fund, which should provide more working capital.

Other considerations include the potential for using the pooled funds for investment by the MFI, deciding on the selection of schools, the degree of involvement by the MFI with the schools, and whether or not parent-teacher associations should be created or involved in the program.

**Implementation**

Existing microfinance firms will be used to add the education program feature to their portfolio. A formal application process will be used to apply for the program scholarship for children. Most loans will require some degree of personalization in identifying sustainability levels and the degree to which the interest rate should be reduced.

Clients will be statistically organized into the three groups. To evaluate the success of the program, the metrics developed by Khumawala and Frazier (2007) will be used throughout the study for all three groups: client income level prior to the program’s start and during each stage, total asset value before and after the program, family living conditions before and after, tuition requirements for children once sustainability is reached, the number of children attending school, and the children’s performance in school. These measurements will be then compared from one group to the other.

**Conclusion**

Great prospects exist for potential growth, in terms of poverty reduction, in the area of microfinance. Ensuring that the doors of capital, opportunity, and knowledge are allowed to be opened for the poorest populations is a challenging task. Expansion from a base of capital extension into these populations in order to create opportunities for that capital to grow is the next step. The prospects to this point appear promising as the microfinance infrastructure grows in developing countries as incentives for education programs have a successful track record.

**Endnotes**

1. Microloans for the Gulf Coast? Three years after Katrina, one-quarter of New Orleans small businesses are still closed. [http://www.csmonitor.com/2008/1007/p04s02-usec.htm](http://www.csmonitor.com/2008/1007/p04s02-usec.htm)

2. A recent study by Goldberg (2005) is the most comprehensive study on compiling the results of microfinance studies worldwide. The results show poverty alleviation, but they do not always conclude that each microfinance program is solely responsible for the improvement.


4. Much of this work is well documented by Armendariz de Aghion and Morduch (2005, Chapters 3-5) in establishing how to design efficient processes, while some recent studies on specific institutions have come from Kanter and Reisen de Pinho (2005) and Chu (2005).

5. Goldberg’s major purpose in this research is to bring together the performance results from the multitude of studies that have been executed, so that comparisons can be made across geographic areas, ethnic backgrounds, political situations, lending and service methodologies, etc.

6. Each program is implemented differently. Some are implemented by
government officials, while others join with NGOs and provide subsidies to implement the program. One such example is the FFE program in Bangladesh, which utilized BRAC’s infrastructure and schools by providing subsidies to BRAC so that incentives such as wheat could be provided to families with children in BRAC’s schools.

7. The PROBE Report (Public Report on Basic Education in India, 1999) was sponsored by the Indian government in an effort to determine the conditions of primary schools in India.

8. This essay did conclude that improvements have been seen in poor areas and for female children. Both demographics showed improvement from 1993 to 1998; however, attendance rates for boys across all demographics in the study decreased during that time period.

9. In many joint-liability contracts, loan amounts are the same for the group and the group will decide how the money is allotted, based on the needs of each group member. In other cases, the administering agent knows which member is receiving the funds (whether they are different in contract design to other group members or not). For both cases, accommodations will have to be made for that group member that enters the program, especially in the case where other group members may not enter into the program.
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Being successful in a Ph.D. program requires more than just mental ability. It is a challenging task that demands unequivocal determination and long hours of reading and writing. What does it take to be successful? Below you will find three essays that provide advice to Ph.D. students. The first one is written by Michael Hitt, a Distinguished Professor and Joe B. Forster Chair in Business Leadership at Texas A&M University and well-known author in strategic management. Michael has mentored over 40 doctoral students over his academic career. Two of his former doctoral students are reflecting upon their experience as Ph.D. students. Parthiban David, an associate professor and Rath Chair at the Price College of Business at the University of Oklahoma, discusses what it takes to be successful in a Ph.D. program from the perspective of somebody that graduated over 10 years ago. Tim Holcomb, an assistant professor in Management at Florida State University, also shares his thoughts about what it takes to be successful in a Ph.D. program with a third essay. He recently received his Ph.D. in strategic management from the Mays Business School at Texas A&M University. [Xenophon Koufteros, Feature Editor]

Being Successful in a Ph.D. Program
by Michael Hitt, Texas A&M University

Because of the careful processes used in screening and selecting new Ph.D. students, there is very little variance in the intellectual capabilities and other skills of those entering Ph.D. programs. And, success in a Ph.D. program requires more than intellectual capabilities. I have several recommendations for people who want to ensure that they are successful in a Ph.D. program.

Mental Preparation
Among those include the mental preparation required for a rigorous experience. To successfully complete such a program requires motivation and commitment. First, to be successful in a Ph.D. program, students need to prepare themselves mentally for a highly challenging and rigorous experience. This means that they should come into the program with the expectation of being challenged both intellectually and in terms of the rigor they should expect from the demands in the programs. Students also must be highly committed to performing well in the program and to gaining as much value from the program as possible. This commitment is based on a desire to succeed, the motivation to perform well and a willingness to make sacrifices and tradeoffs. In particular, the tradeoff that most students have to make in order to be successful is that of time and other activities. The most successful students are unlikely to have much leisure time, for example. Undoubtedly, some time away from the rigors of the program can be helpful, but they are likely to be few in number and short in duration.

Knowledge Absorption Capability
One of the important demands on Ph.D. students is a heavy requirement for reading a significant amount of material. Thus, I recommend that students develop the capability to read and absorb material quickly. Of course, speed reading is only valuable if the student is able to learn and internalize the content. Thus, speed reading is only part of the skill. The ability to absorb (understand and internalize) new knowledge is especially critical in Ph.D. programs. Such skills are necessary to be successful in a Ph.D. program.

Research Capabilities
In addition to the general content knowledge in the field of study, a Ph.D. pro-
program should help students build their research capabilities. Most Ph.D. programs require students to take a number of courses designed to help build their knowledge of research methodologies and statistical tools. Yet, some aspects of research are difficult to teach. In fact, these aspects of research often involve the application of tacit knowledge. Thus, individuals must actively participate in research projects in order to gain this knowledge. Ph.D. students likely will be motivated to participate in research projects in order to gain publications that help them in obtaining their first job as a faculty member. Such activity also adds to their repertoire of publications that can count toward promotion and tenure. Yet, participation in research projects while in the Ph.D. program also provides an important opportunity to learn and to build tacit knowledge on how to do research. As a result, Ph.D. students should participate in research projects with the intent of learning all aspects of research and publication. If papers are submitted to journals and students receive the opportunity to revise and resubmit, they should pay careful attention to the revision process and how to respond to editors and reviewers to achieve a successful publication decision.

Participating in research projects and working on other research papers provide the opportunity for an early start in developing the research question for the student’s dissertation. In addition, the dissertation research process provides an opportunity for the student to learn how to develop and manage a major research project. For example, by working with committee members, the student can learn how to manage others involved in a major research project. So, if one approaches the dissertation process appropriately, much can be learned that can be useful throughout one’s career in managing large research projects.

Learning how to derive value from those research projects through publication of the findings in major research outlets is exceptionally important for success in one’s career. Many of these skills, capabilities, and knowledge can be obtained in a Ph.D. program if the student is motivated.

Conclusions
Overall, a Ph.D. program is demanding and rigorous but can also be personally fulfilling and even enjoyable. Successful students often make some of the best friends through their peer group in Ph.D. programs. Some of the best friends I’ve had in my life come from people with whom I experienced and worked, and from whom I learned in my own Ph.D. program. I would wish the same positive experience for every Ph.D. student. They can do so if they approach it with the right attitude and commitment to learning.

Distant Reflections …
by Parthiban David, University of Oklahoma

Mike has, as always, provided excellent advice. Let me follow up with a few thoughts on what I think has worked for me.

Learn the Craft
The doctoral program provides plenty of opportunity to learn. Doctoral seminars teach us the tools of the trade, the theories and methodologies that help us ask and answer interesting questions. Think of the doctoral program as the means to build a strong foundation. A professor has to always be learning, and this is easier to do with a strong foundation to build on.

We’re Not Alone: Learn from Others
Research does not have to be a solitary activity. In the Ph.D. program, we learn from our professors, especially from our dissertation advisor and committee members, and from fellow doctoral students. Our circle expands over time to include doctoral students and professors at other schools, as we start to submit papers, attend conferences, and find jobs after graduation. These are potential role models, mentors, and friends. We can learn from their experience, and get help and advice on research, teaching, careers, and reviewing. Our conversations can help sharpen our ideas and foster opportunities to work on joint projects. If nothing else, our friends and mentors help us better celebrate our successes and cope with our disappointments. I owe much to mentors and friends who guided and inspired me, worked with me on my research, and helped me make better decisions. I would put having good friends and mentors right at the top of my list of what it takes to succeed.

Be Known for Your Work
It is easier to make a contribution by focusing on a unified stream of research than by dabbling in a variety of unrelated areas. The doctoral program provides a wealth of menu choices that should help you decide what area you would like to emphasize in your research. Start thinking about your research early. The sooner you start on your own research stream, the faster your progress. Be sure to pick a topic area you are truly interested in so that you can sustain your enthusiasm over the long haul.

Find the Right Balance
Success means different things to different people. We should aspire to do our best, but it helps us stay sane if we can be realistic about our abilities and our limitations so that we can “accept that which cannot be changed; the courage to change that which can be changed, and the wisdom to know the difference” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serenity_Prayer).
Recent Reflections …

by Tim R. Holcomb, Texas A&M University

What does it take to succeed in a doctoral program? Each doctoral program is different; each faculty is different; and each student holds unique ambitions and faces distinctive challenges. Thus, each student’s experience in a doctoral program is different. Nevertheless, much can be passed on to those who are beginning the journey. Certainly, success in a doctoral program requires competence, determination, and a passion to succeed. However, is there more to it? In reviewing my own experience, I have three suggestions for students to bear in mind when considering what it takes to succeed in a doctoral program: (1) prepare a plan, (2) set a deliberate pace, and (3) seek to persevere.

Prepare a Plan

Someone once said that success happens when preparation meets opportunity. Indeed, determining where you want to go and what steps you should follow are among the most important considerations when preparing for any journey. Pursuing a Ph.D. is no different. Define your goals for the program. Stephen R. Covey, noted consultant and author of the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People, suggests that all things are created twice and urges readers to begin with an end in mind (Covey, 1989). Covey argues that successful people first visualize an outcome, and then work to bring that outcome into physical existence. By taking control of our own first creation, we can write or re-write our own scripts, thus taking some control and responsibility for the outcomes that we value.

Doctoral students need to realize that they are in charge of their program. A doctoral program can humble the most accomplished student. Be proactive and take responsibility for your next four years in the program. Take stock of your inventory of skills. Understand your strengths and weaknesses. Prepare a plan and set milestones that shape the journey.

Be honest about what you want to accomplish. For instance, if your goal is to land a position at a top research school when you graduate, plan to devote considerable time and effort to develop a project pipeline that can produce at least one “A” publication. Remember the failure rate at most top journals exceeds 90 percent. Even under the most optimistic circumstances for those manuscripts that survive the review process, securing an “A” publication often requires two years from the start of a project to the final acceptance. As a result, students must start work on meaningful projects very early in the program. Your plan should provide a clear vision of your desired goals and destination. Be flexible, but let the goals that you establish for your program guide the choices that you make.

Set a Deliberate Pace

It is important to manage your time wisely. Organize and execute your work around the priorities outlined in your plan. Focus on elements of the program that relate directly to your goals and that you can control. Avoid spending time on issues that are outside of your control. Prioritize your work. Students known for their competence and motivation tend to experience more demands on their time from their cohorts and faculty. Developing a positive reputation can be a great asset to you, especially in building your pipeline, but remember that every opportunity has a cost. Reflect on your goals, and choose wisely. Set a deliberate pace. Find a rhythm that works for you. Dierickx and Cool (1989) introduced the concept of time compression diseconomies: the fundamental mechanism of diminishing returns when—everything else equal—the pace of activities increases. They explain it by providing the example of MBA students in a one-year program, who may not accumulate the same stock of knowledge as students in a two-year program, even if all inputs other than time are doubled. The same mechanism applies to students who pursue a Ph.D. The amount of new knowledge that you can absorb and put to use during the program is constrained in time. An understanding of the literature and the linkage between theoretical domains has to be established, assimilated, and integrated, but students are bounded in terms of their ability to absorb this knowledge quickly. Avoid over-extending yourself. Be purposeful.

Similarly, do not underestimate the time that is required to learn the “tools of the trade.” Allocate the necessary time to sharpen the skills that you need to experience a successful career in academics. For instance, one of the biggest challenges a student faces when starting a doctoral program is learning how to write well. Begin writing early in your program and write often. In addition, invest time to build a community around your research topic. Identify relevant faculty at your school and in other programs that share research interests. Take time to socialize at conferences and build a professional identity. Build your network. Establish strong working relationships with scholars that share your research interests. Leverage those relationships to secure feedback on your work and help guide your time in the program. The most successful students look for different avenues to work with faculty and other colleagues and welcome the opportunity to expose their work to other scholars at conferences and research forums. These investments can produce important benefits to you as your career develops.

Seek to Persevere

The Ph.D. journey is long, demanding, and pressure-packed. You are sure to experience highs and lows in your doctoral program. Embrace each challenge as a learning experience. Aim high. Strive to see your research projects published.
Obstacles that Limit the Application of Quantitative Scheduling Techniques

by Ceyhun Ozgur, Valparaiso University, and J. Randall Brown, Kent State University

For quantitative scheduling techniques found in journals, their wider use in applications has been retarded by a variety of obstacles. This article will first list a number of these obstacles and then suggest ways to overcome them.

Let us begin with a situation encountered in 1972 by one of the authors in devising a computerized quantitative production scheduling system for a tire production plant. The schedule produced by the system was constrained by the machines available, the sequencing of the machines for each type of job, the flow of materials, the demand of make-to-order jobs, the demand of make-to-stock jobs, the job due dates, and the personnel available. The corporate MIS department commissioned the system, which was designed to be updated on their mainframe computer once a week. After the system was completed, the MIS department said the system was a success because it demonstrated to the company that the computer could be used to schedule production, which was the entire purpose of the project. However, the system would not be used to actually schedule production, which was a shock to the author. After much thought, there were many reasons for the non-implementation.

1. **Job control.** The production schedulers did not want the MIS department to take control. Basically, they did not want someone else doing even part of their job.

2. **Efficient schedule.** The production schedulers felt that a computer program could never produce a schedule as efficient as their schedule and the company would lose money.

3. **Short-term priority changes.** The computer schedule could not respond to short-term changes in the priorities such as marketing or corporate headquarters requesting that a particular customer receive top priority today.

4. **Tradeoffs.** Production schedulers did not agree with, or more importantly, even know how the computer schedule made the myriad of tradeoffs necessary to produce a schedule. For example, a production schedule must trade off decreasing total setup time versus increasing the chance that some due dates will not be met. In addition, if all due dates cannot be met, the computer schedule internally chooses which jobs are late, and the production schedulers may not agree with the tradeoffs used to make that choice.

5. **Preference and knowledge input.** The computer schedule did not reflect the preferences and knowledge of the production schedulers or any other department such as marketing.

6. **Using the computer schedule as a tool.** Most production schedulers don’t understand or even want to understand how the quantitative scheduling algorithm determines the computer schedule. Therefore, any real or perceived problem with the computer schedule is cited as proof that the quantitative scheduling algorithm should be scrapped as it is clearly inferior to a schedule produced by a production scheduler. In other words, a production scheduler is not trained to use the computer schedule as a tool to help them do their job but instead view it as a competitor.
Priority Class Scheduling

Most of the problems listed above are present in all applications of quantitative scheduling techniques, but there has been very little work in the literature to try and solve these problems. One study by the authors (Brown & Ozgur, 1997) suggested using priority class scheduling to reduce due date conflicts between marketing and the production schedulers by replacing due dates with production periods and priority classes. The priority classes are used by the production scheduler as constraints on what can be scheduled in a production period. If any job in priority class i is started in the production period, then all jobs in priority class i-1 must be completed within the production period. This is the only constraint on the production scheduler and allows the scheduler to concentrate on optimizing manufacturing efficiency within the production period. The constraint is so simple that its consequences are easily understood by those who assign jobs to priority classes, but at the same time allows manufacturing some flexibility in scheduling. Indeed, the production scheduler can schedule a priority three job to be completed early in the production period as long as all priority one and priority two jobs are completed within the production period. In addition, if only some priority three jobs can be completed in the production period, the selection of which jobs to produce is made entirely on the basis of production efficiency. This gives some flexibility to manufacturing to optimize production efficiency. Indeed, the production scheduler only considers the priority classes when scheduling and does not even need to know the due dates of the jobs. This means that marketing alone without any help from the production schedulers could determine the priority class for each job and let the production schedulers concentrate on increasing production efficiency. Theoretically, priority class scheduling would greatly reduce the conflict between marketing and manufacturing.

However, getting the production schedulers to agree to even try priority class scheduling would be very difficult because of some of the problems listed above. The production schedulers would perceive a loss of job control because they would feel that marketing would be dictating to them. With marketing in control of the “due dates,” manufacturing would think that getting an efficient schedule would be impossible and the company would lose money. Short-term physical changes could cause the violation of the priority class scheduling rules. For example, suppose a priority class 3 job was lumped together with a priority class 1 job early in the production period to reduce setup time and cost. If later in the production period a machine broke down and caused a priority class 2 job not to be run, then at the end of the production period, a priority class 3 job was completed while a priority class 2 job was not completed. Since this is a clear violation of the idea of priority classes, the production schedulers would be blamed for the violation and marketing would be furious.

Scheduling Parks Maintenance

Although many quantitative scheduling techniques are designed for production scheduling, other types of scheduling problems have been studied, but they have some of the same obstacles listed above for production scheduling. For example, consider the problem of scheduling jobs in a governmental agency where the amount of work to be done almost always exceeds the resources available. In this case, the scheduling problem is deciding how much of each job to do and not do given the amount of resources on hand.

Anderson and Brown (1978) devised the Parks Maintenance Management System (PMMS), a quantitative parks maintenance scheduling system that avoided some but not all of the obstacles listed above. Using the resources available (mainly personnel and machines), parks maintenance must determine how much of each job to do to keep the parks in as good condition as possible. For example, in the summer, a parks maintenance district must trade off how the number of times jobs like tractor mowing (mowing large open areas), trim mowing (mowing small areas around trees, sidewalks, buildings, etc.), litter removal, and ballfield dragging are done in each park. The main problem is to determine the correct balance between the jobs, given the resources available. This is clearly a case where a balance is necessary because doing a lot of litter removal and ballfield dragging while doing no mowing would not be acceptable to the taxpayers.

For each parks district and scheduling period, the PMMS used as data a list of the parks, estimates of the time for a parks maintenance crew to complete each job in each park, the personnel and equipment available, and what personnel and equipment constituted a parks maintenance crew for each job. In addition, the model was driven by a maximin value function collected from the parks maintenance management that showed what they considered the best balance of the jobs at various levels of resources. For example, they might feel that for a low level of resources, relatively more mowing should be done while for a higher level of resources, the amount of litter removal and ballfield dragging relative to mowing should be increased. A computer schedule was run every two weeks and gave a district maintenance supervisor an amount of each job the district could accomplish in the next two weeks with the resources predicted to be available. This computer schedule represented the best balance between the jobs as it maximized the maximin value function given the resource constraints.

A very simple example will be used to illustrate PMMS. Suppose a parks manager (PM) is trying to decide how many times the jobs trim mowing, tractor mowing, litter removal, and ballfield dragging should be completed this summer for the parks in his district. First, the PM’s perfect complements preference
structure is determined by having him complete a table. Table 1 contains a completed table where initially the Desirable Quantity column as well as columns 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are empty except for the Totals and UTILITY rows. The PM is asked to give how many times each job should be done to keep the parks in good condition (these amounts should represent the upper end of the PM’s range of interest). The PM’s response is shown in the Desirable Quantity column of Table 1. Next the PM is asked to complete column 1 with percentages of the corresponding desirable quantity that sum to 80. The response of 10 for trim mowing corresponds to 10 percent of the desirable quantity of 20 or 2 trim mowings. These percentages reflect the PM’s tradeoffs between the four attributes and contain what he considers the best balance between them given the percentages can only sum to 80. The attribute values corresponding to the percentages in column 1 are 2 trim mowing, 10 tractor mowing, 2 litter removals, and 0 ballfield draggings over the summer. These attribute values are then entered in column 1 of Table 2. In a similar manner, the PM then fills in columns 2, 3, 4, and 6 so the percentages for each column sum to the amount listed in Totals row. Finally, the attribute values corresponding to the percentages are entered in the appropriate columns in Table 2. This collects data on what the PM thinks is the best balance between the attributes over a range from doing nothing (column 0) to the desirable quantities (column 5) and beyond (column 6).

Since each column in Table 2 is a point in the attribute value space, a linear line between these points approximate what the PM considers the best balance over the entire attribute value space. To keep it simple, suppose the only limiting resource needed to accomplish the jobs is labor measured in hours. The PM estimates that one trim mowing requires 50 labor hours, one tractor mowing requires 40 labor hours, one litter removal requires 150 labor hours, and one ballfield dragging requires 10 labor hours. These estimates are entered in the LABOR HOURS column of Table 2. The labor hours needed to accomplish the attribute values in columns 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are computed and entered in the TOTAL LABOR HOURS row. Since each column in Table 2 is a point in the attribute value space, a linear line between these points approximate what the PM considers the best balance over the entire attribute value space. To keep it simple, suppose the only limiting resource needed to accomplish the jobs is labor measured in hours. The PM estimates that one trim mowing requires 50 labor hours, one tractor mowing requires 40 labor hours, one litter removal requires 150 labor hours, and one ballfield dragging requires 10 labor hours. These estimates are entered in the LABOR HOURS column of Table 2. The labor hours needed to accomplish the attribute values in columns 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are computed and entered in the TOTAL LABOR HOURS row. Suppose the PM has 2074 labor hours available this summer. Then the amount of each attribute that provides the best balance while using no more than 2074 labor hours can be found by linear interpolation in Table 2. From Table 2, the best balance is 8.8 trim mowings, 15.6 tractor mowings, 6.2 litter removals, and 8 ballfield draggings for a utility of 48. Note that a non-integer amount such as 8.8 trim mowings is acceptable because that means every park would be trim mowed 8 times and get 80 percent of the way through the ninth trim mowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>DESIRABLE QUANTITY</th>
<th>PERCENT OF DESIRABLE QUANTITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Trim Mowing</td>
<td>20 Mowings</td>
<td>0 10 40 50 80 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Tractor Mowing</td>
<td>20 Mowings</td>
<td>0 50 70 90 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Litter Removal</td>
<td>10 Removals</td>
<td>0 20 50 80 90 100 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Ballfield Dragging</td>
<td>100 Draggings</td>
<td>0 0 0 20 50 100 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0 80 160 240 320 400 480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Constrained choice table for parks maintenance example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>LABOR HOURS</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTE VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Trim Mowing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0 2 8 8.8 9.6 10 16 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Tractor Mowing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 10 14 15.6 17.2 18 20 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Litter Removal</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0 2 5 6.2 7.4 8 9 10 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Ballfield Dragging</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 0 0 8 16 20 50 100 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LABOR HOURS</td>
<td>0 800 1710 2074 2438 2620 3450 4300 5200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Attribute value table for parks maintenance example.
This system has many advantages. The PM’s preferences are input to the model and are used to determine the best amounts of each attribute to accomplish given the resources available. The PM can easily understand how the quantitative scheduling algorithm determines the schedule. In addition, what if questions can be answered. Suppose city council asked the Parks Department what it could accomplish if the labor hours were increased from 2074 to 2438. Using linear interpolation, Table 2 shows that 2438 labor hours would increase the trim mowing from 8.8 to 9.6, increase tractor mowing from 15.6 to 17.2, increase litter removal from 6.2 to 7.4, and increase ballfield dragging from 8 to 16.

PMMS also collected data on how much of each job was accomplished in the preceding two-week period. Although this actual job performance data was compared to what the computer schedule predicted could be done, it was not used in a punitive fashion but rather as a starting point for discussion of what changes would enable the parks department to do a better job of serving the public. The objective was to instill pride in the parks maintenance personnel and to motivate them into making continual improvements.

By design and by enlightened management, PMMS avoided many of the obstacles listed above. PMMS avoided the job control obstacle as parks maintenance management viewed the computer schedule as simply a starting point and was free to change it as conditions warranted. In addition, the computer schedule only gave the amounts of each job that could be accomplished and did not tell a manager what personnel should be assigned to which crew or like priority class scheduling when the jobs should be done within the period. The managers were free to devise their own work schedule within the computer schedule framework so they were hopefully motivated to design an efficient schedule and could not blame any inefficiencies on the computer schedule. The managers were also free to respond to both short-term physical changes and priority changes as they saw fit. The preference and knowledge input obstacle and the tradeoffs obstacle were for the most part avoided by using the maximin value function supplied by the parks maintenance management to drive the determination of the computer schedule. For the obstacle of using the computer schedule as a tool, every effort was made to enable parks management to use the computer schedule as a tool, but this was limited by the fact that the computer schedule was only produced once every few weeks and the parks maintenance managers could not use it to ask what if questions. In addition, although there was some minimal training on how the quantitative scheduling algorithm worked, hindsight says that more effort should have been directed into training. Finally, as with all applications of quantitative scheduling techniques, the incomplete information obstacle was present.

Overcoming Obstacles

Using the discussion above, some strategies and ideas on how to overcome obstacles to the application of quantitative scheduling techniques can now be stated. Probably the most important idea is to make the quantitative scheduling technique accessible to the managers as an integral tool in their day-to-day work. This requires three important changes in the way quantitative scheduling techniques are designed and implemented.

1. Managers must understand how the scheduling algorithm works so they know not only its strengths but its weaknesses. Much more time must be spent in educating the managers so they view the scheduling algorithm as an important tool that they can use.

2. Managers must have constant access to the scheduling algorithm so they can run what if analyses. This access was not possible in 1972 tire production system because only mainframe computers were available. However, today the power of laptop computers and the Internet make this access possible, but the designers and programmers of the scheduling system must make this access the top priority in the design and implementation of the computerized quantitative scheduling system.

3. Ways to measure a manager’s value function and integrate that value function into his model must be invented. If this is done, the manager will feel ownership of the model and will not be afraid to use its results.
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ANNOUNCEMENTS (see more information on related conferences and publications at http://www.decisionsciences.org)

Institute Meetings
The 40th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 14-17, 2009, at the New Orleans Marriott Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana. Submission deadline is April 1, 2009. Contact Program Chair Maling Ebrahimpour, Roger Williams University, mebrahimpour@rwu.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 2009 Annual Meeting on July 4-8, 2009, on the campus of the China Europe International Business School (CEIBS) in Shanghai, The People’s Republic of China. Submission deadline is February 28, 2009. Program co-chairs are Tom Callarman and Norma Harrison, CEIBS.

www.ceibs.edu/dsi2009/index.html
http://www.apdsi.org

The Indian Subcontinent Region held its second annual conference at the Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, January 3-5, 2009. For more information, contact Jatinder N. D. (Jeet) Gupta, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, guptaj@uah.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, at the Marcum Conference Center and Miami Inn in Oxford, Ohio. Submission deadline is February 13, 2009. For more information, contact William “Rocky” Newman, Miami University, newmanw@muohio.edu.

http://www.fsb.muohio.edu/mwdsi2009/

The Northeast Region will hold its 2009 Annual Meeting on April 1-3, 2009, at Mohegan Sun in Uncasville, Connecticut. Submission deadline was October 10, 2008. For further information contact Program Chair Kenneth J. Sousa, Bryant University, at nedsi09@bryant.edu.

http://www.nedsi09.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 was September 19, 2008. The call for papers can be found at http://www.sedsi.org. 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 will hold its 2009 (30th) Annual Meeting on February 24-28, 2009, at the Renaissance Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, USA. Submission deadline for papers was October 15, 2008. For more information, contact Kai S. Koong, University of Texas – Pan American, koongk@utpa.edu and drkks2002@yahoo.com.

http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region will hold its 2009 (38th) Annual Meeting on April 7-11, 2009, at the Hilton Kaiusi Beach Resort in Kauai, Hawaii. Submission deadline for abstracts and papers was October 1, 2008. For further information contact Nafisseh Heiat, Montana State University-Billings, programchair@wdsinet.org.

http://www.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers
Conferences
The 1st International Conference of Accounting, Business, Leadership and Information Management will be held August 7-9, 2009, in Beijing, China, at the Beijing Friendship Hotel. The theme of the conference is “Leading to Global Frontiers.” Coordinating the conference is Lee Yao, chief editor of the International Journal of Accounting and Information Management. Submission deadline is March 9, 2009.

http://www.icablim.org/index.html


http://www.panpacificbusiness.org

The 3rd International Conference on Operations and Supply Chain Management will be held from July 28 to August 3, 2009, in China. In addition to plenary sessions by invited speakers (Profs. Barbra Flynn, Vicki Smith-Daniels, Aleda Roth, Vinod Singhal, Chris Voss) and parallel sessions, the program will feature (1) factory visits and city tours in Wuhan, (2) study tour along the Yangtze River to the famous Three Gorges Project, one of the biggest hydropower-complex projects in the world. There will also be a three day research workshop conducted by the invited speakers and a local tour in Chongqing, the world’s largest city and the one of the most industrialized areas in Western China. Submission deadline is March 30, 2009.

http://lf-scml.baf.cuhk.edu.hk/icoscm

ANNOUNCEMENTS, see next page
**Midwest Region**

The Midwest Region of the Decision Sciences Institute will hold its 40th Annual Meeting on April 16-18, 2009 in Oxford, OH. The website has been updated and the submission deadline is February 13, 2009.

http://www.fsb.muohio.edu/mwdsi2009/

The Program Team has been busy planning some unique experiences and sessions at the MWDSI Conference. Our objective is to provide a quality, accessible, regional program. With today’s budget crises in higher education, many academics do not have the resources to travel to the national conferences. We hope that the attendees will include colleagues from institutions of all sizes. The conference is hosted by the Farmer School of Business at Miami University.

The conference will be held in Miami’s Marcum Conference center and Inn (513-529-1611, http://www.hdg.muohio.edu/marcum/).

As we are also targeting the smaller colleges in our region, we have many new and cross-functional tracks designed to incorporate the faculty from all business and economics departments, even those in the liberal arts schools. Some of the new tracks include Information Security, Innovative Education & On-line Instruction, Ethics and Sustainability, and Business Economics.

**MWDSI Doctoral Consortium**

The MWDSI (Midwest Decision Sciences Institute) Doctoral Student Consortium will be held as part of the 2009 MWDSI annual conference. We are planning on a strategic research workshop as well as a session on “Life as an Academic.” These sessions will include well-known researchers who will act as mentors to the doctoral students. The Doctoral Consortium will run on the first day of the conference, April 16, 2009, from about 1:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., concluding with a reception. The program will accommodate approximately 15 students, so application should be made quickly. We are also inviting top scholars to attend a reception on Friday where doctoral students will have an opportunity to get to know some “names” in the decision sciences.

Application and information on the Doctoral Consortium is available on the conference website. Please email your application to Dr. Gerry Aase, Northern Illinois University, at gaase@niu.edu

---

**Publications**

*Decision Sciences* Journal seeks papers for a Special Topic Forum on Virtual Worlds in the Business Enterprise. Associate Editor Team are Anne P. Massey, Indiana University, and Mitzi M. Montoya, North Carolina State University. Deadline for submissions is May 15, 2009.

A virtual world (VW) is a computer-based 3D environment where users interact via visual representations of themselves known as avatars. Users can meet and interact with other people and with the content of the virtual world. While VW platforms vary in their features and functionality, in general, avatars can communicate using text or voice chat and gestures. Some virtual world platforms require a desktop client download (e.g., Linden Lab’s Second Life), others bring 3D VWs to the web browser (e.g., Google’s Lively), and some deploy 2D flash-based environments. Early business efforts to use VWs focused on external consumer marketing and branding activities. Recent press and industry reports suggest that businesses are now exploring application of VWs for inter- and intraorganizational uses. This interest is entirely consistent with the rise of geographically distributed and culturally diverse enterprises. Enterprise-based uses for VW environments include team collaboration, community building, training and development, new hire on-boarding, research, and various events. Enterprises are also beginning to use VW technologies to communicate and collaborate with external partners and customers. While VWs open new and exciting possibilities for business enterprises, they remain largely uncharted territory. Are VWs just another medium? How should companies integrate VW technology into their prior and current investments in a variety of communication technologies (e.g., wikis, unified messaging, audio/video/web-conferencing, telepresence systems etc.)? There is a need for research that examines the value and fit of VWs for business enterprise application. This is the major motivation underlying this STF in the Decision Sciences journal.

http://decisionsciencesjournal.org/index.cfm

*Decision Sciences* Journal seeks papers for a Special Topic Forum on New Frontiers in Collaborative Decision Making. Associate Editors are Paulo B. Goes, University of Connecticut; José A. Pino, University of Chile; and Asoo Vakharia, University of Florida. The deadline for submissions has been revised to March 1, 2009.

In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in collaborative decision making in a variety of business settings. One major reason for this could be the increase in globalization of business operations leading to geographically dispersed executives and decision makers. Information technology plays a key role in supporting and facilitating collaborative efforts in these settings and the area of Computer-Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW) addresses issues in the design, development, and implementation of information technology tools to support group decision making. Some of the well-known IT tools developed in this arena and used extensively today include web 2.0, social networks, wikis, multi-player games, and virtual team environments. From a business perspective, collaborative IT-based tools are vital enablers to address mul-
Since its inception in 1969, the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) has provided a forum for disseminating knowledge and advancing the science and practice of decision making in organizations. In November 2009, we will celebrate 40 years of success as a premier society for decision-making professionals. DSI supports the advancement of high-quality research and sponsors an annual meeting for discussing new developments and generating new ideas in a cordial and affable environment that is conducive to the development of long-lasting fellowship and friendship. It is our hope that the 2009 DSI Annual Meeting will build on the success of the last 40 years and pave the way for another 40 years of fellowship and progress in the practice of decision making.

The Decision Sciences Institute’s 2009 Annual Meeting theme is “Celebrating 40 Years of Fellowship, Learning & Advancing the Practice of Decision Making.” We invite basic, applied, theory, and case study research in the field of decision making, as well as proposals for panel discussions, 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 26 tracks and various miniconferences. The meeting will also feature professional activities focused on curricular issues, technology in the classroom, grantsmanship, and faculty development programs for doctoral students, new and senior faculty.

We invite you to join us in New Orleans, Louisiana, for the 2009 DSI Annual Meeting to be held at the Marriott New Orleans from November 14 to 17. Detailed information on the hotel and meeting event activities in New Orleans is available on the meeting website http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

If you have any questions, suggestions, or requests, feel free to email Program Chair Maling Ebrahimpour at dsi2009@rwu.edu.

2008 Track Chairs

Accounting: Assurance and Public Accountability
Richard L. Jensen, Utah State University
Mehmet C. Kocakülâh, University of Southern Indiana

Business Ethics and Leadership
Shirley Hopkins, California State University, Chico
Barbara Withers, University of San Diego

Business in East Asia
Shaw K. Chen, University of Rhode Island
Case Studies
Rik Berry, University of Arkansas - Fort Smith
Lynn Ruggieri, Roger Williams University

DSS/AI/Expert Systems
Silvana Trimi, University of Nebraska - Lincoln

E-Commerce
Binshan Lin, Louisiana State University, Shreveport
Fellows
Linda Sprague, Rollins College

Finance/Financial Management
Luis Eduardo Rivera Solis, Dowling College

Health Care Management
Neset Hikmet, Nicholls State University

Hospitality Management
G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada-Las Vegas
Natasa Christodoulioudou, California State University, Dominguez Hills
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2009 Instructional Innovation Award Competition

Recognizing outstanding contributions that advance instructional approaches within the decision sciences
Co-Sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta, Prentice Hall, and DSI

The advancement and promotion of innovative teaching and pedagogy in the decision sciences are key elements of the mission of the Decision Sciences Institute. At the President’s luncheon during the 2009 Annual Meeting, the 31st presentation of this prestigious award, co-sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta (the national honorary in the decision sciences), Prentice Hall, and the Institute, will be made.

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

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

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

All submissions must adhere to the following guidelines and must be received no later than April 1, 2009.

Instructions

Applications must be submitted in electronic form using instructions on the conference website at

http://www.decisionsciences.org/Annualmeeting

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

Electronic Submission Notes

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

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

Document Format

Competition finalists will closely adhere to these format requirements.

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

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

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

4. Summary Section: On the next 3 to 7 pages, present a double-spaced summary of your submission, with the following headings:

   a. Topic or Problem toward which your approach is focused.
   b. Level of students toward which your approach is focused.
   c. Number of students with whom the approach has been used.
   d. Major educational objectives of your approach.
   e. Innovative and unique features of your approach.
   f. Content: Describe the content or substance of the material addressed with your approach. Indicate why you focused your innovative efforts on this material or content.
   g. Organization: Explain how you structured the material or content, unique features of your approach, and how your approach contributes to student learning.
   h. Presentation: Discuss how you designed the explanation and illustration of the
material or content, what is unique about your approach, and how its use makes learning more effective.

i. Effectiveness and specific benefits of your approach to the learning process: Indicate how your major educational objectives were met, benefits derived from the presentation, students’ reactions to the presentation, and how you evaluated the effectiveness or benefits derived. It is essential to include measures of the success of the approach, which may include, but should not be limited to, instructor or course evaluations.

j. Transferability: Explain how this innovation could be used by other institutions, professors, or courses.

The Summary Section will be used for the first round of reviews and may also serve as the Proceedings version for both finalists and papers accepted for presentation in regular sessions.

5. Expanded Section: This is the complete, full version of the submission that should stand alone without the summary section. The expanded section may not exceed 21 pages, including exhibits. This document is used in the second round of reviews and permits you to describe the content, organization, presentation, and effectiveness in more detail. In addition to the same information provided in the Summary Section, you may:

a. List experiential exercises, handouts, etc. (if any), which are part of your innovative approach and explain where they fit in your approach.

b. Add any other discussion or material that you feel is essential to an understanding of your submission.

c. Appendix. Attach copies of illustrative material, especially any that you have developed, and a copy of the most recent course syllabus in which the innovative activity was used.

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

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

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

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

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

All applicants, including the finalists, will be notified by June 8, 2009. If you are one of the finalists, you will be required to attend the Instructional Innovation Award Session at the annual meeting in Baltimore. At that session, each finalist will do the following: (1) present a review or summary of the submission, (2) conduct an in-depth presentation or a discussion of a specific component of the submission (selected by the finalist), and (3) respond to questions from the audience.

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

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

Please remember that all submissions must be received by April 1, 2009.

Instructional Innovation Award Competition Coordinator
Christine T. Kydd
Department of Business Administration
Lerner College of Business and Economics
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
kyddc@lerner.udel.edu
(302) 831-1783

ANNOUNCEMENTS, from page 23

Three strategic and tactical problems. These include new product design and development, coordination of virtual teams located across continents, vendor and outsourcing management, designing effective and efficient supply chains, and knowledge management systems. There are a few documented success stories in the application of IT to support business decision making. For example ECR (Efficient Consumer Response) is one mechanism which has been used to enhance collaborative decision making in the supply chain. Another emerging concept in global corporations is the “24-Hour Knowledge Factory,” which can be used to support the collaborative efforts between globally dispersed team members. However, what seems to be lacking is a focus in terms of problem settings and corresponding tools/technologies to support collaborative decision making.

http://decisionsciencesjournal.org/index.cfm
2009 Doctoral Dissertation Competition

Searching for the best 2008 dissertation in the decision sciences
Co-sponsored by McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute

McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute are co-sponsoring the Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition. The purpose of the competition is to identify and recognize outstanding doctoral research in the development of theory and/or applications of decision sciences completed during 2008. A monetary award of $1,500 will be presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting. Submission deadline is April 1, 2009.

The dissertation must deal with the development of methodology for, and/or application of, decision sciences. This could include analytical or empirical based research.

The dissertation must have been accepted by the degree-granting institution within the 2008 calendar year. It is not necessary for the degree to have been awarded by the end of 2008. Also, the dissertation may not have been submitted previously to a Decision Sciences Institute dissertation competition.

The following are the requirements:

1. A nominating letter on university letterhead stationery submitted by the student’s major professor. This letter introduces the student, the supervisor of the dissertation, and the degree-granting institution. It also certifies the acceptance of the dissertation by the institution within the required time frame. All contact information for both the author and the major professor should also be stated in the letter. This letter should be emailed as a PDF file to fsahin@utk.edu. Call this file “Last Name-Nomination” where Last Name is the student’s last name. (For example, if the student’s name was Kong, the file should be called “Kong-Nomination”)

2. A separate statement by the major professor about why the dissertation deserves special recognition. This letter should be emailed as a PDF file to the e-mail address given above. Please call this file “Last Name-Recommendation,” where Last Name is the student’s last name.

3. A summary of the dissertation. This five-to-ten page double-spaced overview should include a description of the problem, the methodology, and the major findings and conclusions. At the top of the first page, the dissertation’s major and minor fields should be identified. Major fields typically are accounting, economics, finance, information systems, organizational behavior, design, and theory, operations management, supply chain management, and strategy/policy. Minor fields are often simulation, optimization, service sector, quality, quantitative analysis, artificial intelligence, expert systems, experimental design, and so on. The summary should include a 250-word abstract. This letter should be emailed as a PDF file to the e-mail address given above. Call this file “Last Name-Summary” where Last Name is the student’s last name.

4. Three copies of a complete dissertation in hard copy format should be mailed to the following address:

Funda Sahin
Department of Marketing and Logistics
College of Business Administration
University of Tennessee
317 Stokely Management Center
Knoxville, TN 37996-0530

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

In ALL email communications, make sure that the doctoral student’s full name appears somewhere in the email message.

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition Coordinator
Funda Sahin
Department of Marketing & Logistics
College of Business Administration
University of Tennessee
fsahin@utk.edu
2009 DSI Annual Meeting

2009 Doctoral Student Consortium

Creating successful career paths for students
Co-sponsored by McGraw Hill/Irwin, Alpha Delta Iota and DSI

DSI’s 27th 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 Alpha Iota Delta for this important event. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 14, 2009, at the 2009 DSI Annual Meeting in New Orleans.

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, research strategies, effective teaching, manuscript reviewing, and promotion and tenure, among others. Students who are interested in addressing these subjects in a participative, interactive way will enjoy and benefit from the Consortium.

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

2. Skill development. Learn from veterans. Excellent teaching and research require practical skills in addition to content knowledge. Veterans will share their secrets to success.

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

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

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

Program Content
The Doctoral Student Consortium involves seasoned, world-class research faculty from a variety of 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 2009. His sessions are simply not to be missed. Even experienced faculty members sit in on these dynamic and inspiring sessions.

Mapping Out a Research Plan. Tenured faculty mentors help participants to develop a strategic research plan for moving from the dissertation to a planned research program that will put them on a strong trajectory for tenure. Working in small groups, with the advice and guidance of a faculty mentor, participants will identify their areas of expertise, target appropriate journals, profile suitable co-authors, and plan a mix of publications.

Being a Professor. Professor Ira Horowitz, a DSI Fellow and past president, will share his insight and secret for success as a professor in academia.

Writing and Reviewing Manuscripts. 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.

Harvey Brightman (right) with 2008 Consortium Coordinator Maling Ebrahimpour.
Planning the Job Search. Should you target your job search on researcher-oriented schools? Teaching schools? Private? Public? What’s the best way to market yourself? What makes a good job interview? This session will help participants answer these questions through insights drawn from a panel of faculty experts.

Balancing It All. How do you balance the demands of teaching, research and service, and manage to ‘have a life’?

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 2010-2011, 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 Rhonda Aull Hyde, Doctoral Consortium Coordinator, by October 1, 2009. Those who apply by this date and meet the criteria listed above will be accepted for participation. Applications received after October 1st will receive consideration on a space-available basis.

Participants must pay the regular student registration fee for the annual meeting, but there will be no additional charge for the Consortium. This fee includes the luncheon and reception on Saturday and the networking luncheon on Sunday. 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 Student Consortium Coordinator
Rhonda Aull Hyde
Operations Research Program
210 Townsend Hall
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716
rhyde@udel.edu
302-831-1324
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 the consortium is by application, and is limited to faculty members who have earned their doctoral degrees in a business discipline and are in the first three years of their post-doctoral teaching careers within business schools or equivalent.

The consortium will last a full day on Saturday, November 14, 2009. It will include interactive and panel sessions with faculty at varying stages of their careers and at a variety of institutions, 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
- Tenure and promotion policies at different types of schools
- Becoming an excellent teacher and how to document it
- Becoming an excellent researcher in various types of environments
- The role of service
- Building an academic portfolio
- Career path strategies and professional development
- Academic ethics
- Future trends in the academy

To apply for the 2009 New Faculty Development Consortium, please complete the application form (see below or online via the DSI Annual Meeting web pages) and send it with a copy of your current vita to the NFDC Co-Coordinator. All applications must be received by October 1, 2009. Participation is limited to the first 50 qualified applicants. More specific information will be provided to those participants who are accepted for the Consortium. Each participant will be expected to register for the Institute’s 2009 Annual Meeting in New Orleans. No additional fees are charged for the New Faculty Development Consortium.

New Faculty Development Consortium Coordinator
Vijay R. Kannan
Jon M. Huntsman School of Business
Utah State University
v.kannan@usu.edu

Application for New Faculty Development Consortium
November 14, 2009 • New Orleans, Louisiana

Send in this form and a current copy of your vita to the Coordinator (see above). Application deadline: Oct. 1, 2009.

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Current institution and year of appointment: ____________________________

Mailing address: ___________________________________________________

Year doctorate earned: _____________________________________________

Doctoral institution: _______________________________________________

Phone: ____________________________________________________________

Fax: ______________________________________________________________

E-mail: ____________________________________________________________

Research interests: _________________________________________________

Teaching interests: _________________________________________________

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

Have you attended a previous DSI Doctoral Student Consortium?

____ yes    _____ no

If so, when? _____________________________________________________
The Decision Sciences Institute has a tradition of promoting case-based teaching and the development of new instructional case studies. The Best Case Studies Award will be awarded based primarily on the following criteria and metrics.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The top three contestants, selected by a panel of case experts, will present their case studies and analysis at a regular session at the 40th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute to be held in New Orleans. The case study must be presented at this regular session to be eligible to win the Best Case Studies Award. The panel of judges will then select the winner from among the finalists, based both on the written material and the presentation. The winner will be announced at the Awards luncheon.

Cases not selected as finalists may be presented at the Annual Case Writer’s Workshop to be held at the 2009 Annual Meeting (see below).

### 35th Annual Case Workshop

The 35th Annual Case Workshop for members engaged in developing new instructional cases will be held at the 2009 DSI Annual Meeting in New Orleans. Members are invited to submit completed case studies along with an appropriate instructor’s note to the DSI program chair.

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

Attendance at the Case Writers’ Workshop is open to all conference attendees. Submission deadline is April 1, 2009.

**Best Case Studies Award Competition Coordinator**

M. Johnny Rungtusanatham
Carlson School of Management
University of Minnesota
rung002@umn.edu

---

*Bourbon Street in New Orleans is the French Quarter’s liveliest thoroughfare, where you’ll find the rhythmic sounds of jazz, country western, Dixieland and sultry blues in the air, and everything from shopping to music to Cajun food. (New Orleans photos courtesy of the New Orleans Metropolitan Convention and Visitors Bureau).*
**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 education programs.

André M. Everett, University of Otago,
aeverett@business.otago.ac.nz

**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.

Rhonda Hyde, University of Delaware,
rhyde@udel.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 curricular 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 curricular areas noted above. The Doctoral Studies Miniconference seeks original papers, research drafts, works in progress, and panel discussion proposals on these topics.

Paul Mangiameli, University of Rhode Island, mangia@uri.edu

**Miniconference on Making Statistics More Effective in Schools and Business**

The mission of MSMESB (Making Statistics More Effective in Schools and Business) is to improve the teaching and practice of statistics in schools and business. More specifically, MSMESB focuses on improving the teaching of statistics and statistical thinking, on cross-disciplinary research, on continuous improvement in business and education, and on interaction between academia and industry. We aim to encourage interaction between business faculty and others involved in teaching business statistics with professionals from industry and government, with publishers, and with software vendors. A miniconference was held at the Baltimore meetings in 2008 and that activity has lead to the establishment of a similar activity for New Orleans. The miniconference is a one-day event that will take place on Monday during the DSI Annual Meeting. We invite DSI members to submit papers and/or suggest session topics for this event, which will be organized in collaboration with the Statistics & Decision Analysis track.

Robert Andrews, Virginia Commonwealth University, randrews@vcu.edu;
Keith Ord, Georgetown University, ordk@georgetown.edu; and John McKenzie, Babson College, mckenzie@babson.edu

**Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship**

Securing external research grants can significantly enhance research projects. A day-long event to be held on Saturday, November 14, 2009, the Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship is intended to help develop interest 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.

Kristie Seawright, Brigham Young University, kristie.seawright@byu.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.

Vijay R. Kannan, Jon M. Huntsman School of Business, Utah State University, v.kannan@usu.edu

**Professional and Faculty Development Program**

The Professional and Faculty Development Program is for Institute members in all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. The content of the program is designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities in today’s rapidly changing environment. We would welcome submissions of proposals that address changing needs of faculty development through professional life cycle. Submission deadline is May 1, 2009.

Krishna S. Dhir, Berry College, kdhir@berry.edu

---

**2009 ACTIVITIES**, see next page
2009 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 select and recognize the best dissertations written in the past year in the decision sciences area. The Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award, accompanied by a $1,500 prize, will be presented at the annual meeting. Applicants for this award should submit three (3) hardcopies of their dissertation in the required format directly to the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator by April 1, 2009. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.
Christine Kydd, University of Delaware, kyddc@lemer.udel.edu

Best Paper Awards Competition
Best Paper Awards will be presented at the 2009 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 also may be recognized through a distinguished paper award in a given track. Reviewers will be asked to nominate outstanding paper submissions for these awards. Nominations will then be reviewed by a Best Paper Awards review committee which will make award recommendations.
Dwight Smith-Daniels, Wright State University, dwight.smith-daniels@wright.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).
M. Johnny Rungtusanatham, University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, rung0002@umn.edu

Best Student Paper Award
An award for the best student paper will be presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting. The competition is open only to student-authored papers without faculty co-authors. Reviewers will be asked to nominate outstanding paper submissions for this award. Nominations will then be reviewed by a Best Student Paper Award review committee that will make award recommendations. This is a great opportunity for students to receive recognition for their research.
Kathryn M. Zuckweiler, University of Nebraska at Kearney, zuckweilerkm@unk.edu

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition
The purpose of the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition is to select and recognize the best dissertations written in the past year in the decision sciences area. The Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award, accompanied by a $1,500 prize, will be presented at the annual meeting. Applicants for this award should submit three (3) hardcopies of their dissertation in the required format directly to the Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator by April 1, 2009. For more information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.
Christine Kydd, University of Delaware, kyddc@lemer.udel.edu

Best Paper Awards Competition
Best Paper Awards will be presented at the 2009 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 also may be recognized through a distinguished paper award in a given track. Reviewers will be asked to nominate outstanding paper submissions for these awards. Nominations will then be reviewed by a Best Paper Awards review committee which will make award recommendations.
Dwight Smith-Daniels, Wright State University, dwight.smith-daniels@wright.edu

Instructional Innovation Award Competition
The Instructional Innovation Award Competition seeks to recognize outstanding contributions that advance instructional approaches within the decision sciences. The focus of this award is on innovation in college- or university-level teaching. Three finalists will be chosen to make presentations at the conference competition. The winning entry receives an award of $1,500, and $750 will be divided among each of the other finalists. Applicants are required to submit all contributions electronically using instructions on the conference Web site. The due date for submissions is April 1, 2009. For information concerning this competition, please contact the coordinator.
Funda Sahin, The University of Tennessee, fsahin@utk.edu

Best Student Paper Award
An award for the best student paper will be presented at the 2009 Annual Meeting. The competition is open only to student-authored papers without faculty co-authors. Reviewers will be asked to nominate outstanding 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

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference
The Technology in the Classroom Miniconference provides a forum at the DSI annual meeting for participants to share novel or innovative applications of technology in the classroom that enhance students’ learning experience. Submissions should consist of creative approaches and best practices for using course support software, multimedia, spreadsheet software, simulation software, online tutorials, or other applications of technology. We are especially interested in creating hands-on workshops in 2009 in which presenters and participants can engage in interactive discussions and demonstrations of effective use of technology and practice in the classroom. Submissions are competitively reviewed and selected for their creativity, novelty, and contribution to pedagogy and should not be duplications of material found in existing textbooks. Please send submissions (following the “Instruction for Electronic Submissions”) directly to the mini-conference coordinator by May 1, 2009.
William Johnson, Bentley University, wjohnson@bentley.edu
The DSI2008 Meeting in Baltimore received 1,143 submissions (a 10.8 percent increase over the DSI2007 Meeting). We had a total of 24 tracks and a total of 360 sessions.

In addition to the regular sessions, there were four miniconferences, two consortiums and a faculty development program. They included Curricular Issues Miniconference coordinated by Vijay R. Kannan; Technology in the Classroom Miniconference, coordinated by William Johnson and Rupak Rauniar; and the Miniconference on Successful Grantsmanship, coordinated by Q. B. Chung and Kristie Seawright. New to DSI meetings we initiated this year the Doctoral Studies Miniconference, coordinated by Yair Levy, Iram Becerra-Ferrandez, and George M. Marakas. We also had the Doctoral Student Consortium, coordinated by Maling Ebrahimpour, and the New Faculty Development Consortium, coordinated by William B. Carper, Carl W. Gooding, and James A. Pope. In addition we had the Professional and Faculty Development Program, coordinated by Binshan Lin.

We also had a five award competitions. They included the Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition, coordinated by Julie Kendall; Instructional Innovation Award Competition, coordinated by Nancy Lea Hyer; Best Paper Award Competition, coordinated by E. Powell Robinson; Best Case Studies Competition, coordinated by Ayman Abuhamdieh; and Best Student Paper Award Competition, coordinated by Kathryn M. Zuckweiller.

In addition to those program committee members listed above, the track chairs, session chairs, and paper reviewers should be acknowledged for their individual contributions that added value to this meeting for the DSI membership. I thank you all for your roles you carried out so well. I would also like to thank all the program coordinators, Associate Program Chair Qing Cao, Proceedings Coordinator Anthony Ross, Job Placement Coordinator Arijit Sengupta, Local Arrangements Coordinator Christine Kydd, DSI Executive Director Carol Latta, and Hal Jacobs and the other DSI Home Office staff for an incredible job of putting on the DSI2008 Meeting.

In the post-meeting DSI quality program survey, the results to the question, “Overall, how satisfied were you with the 2008 Annual Meeting?” had a breakdown of: Very Satisfied 27.8%, Satisfied 53.6%, Neutral 10.6%, Dissatisfied 4.6%, Very dissatisfied 3.3%, based on a total 151 respondents.

I hope you found some value in the DSI2008 Annual Meeting and will join us again for the DSI2009 Annual Meeting in New Orleans.
Janelle Heineke (Boston University), Larry Meile (Boston College), Linda Boardman Liu (Boston University), and Jane Davies (Boston University) win prestigious competition

by Nancy Lea Hyer, Vanderbilt University

Students struggle with the concepts of uncertainty & variability; in project management it is critical that students can identify, understand, and manage project risk. Neither textbooks nor cases can effectively convey how uncertainties in projects unfold over time and how project outcomes are affected by the combinations of decisions made under those conditions. Project Flip uses a case scenario to immerse students in the management of a typical project. It exercises their technical project management and financial analysis skills and exposes them to the capabilities of project management software. In a competitive classroom environment it merges the art and science of project management and introduces elements of risk so that students are able to experience both the excitement and frustration a project manager faces when ‘lady luck’ reaches out and touches the best-laid plans of the conscientious project manager.

WINNER

Project Flip: An Interactive Case/Exercise in Managing Uncertainty

Janelle Heineke (Boston University), Larry Meile (Boston College Carroll School of Management), Linda Boardman Liu (Boston University), Jane Davies (Boston University)

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

The award brings national recognition for the winner’s institution and a cash prize of $1,500 to the author of the winning submission. Authors of each of the remaining finalists each receive $750. Winning and finalist abstracts are included below.

FINALISTS

Life Lessons Using Technology: Helping (Underrepresented Minority) Freshmen Get Ahead Before They Have Even Started

Roy M. Dejoie (Purdue University), Hal P. Kirkwood Jr. (Purdue University)

The authors have transformed a typical introduction to computing tools (Microsoft Office) course into a platform that integrates the use of information technology with interdisciplinary life lessons learning for incoming freshman students in an academic and professional enhancement program that targets underrepresented minority high school graduates.

INNOVATION, see page 40
2008 Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award Competition Winners Honored at Annual Meeting

by Julie E. Kendall, Rutgers University

We are pleased to announce that Scott C. Ellis of Clemson University is the winner of the 2008 Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award Competition. Two honorable mentions (listed in alphabetical order) were also awarded to Thomas J. Kull of Arizona State University and David Peng of Texas A&M University.

As the winner, Ellis received a $1,500 check and a plaque on November 25, 2008, at the President’s Luncheon during the Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland. During the luncheon, Kull and Peng and their faculty advisors each received a certificate to mark their achievements. The full details of the winners’ dissertation titles, doctoral granting institutions, and faculty advisors appear later in this article.

The purpose of the award is to encourage and publicize outstanding dissertation research by selecting and recognizing the best dissertations written during 2007 in the decision sciences. The competition is co-sponsored by McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute.

Twenty submissions were received and entered into a two-stage review process. Each dissertation was subject to an initial screening by 10 or 11 reviewers. This round resulted in the selection of four dissertations for further reviews. In the second round, four reviewers reviewed each of the remaining four dissertations.

We wish to thank the many reviewers who assisted in this process and congratulate the winners. In addition, each of the authors who submitted a thesis should be proud of their efforts, since the reviewers were highly complimentary of all of the research submitted.

Winner of the Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Competition

Toward Supplier Portfolio Management Theory: An Empirical Study of Buyer-Supplier Relationships in the U.S. Automotive Components Industry

Scott C. Ellis, College of Business & Behavioral Sciences, Clemson University

Dissertation Advisor & Degree-granting Institution: Nallan C. Suresh, School of Management, University at Buffalo, State University of New York

Honorable Mentions (alphabetical order)

A Multilevel Analysis of Quality Management Practices, Cooperative Cultural Values and Work Performance

Thomas J. Kull, W.P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University

Dissertation Advisor & Degree-granting Institution: Ram Narasimhan, The Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University

Improvement and Innovation Capabilities in Manufacturing: Linking Practice Bundles to Strategic Goals and Supplier Collaboration

David Peng, Mays Business School, Texas A&M University

Dissertation Advisor & Degree-granting Institution: Roger G. Schroeder, Carlson School of Management, University of Minnesota

Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award winner, Scott Ellis (2nd from left) with (from left) Julie Kendall, 2008 Doctoral Dissertation Competition coordinator; Nallan Suresh, University at Buffalo, Ellis’s dissertation advisor; and Ken Kendall, immediate past president of DSI.

Dissertation, see next page
**Distinguished Track Papers**

### Hospitality Management

**The Effect of Information Technology Steering Committees on Perceived IT Management Sophistication in Hotels**
Cihan Cobanoglu, University of Delaware
Baker M. Ayoun, Auburn University
Daniel J. Connolly, University of Denver

**A Service-Design of IT Infrastructure**
Pratim Datta, Kent State University
Marvin D. Troutt, Kent State University
David Booth, Kent State University
Murali Shanker, Kent State University

### International Business

**Airlines In India—A Strategic Analysis**
Nat Natarajan, Tennessee Technological University
V. Sridevi, Institute of Financial and International Management, Bangalore, India

### Information Systems

**Why Experience May Not Matter in Data Warehousing: The Role of Expertise**
Richard J. Goeke, Widener University
Robert H. Faley, Kent State University
Kevin E. Dow, Kent State University
Alan A. Brandyberry, Kent State University

**Finding the Business Value after Successful ERP Implementation: Making the Case for Gross Margin**
Richard J. Goeke, Widener University
Robert H. Faley, Kent State University
Kevin E. Dow, Kent State University

### Knowledge Management

**A Model of Virtual Community Knowledge Exchange Intentions: Perceived Network Structure, Self-Efficacy, and Individual Motivations**
Kyung Woo David Kang, University of Rhode Island
Seung Kyoon Shin, University of Rhode Island

**The Impact of Business Intelligence Technologies on Organizational Absorptive Capacity and Ambidextrous Innovation Competence**
Lih-Bin Oh, Xi’an Jiaotong University
Hock-Hai Teo, National University of Singapore

### Manufacturing Management and Practice

**Schedule Stability’s Moderating Effects on the Impact of Manufacturing Flexibility**
John Goodale, University of Oregon
Hans Heese, Indiana University-Bloomington
Xinxin Hu, Indiana University-Bloomington
Peter Ittig, Univ. of Massachusetts-Boston
Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University
Mehmet Murat Kristal, York University
G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada Las Vegas
Kevin Linderman, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Mo Adam Mahmood, University of Texas at El Paso
Debashish Mallick, University of St. Thomas
Paul Mangiamele, University of Rhode Island
Kathleen McFadden, Northern Illinois University
Diane Parente, Penn State Erie
William C. Perkins, Indiana University-Bloomington
James A. Pope, University of Toledo

### Supply Chain Management

**Buy Now and Match Later: The Impact of Posterior Price Matching on Profit with Strategic Consumers**
Lai Guoming, Carnegie Mellon University

**Emergent Supply Chain Patterns and Their Impact on Performance**
Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
Baofeng Huo, Chinese University of Hong Kong
Xiande Zhao, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

### Strategy and Policy

**Cliques and Structural Holes in Collaborative Endeavors**
Yan Cimon, Université Laval
Louis Hébert, HEC Montréal

**An Empirical Test of Thompson’s Model of Strategic Choice**
Paul C. Nutt, University of Strathclyde

---

**DISQUATION, from previous page**

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

- Anil Aggarwal, University of Baltimore
- Patrice Auger, University of Melbourne
- Kathryn L. Blackmon, University of Oxford
- Pamela Carter, North Carolina A&T State University
- Joseph Carter, Arizona State University
- Q. B. Chung, Villanova University
- James F. Courtney, University of Central Florida
- Christopher Craighead, Penn State University
- Jo Ann M. Duffy, Sam Houston State University
- Joy Field, Boston College
- Byron Finch, Miami University
- Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
- S. Thomas Foster, Brigham Young University
- John Goodale, University of Oregon
- Hans Heese, Indiana University-Bloomington
- Xinxin Hu, Indiana University-Bloomington
- Peter Ittig, Univ. of Massachusetts-Boston
- Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University
- Mehmet Murat Kristal, York University
- G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada Las Vegas
- Kevin Linderman, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- Mo Adam Mahmood, University of Texas at El Paso
- Debasish Mallick, University of St. Thomas
- Paul Mangiamele, University of Rhode Island
- Kathleen McFadden, Northern Illinois University
- Diane Parente, Penn State Erie
- William C. Perkins, Indiana University-Bloomington
- James A. Pope, University of Toledo
- Tobin E. Porterfield, University of Maryland
- Daniel Power, University of Northern Iowa
- Madeleine Pullman, Portland State University
- Cliff Ragsdale, Virginia Tech
- Marcus A. Rothenberger, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- Roberta S. Russell, Virginia Tech
- Vallabh Sambamurthy, Michigan State University
- Roger Schmenner, Indiana-Purdue University Indianapolis
- Scott Shafer, Wake Forest University
- Enno Siemsen, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Vijayan Sugumaran, Oakland University
- Morgan L. Swink, Michigan State University
- Kwei Tang, Purdue University
- Asoo J. Vakharia, University of Florida
- Shawnee K. Vickery, Michigan State University
- Morgan L. Swink, Michigan State University
- Scott Webster, Syracuse University
As early as 7:30 am in the morning of Saturday, November 22, 2008, over 80 people started the Annual Doctoral Consortium with a light breakfast. This event is an integral part of the Decision Sciences Institute Annual Conference, which was held in the Baltimore Marriott Waterfront. Doctoral students from as far as Australia and Finland were among the participants.

The Consortium was sponsored by the generous contributions of Alpha Iota Delta, Beta Gamma Sigma, McGraw-Hill/Irwin Publishing Company and the Decision Sciences Institute.

After the breakfast, students and presenters were welcomed and provided a brief overview of the program, which is a forum for doctoral students to learn as much as possible about life in academia, including many opportunities to network among themselves and seasoned faculty and administrators during the breaks, working lunch, and at the reception.

What to Do and What Not to Do

Three panels of experts discussed factors leading to a successful career and shared their own experiences and gave practical advice on how to find a job that fits an individual. In addition, presenters gave pointers on how to prepare for a successful interview. A panel of deans from small and large business schools focused on positive steps that participants can take to be successful in managing their tenure process. The three deans shared their experiences from the perspective of the teaching school, teaching–research, and the research school.

Sailing Successfully toward Tenure and Beyond

This was a great session presented by Ira Horowitz. He shared his experiences as a newly-minted doctoral student and aspiring faculty member 50 years ago! A survey of the participants showed that his inspiring talk was extremely effective and helped the audience to get a better understanding of what audience should expect as an academician. He provided examples from the past that showed how very little the path to success in academia has changed.

Writing Publishable Articles and Navigating the Review Process

This was a joint session with the New Faculty Development Consortium. Editors from the three DSI publications presented their view on how researchers need to manage their research and how to bring their work to fruition in terms of getting their work published. Panels provided specific tips for preparing a manuscript and working with journal editors. The three editors from Decision Sciences, Decision Line, and Decision Line, of Innovative Education, Chetan S. Sankar of Auburn University; and Decision Line, Krishna S. Dhiri of Berry College provided a detailed step-by-step approach for publishing success.

Networking Lunch—A 25-Year Anniversary!

This was the second joint session with the New Faculty Development Consortium. During lunch, Norma Harrison (DSI President) and Marc Schneiderjans (2008 Program Chair) welcomed students to DSI and discussed the importance of participation in DSI activities. Gregory Ulfers (University of Detroit Mercy, Alpha Iota Delta President) and Jim Viehland (Executive Director, Beta Gamma Sigma) discussed the lifelong benefits of joining premier professional societies. The highlight of the lunch was the surprise presentations made by the Alpha Iota Delta, Beta Gamma Sigma, and the Decision Science Institute to honor and celebrate Harvey Brightman (“The Master Teacher”) for his 25 years of consecutive workshops on “Learning from the Master Teacher.”

Research Strategy Panel and Workshop

The session was in a breakout round-table format. Several well published authors/scholars were given the role of research mentors and were assigned separate tables. Students chose a mentor and sat around his/her table. The responsibility of the faculty research scholars was to foster discussion and debate among the student participants, to facilitate interdisciplinary dialogue, and to identify important issues as they emerged. The focus of the discussions was to take the early research work, dissertation, and research philosophy and mold them into a coherent research strategy for each round-table participant.

This unique workshop helped students to develop a strategic research plan. The goal was to help students move from their doctoral program publications and dissertation into a research program that will see them through tenure.

To Be the Best Teachers: Lessons from the Master—(25th Anniversary)

Harvey Brightman focused on three key research-based ideas on how to improve your teaching and student learning. This session was Professor Brightman’s 25th consecutive year of workshop presentations at the DSI annual conference. His presentation was met with great enthusiasm by doctoral students. Based on the survey from the audience, it appeared that they learned valuable lessons on how to be a more effective teacher.
Social Hour—A Successful Networking Event

When the last session ended, both students and presenters were ready for a well-deserved break. The social hour was sponsored by Beta Gamma Sigma and Alpha Iota Delta. Everyone enjoyed the food and drink and relaxed after a day of hard work. The social hour presented itself as a great opportunity for further networking among students and presenters.

Presenters at the 2008 Doctoral Student Consortium

Ayodele Julius Alade, Dean, University of Maryland Eastern Shore (Panel Member)
Darlene Brannigan Smith, Dean, The University of Baltimore (Panel Member)
David Martin, Associate Dean, LaSalle University (Session Chair)
Mr. James Viehland, Beta Gamma Sigma, (Presenter and Sponsor)
Harvey Brightman, Georgia State University (Emeritus), (Session Chair)
Ira Horowitz, University of Florida (Emeritus), (Session Chair)
Burcu Keskin, University of Alabama (Panel Member)

Chetan S. Sankar, Auburn University (Panel Member)
David Dills, Vanderbilt University (Panel Member)
Funda Sahin, University of Tennessee (Session Chair)
Gregory W. Ulferts, University of Detroit Mercy and Alpha Iota Delta, (Presenter and Sponsor)
Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University (Panel Member)
Krisha S. Dhir, Berry College (Panel Member)
Larry Fredendall, Clemson University (Panel Member)
Marc J. Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln (Program Chair)
Neset Hikmet, Nicholls State University, (Panel Member)
Norma Harrison, Macquarie Graduate School of Management (DSI President)
Paul Mangiameli, University of Rhode Island, (Session Chair)
Sarah Bryant Bower, Shippensburg University, Pennsylvania (Panel Member)
Tobias Schoenherr, Michigan State University (Panel Member)
Vicki Smith-Daniels, Arizona State University, (Session Chair)
William B. Carper, University of West Florida (Session Chair)
Xiaosong (David) Peng, Texas A&M University (Panel Member)

If you are a doctoral student preparing a dissertation in anticipation of entering the job market in the next couple of years (2010, 2011, or 2012) you will benefit immeasurably from participating in the DSI Doctoral Student Consortium as well as the DSI Annual Conference. Furthermore, I urge all doctoral dissertation advisors to encourage their students to take advantage of this very valuable opportunity provided by DSI.

---

2008 Doctoral Student Consortium Student Participants

Susita Asree, The University of Toledo
Ryan Atkins, Queen’s University Belfast
Preetam Basu, University of Connecticut
Liwen Chen, The University of Texas at Austin
Yi-Su Chen, University of Minnesota
Toyin Clottey, The Ohio State University
Robert E. Crossler, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Gregory D. Deyong, University of Indiana
David D. Dobrzykowski, University of Toledo
Zhiyuan Dong, University of Cincinnati
Stephanie Eckerd, The Ohio State University
Mauro Falasca, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Chadong Han, University of Maryland
Robert E. Hooker, The Florida State University
Wen-Cheng Hsieh, University at Buffalo
Tao (Eric) Hu, The University of Memphis
Woosang Hwang, University of Toledo
Brian W. Jacobs, Georgia Institute of Technology
Kyung Woo (David) Kang, University of Rhode Island
Minkyun Kim, SUNY Buffalo
Sung Tae Kim, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Yingjie Lan, University of Maryland
Sang-Heui Lee, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Gang Li, The University of Texas at Austin
Mei Li, Arizona State University
Xiangrong Liu, Drexel University
Heather S. Lutz, Syracuse University
Alan W. Mackelprang, University of South Carolina
Angela Mattia, Virginia Commonwealth University
William Mennell, University of Maryland
Dmitriy Nesterkin, University of Arkansas
Jason Niggley, University of Southern California
Deborah Noble Burak, Capella University
Joy Oguntebi, University of Michigan
Xiajun Amy Pan, The University of Texas at Austin
Ann M. Pearson, Southern Illinois University
Olga Perdikaki, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Sufian Qrunfleh, The University of Toledo
Cheul Rhee, University at Buffalo
Guang Rong, Clemson University
Jay Simon, University of California, Irvine
Antti Tenhiälä, Helsinki University of Technology
Xiaoting Wang, Louisiana State University
Jie Zhang, Boston University
Xihui (Paul) Zhang, The University of Memphis
2008 DSI Annual Meeting

Curricular Issues Miniconference

by Vijay R. Kannan, Jon M. Huntsman School of Business, Utah State University

The 2008 Curricular Issues Miniconference brought together sessions addressing issues that cut across the Decision Sciences, and indeed, business curriculum. In addition, it showcased several of the best articles from the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education. Peter Ward (Ohio State University) and Randy Cook (Utah State University) discussed the role of Lean Manufacturing in the curriculum. The session presented details of what two institutions are doing to not only increase awareness of lean manufacturing among students, but integrate it into the business curriculum. Jon Grandol (Bloombsurg University of Pennsylvania), Sandra Richtermeyer (Xavier University), Jerry Flato (University of Indianapolis), Bernard Han (Western Michigan University), and Mike Slette (Microsoft Corporation) examined Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems as a teaching tool and integrating framework. The session explored the experiences with ERP of a variety of schools, and how these schools are leveraging ERP in the classroom. Marianne Pierce and Cheryl Patterson (Furman University) examined co-curricular activities. The session discussed non-instructional activities that can be used to not only enrich the curriculum, but provide students with practical experiences that supplement traditional instruction.

Two sessions focused on program assessment. Paul Bobrowski (Auburn University), Susan Engelkemeyer (Ithaca College), Dave Christy (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo), and John Grout (Berry College) addressed assessment from the perspective of deans and achieving AACSB accreditation. The session not only highlighted the experiences of schools with different academic missions, it brought clarity in understanding the underlying objectives of AACSB’s assessment requirements. Sarah Bryant Bower (Shippensburg University), Maling Ebrahimpour (Roger Williams University), and Ward Ulmer (Strayer University) examined the issue of feedback in the assessment process. Based on their schools’ experiences, they identified steps that can be taken to respond to assessment data and implement strategies for continuous improvement.

Two sessions organized by Chetan Shankar (Auburn University) and Ceyhun Ozgur (Valparaiso University), editor and associate editor, respectively of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, presented the outstanding teaching briefs and empirical research from the journal. The sessions highlighted the work being done to advance teaching within the Decision Sciences. Following the presentations of the empirical research papers, best paper awards, sponsored by Wiley Blackwell, were announced. First place, which comes with an award of $1,000, was given to the paper “Applying the Collective Casual Mapping Methodology to OM Curriculum Development,” by Julie Hays, Tatiana Bouzdine-Cahmeeva (both of Bordeaux Management School), Arthur Hill, Susan Meyer Goldstein (both of the University of Minnesota), and Annilab Jose Scavarda (Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University). Runner-up awards, each worth $500, were given to the papers “Influence Tactics in the Classroom and their Relationship to Student Satisfaction,” by Stephen Standifird (University of San Diego), Frank Pons (Université Laval), and Dan Moshavi (Montana State University), and “The Use of Problem-Based Learning to Enhance MIS Education,” by Peter Mykytyn, Kathleen Mykytyn, Souren Paul, and Ann Pearson (all Southern Illinois University, Carbondale).

Each of the sessions was well attended and generated lively discussion. As the mission of DSI states, DSI is dedicated to “advancing knowledge and improving instruction in all business and related disciplines.” The sessions in the miniconference achieved that and provided a valuable forum for the exchange of ideas and experiences regarding instructional delivery. I encourage you to contribute to and participate in the 2009 Curricular Issues Miniconference. For details, contact André Everett, University of Otago, at averett@business.otago.ac.nz.

INNOVATION, from page 35

Integrating the Business Curriculum: International Company of the Year
Joanne M. Tucker (Shippensburg University), Sarah Bryant Bower (Shippensburg University)

It is incumbent upon faculty to integrate course material that enhances understanding of business as a whole, not in traditional siloed formats. Our innovative approach to curricular integration is two-fold. First, faculty select our “International Company of the Year” from companies with headquarters within our regional area; and then, incorporate the company’s activities into assignments throughout the business core classes.

2008 Instructional Innovation Award Competition Committee
Nancy Lea Hyer, Vanderbilt University, Chair
Peter M. Arnold, Boston University
Karen A. Brown, Thunderbird
Lori Cook, DePaul University
Robb Dixon, Boston University
Gary Kern, Indiana University-South Bend
Ronald Klimberg, Saint Joseph’s University
David M. Levine, Baruch College-CUNY
Nada R. Sanders, Texas Christian University
Gregory W. Ulferts, The University of Detroit-Mercy

Decision Line, January 2009
New Faculty Development Consortium

by William B. Carper (University of West Florida), Carl Gooding (Jacksonville State University), and James A. Pope (University of Toledo)

Baltimore’s Inner Harbor provided the backdrop for the 2008 New Faculty Development Consortium that was held on Saturday, November 22, prior to the formal opening of the annual meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute. The Consortium began with a continental breakfast for the 20 participants and was followed by an overview of the day and introductions of all participants.

A total of 11 sessions were presented during the Consortium, involving more than a dozen senior faculty and administrators who discussed various aspects of career planning with the new faculty. Topics for the sessions ranged from “Learning the Rules of the Game” to “Academic Ethics,” with multiple sessions that focused on the specifics of teaching, research, and service expectations for faculty in various types of schools that included teaching oriented, regional comprehensive, research oriented, and public and private programs.

During the day, several joint sessions were held with the Doctoral Consortium participants that included an opportunity to meet the editors of the DSI journals, a luncheon which honored Harvey Brightman for his many years of service to DSI and the two consortia, and an end of the day reception hosted by Alpha Iota Delta and Beta Gamma Sigma. The participants were especially interested in the comments of the journal editors (Vicki Smith-Daniels, editor of Decision Sciences Journal; Chetan S. Sankar, editor of Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education; and Krishna S. Dhir, editor of Decision Line), which focused on what their particular journals looked for in manuscript submissions and provided tips on how to increase the chances of being published in them.

At the end of the Consortium, certificates were presented to the participants or contained in the evaluations, the Consortium was very well received by the participants, who felt that the information presented during the day would be of significant value to them as they began their academic careers.

The New Faculty Development Consortium will be presented again next year as part of the 2009 DSI Annual Meeting in New Orleans and is designed 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 the consortium is by application and is open to faculty members who have earned their doctoral degrees and are in their first two years of their post-doctoral teaching careers. For more information on the 2009 NFDC, contact Vijay R. Kannan, Jon M. Huntsman School of Business, Utah State University, v.kannan@usu.edu.

NFDC Participants
Amrou Awaysheh
Arash Azadegan
Lisa Bain
Stacy Bourgeoiss
Mei Cao
Sinead Carey
Sunyoung Cho
Paul Choi
Sinan Erzurumlu
Qian-nong Gu
Long Li
Yuzhu Li
Jaejoo Lim
Julie Lyon
Divesh Ojha
ChongWoo Park
Janine Sanders
Dongback Seo
Tomoaki Shimada
Jollean Sinclaire
Chiulien Chuang Venezia
Liana Victorino

2008 Best Paper Awards

Best Application Paper Award
The Effect of Information Technology Steering Committees on Perceived IT Management Sophistication in Hotels
Cihan Cobanoglu, University of Delaware
Baker M. Ayoun, Auburn University
Daniel J. Connolly, University of Denver

Best Theoretical/Empirical Paper Award
Buy Now and Match Later: The Impact of Posterior Price Matching on Profit with Strategic Consumers
Guoming Lai, Carnegie Mellon University

Best Interdisciplinary Paper Award
Kwasi Amoako-Gyampah, University of North Carolina-Greensboro
Moses Acquaah, University of North Carolina-Greensboro
Jayanth M. Jayaram, University of South Carolina

Best Student Paper Award
Applicability of Different Capacity Planning Methods: Practical Implications from Contingency Theory
Antti Tenhiala, Helsinki University of Technology

The annual meeting photos on these pages are courtesy of Ken Kendall (Rutgers University), Christine Kydd (University of Delaware), and James Pope (University of Toledo).
The 2008 Professional and Faculty Development Program at the Decision Sciences Institute annual meeting included 10 sessions held from the first through third days of the conference. The sessions sought to accomplish the objectives for this year’s program by appealing to the Institute’s members at all stages of their careers, with the goal of keeping them current in their fields. Content of the sessions, panels, and workshops was designed to provide insight into the challenges and opportunities related to professional service, teaching, and research.

The program was coordinated by Binshan Lin (Louisiana State University in Shreveport) in consultation with the Institute’s Professional Development Program Director Robert E. Markland (University of South Carolina).

Sessions were well attended at this year’s Professional and Faculty Development Program. This year’s program consisted of three major categories: (1) Editors’ workshop/panel, (2) Teaching Excellence, and (3) Administrators panel. The 10 session were spread through the conference:

- Achieving Teaching Excellent in Online Classrooms
- Traditional to Online Instruction
- Preparing Your Manuscript for Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education Workshop for Interested Authors
- Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education Workshop for Interested Authors
- Bringing Managerial Relevance to Business Curriculum through ERP Education
- Reflections on the Contribution of the Decision Sciences Journal
- Nuts and Bolts for an AACSB Accreditation Review without Going Crazy
- Faculty Liability Issues
- Facing the Challenge of Being More Efficient and Effective in Schools of Business
- Remaining Energetic and Engaged in the Classroom

Scenes from New Orleans. . . Location of the 2009 DSI Annual Meeting

The riverfront area adjacent to the French Quarter.

The St. Charles Avenue Line is the only line that has operated continuously throughout New Orleans’ streetcar history.
Technology in the Classroom Miniconference

by William H.A. Johnson, Bentley University

This year’s Technology in the Classroom Miniconference took place over two days during our annual DSI meeting. The focus of the mini-conference, held every year, is to explore the technological tools available for use in the classroom and discussion of techniques for using various tools and practices for effective teaching. The presentations and workshops this year were mostly well attended. A variety of presentations generated interesting discussions addressing a range of pedagogical topics.

In the first session, Lisa Bain engaged participants in a stimulating workshop on the use of student response systems called ‘clickers’ in utilizing presentation software in the classroom. She brought enough clickers for all participants and actively involved the group in demonstrating their use in the class. Then, Jim Lyttle, whose research examines the use of humor in the workplace, presented his innovative and enlightening approach to student response using PowerPoint via the use of ‘ventriloquism.’ One participant stated that it was the “most fun she had learning something in quite a while!”

The second session had Randy Chapman demonstrate the LINKS Supply Chain Management Simulation to a well-attended room. He illustrated key instructional elements and best practices of the simulation technology and covered the necessary background information for participants to decide whether such simulation software could help enhance learning in their classrooms.

In the third session, held on the second day of the conference, Mary Meixell and Bruce White demonstrated their research and experience at teaching and assessing the use of the software, Microsoft Excel, by students. They suggest that we need to do a better job of preparing students on how to effectively utilize this general but important software tool. Then, Hak Ju Kim and Albert H. Huang demonstrated technologies used in their Information Systems classes and discussed their research findings on the use of network technologies.

The last workshop had Randy Bradley discuss innovative instructional approaches for improving students’ teaming and dynamic decision-making skills and attitudes towards MIS. Accompanied by Jeannie Pridmore, the team described the use of multimedia case studies aimed at both improving students’ perceptions of and attitudes towards MIS courses and students’ teaming and dynamic decision-making skills. A number of available cases from all different perspectives were briefly described.

The sessions were informative and stimulating, and Rupak and I would like to say many thanks to all the presenters.
Krishna Dhir Receives 2008 Dennis E. Grawoig Distinguished Service Award

To Krishna S. Dhir
The Henry Gund Professor of Management and former Dean of the Campbell School of Business at Berry College, for his extraordinary dedication and service to the Institute and its members for over three decades, as an At-Large Vice President, Regionally-Elected Vice President, Decision Line Editor, Decision Line Feature Editor, and on the Executive Committee, Strategic Planning Committee, Nominating Committee, Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee, Regional Activities Committee, Member Services Committee, and the Programs and Meetings Committee. The ad hoc committees chaired by him on Constitution and By-laws, Current Organizational Structure of the Institute, and Development of the Strategic Planning Process for the Institute have given clear direction on improvements to the functioning of the Institute. He has provided a voice of reason, a sense of calmness and cool thinking to his fellow Board and committee members. To promote the Institute to business school deans, he edited the first book published by the Institute, *The Dean's Perspective*, comprising articles from a number of deans, AACSB International officials, and academic scholars. He served the Western DSI as President, President-Elect, Program Chair, Proceedings Editor, and Vice President for Member Services, and contributed to the Institute’s international, national, and regional meetings as Track Chair on numerous occasions. He negotiated a home for the Western Region’s journal, *Journal of Business and Management*, at the Chapman University, significantly enhancing the status and continuity of the journal. For his sustained and outstanding contributions to the Institute, it is a pleasure to present Krishna S. Dhir with the Distinguished Service Award.

Dhir receives his plaque at the Annual Meeting luncheon from DSI President Norma Harrison.

2008 Decision Sciences Journal Awards

**Best Article Award**

**Winner**

Outsourcing and Performance in Entrepreneurial Firms: Contingent Relationships with Entrepreneurial Configurations (39(3))
Manjula S. Salimath, University of North Texas
John B. Cullen, Washington State University
U. N. Umesh, Washington State University

Examining the Antecedents and Consequences of CIO Strategic Decision Making Authority: An Empirical Study (39(4))
David S. Preston, Texas Christian University
Daniel Chen, Texas Christian University
Dorothy E. Leidner, Baylor University

The Role of Culture as a Driver of Quality Management and Performance: Infrastructure versus Core Quality Practices (39(4))
Michael Naor, George Mason University
Susan Meyer Goldstein, University of Minnesota

**Finalists**

Managing Interdependence: The Effects of Outsourcing Structure on the Performance of Complex Projects (39(1))
Pamsy P. Hui, Nanyang Technological University
Alison Davis-Blake, University of Minnesota
Joseph P. Broschak, University of Arizona

Kevin W. Linderman, University of Minnesota
Roger G. Schroeder, University of Minnesota

2008 Outstanding Associate Editors

Soon Ang, Nanyang Technological University
G. Tomas M. Hult, Michigan State University

2008 Outstanding Reviewers

Rachel R. Chen, University of California
Jayanth M. Jayaram, University of South Carolina
Rachna Shah, University of Minnesota

2008 Special Recognition: For interdisciplinary thought leadership to the decision sciences

Elliot Bendoly, Emory University
Heineke, Jones and Sanders Named 2008 DSI Fellows

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

At the 2008 Annual Meeting in Baltimore, the following DSI members were named Fellows.

Janelle Heineke, Professor and Chair of the Operations and Technology Department, Boston University School of Management

For her many contributions to the profession and to the Decision Sciences Institute including outstanding service as Treasurer, Program Chair for the 2007 Annual Meeting of the DSL, Ad Hoc Committees on the Evaluation of the Current Organizational Structure of the Institute, Doctoral Consortium Co-Coordinator, Vice President for the Strategic Planning Committee, as well as substantial service to the Northeast Region of the DSI as Regionally-elected Vice President, President and Program Chair. At Boston University she has a record of outstanding teaching and administration, serving as Faculty Director of the MBA Program, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Chair of the Operations and Technology Management Department. Janelle has co-authored three Operations Management textbooks while compiling a significant record of research and scholarship including service as Associate Editor for Decision Sciences, the Journal of Operations Management and Operations Management Research. Prior to her career in business education, she held a series of professional positions in Obstetrics and Gynecology Nursing, including Administrative Manager and Practice Manager in an OB/GYN Department at a Harvard Medical School Teaching Hospital.

Thomas W. Jones, University Professor of Information Systems, Sam M. Walton College of Business, University of Arkansas

For distinction in teaching in the decision sciences, including statistics, operations management and management science/operations research, for which he has contributed materials and methods to assist others in improving student learning experiences and has supported educational sessions to help colleagues innovate in the classroom. His exemplary teaching has been recognized by numerous awards at the University of Arkansas, including the College of Business Distinguished Achievement Award for Teaching Outstanding Faculty Award for Classroom Instruction, Outstanding Faculty Contributions to Teaching Award, Outstanding Teacher Award, the Business Graduate Students Association Outstanding Graduate Faculty Member and Student Alumni Board and Associated Student Government Recognition for Excellence in Teaching. For distinction in service to the Institute, including serving as President, President-Elect, Program, Chair, Treasurer and Track Chair. He has served as the Chair of many committees, including the Nominating Committee, Ad Hoc Home Office Review Committee, Executive Committee, Strategic Planning committee, Ad Hoc Committee to Review Web-Based Submissions, Regional Activities Committee and Investment Advisory Committee, as well as a member of many other committees. He has been active in the Midwest and Southeast DSI regions, serving as President, President-Elect and Program Chair for Southwest DSI.

Nada R. Sanders, Professor and James L. and Eunice West Chair in Supply Chain Management, Texas Christian University

For her many contributions in research, teaching, and service to the Decision Sciences Institute, particularly for her outstanding service to DSI for 20 years, including serving a member of the Board of Directors and Executive Committee, At-Large Vice-President, Chair of the Innovative Education Committee, Coordinator of the Instructional Innovation Award, Development Committee for Excellence, and in numerous capacities for the Midwest Region, including President. Nada has published extensively in the areas of forecasting and supply chain management, and has published numerous articles in top-tier journals such as Decision Sciences, Journal of Operations Management, Journal of Supply Chain Management, Interfaces, and the International Journal of Operations & Production Management, and has served on numerous editorial review boards of major journals. She has also authored a textbook in operations management. During her tenure at Wright State University, Nada received several outstanding teacher awards from the Raj Coin College of Business.
2008 Annual Meeting Snapshots

Keynote Speaker John Janney, Vice President of eBusiness and Enrollment Services Independence Blue Cross, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, spoke on “Innovation and eCommerce in Health Care: Decision Support and Healthcare’s Focus on Consumerism.”

James Viehland of Beta Gamma Sigma, Harvey Brightman and Raja Sooriamurthi of Alpha Iota Delta met with students at the 2008 Doctoral Student Consortium.

Jie Zhang of Boston University and Jamison Day of University of Houston.

James Pope of University of Toledo (left) with Carl Gooding of Samford University and William Whitaker of the University of Cincinnati.

New Faculty Development Consortium in session.

Linda Boardman Liu of Simmons College with Michael Maggard of Northeastern University and Larry Meile of Boston College.
pressed by the continuing dedication and generosity of the committee members.

In addition to the many paper presentations and discussions, the annual conference afforded us the great opportunity to network in a number of ways, conduct research meetings between colleagues and plan collaborative projects, and for junior academics and doctoral students to reap the benefits of valuable mentoring from senior faculty.

I was also very pleased to see the growing numbers of the “Women of DSI.” Not only is there more of a move towards a gender balance in what was previously a male-dominated professional stream, but that many of these women are very credible in their areas of expertise and for whom I have the greatest respect.

One of the places I noticed that received a lot of use in the evenings (and which, I am sure, helped with networking) was the Kozmos Lounge of the conference hotel—that huge area where there was a lot of laughter and gaiety, and constant toasts to each other—right up to the early hours of the morning.

This was where I got the material for this message … what were some of our topics? I posed some questions and challenges to you as researchers and educators, some of which were as follows …

a. Would you give up tenure for a contract posting that was exciting, allowed you to stretch yourself in many ways, paid you more—but still a contract position?
b. Why do you research and publish in the areas you do? Why are you chasing so-called top-tier journals? To senior academics, will you dare to stretch the art of decision sciences into areas without a comfort factor but which leads you to distinctly improve the way that businesses or governments offer their products or services?
c. How do you give back to the country and industrial structures that have afforded you such a superb education?
d. If you are a dean, what would make you broaden your reward systems, tenure criteria, change your metrics, to accommodate your faculty conducting decision analysis that is relevant, practical, and which aids decision makers, especially in the present difficult economic times? How would you give incentives to faculty who contribute to the improvement of the way companies or governments make decisions?
e. Where is DSI today? What ground has been covered? What are its potentials? What are the possibilities?

In your “relaxed” state, many of you were frank enough to tell me of the phenomenon you strived for, called “the steady state”—which basically constituted tenure, then full professorship, having many research students capable of writing and presenting papers for you, large research grants, top journal publications—and with the present status of the economy and the incentive system for new faculty, people did not want to stray from the “steady state.” This response was not surprising but rather sad. The problem is that this “steady state” is too comfortable, you are not stretched, and often this results in very little real creativity and sustainability, especially in the present economic climate, thereby eventually dropping you off from this steady state.

For those of us privileged to work as academics and in education, we have a great opportunity to become builders of the future. As state-of-the-art thinkers, we could lead the way to creative decision analyses which would really make a difference to the economy and to the welfare of the global society. We need to hurry though and not wait for others to lead. We need daring people to jump off the “steady state.”

On behalf of the DSI Board, I wish you all a productive and successful, yet peaceful and happy 2009!

Norma J Harrison (海若琳)
President, Decision Sciences Institute
China Europe International Business School (CEIBS)
Shanghai, CHINA

“Women of DSI” gather at the 2008 DSI Annual Meeting.
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, mttehrani@rwu.edu) or see the website at:

http://internationaldsi.org/

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

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

**Business Law**
Susan Marsnik, University of Saint Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota, USA
SMarsnik@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. Dils, Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee, USA
David.dils@vanderbilt.edu
Netset 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/Al/Expert Systems**
Manouch Tabatabaei, Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, Georgia, USA
mtabataba@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@loyno.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
dreid@christa.unh.edu

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

---

**Nancy, France**

It is the administrative, economic, and educational center of Lorraine. Situated at the edge of the huge Lorraine iron fields, Nancy is an industrial city manufacturing chemicals, clothing, processed food, and machinery. It is one of eight cities specially targeted by the government for urban development. In the city are a noted fine arts museum, an academy of fine arts, and a large university (founded 1854).

Nancy grew around a castle of the dukes of Lorraine and became the duchy capital in the 12th century. In 1477, Charles the Bold of Burgundy was defeated and killed at the gates of Nancy by Swiss troops and the forces of René II of Lorraine. The major part of the center of Nancy, a model of urban planning and a gem of 18th-century architecture, was built during the liberal reign of Stanislaus I, duke of Lorraine (reigned 1738–66) and ex-king of Poland. Nancy passed to the French crown in 1766. In 1848 it was one of the first cities to proclaim the republic. From 1870 to 1873 it was occupied by the Germans following the Franco-Prussian War, and it was partially destroyed in World War I.

Points of interest include the Place Stanislas, the Place de la Carrière, an 18th-century cathedral, and the 16th-century ducal palace. The Church of Cordeliers (15th cent.) houses the magnificent tombs of the princes of Lorraine.

from Answers.com
http://www.answers.com/topic/nancy-1

---

**Nancy Sights**

The Place Stanislas (see photo on next page) named after the king of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and duke of Lorraine Stanislaw Leszczycski, Place de la Carrière, and Place d’Alliance were added on the World Heritage Sites list by the UNESCO in 1983.

The “École de Nancy,” a group of artists and architects founded by the glassmaster and furniture maker Émile Gallé, worked in the Art Nouveau style at the end of the 19th century and the early 20th century. It was principally their work which made Nancy a centre of art and architecture that rivaled Paris and helped give the city the nickname “Capitale de l’Est.” The city still possesses many Art Nouveau buildings (mostly banks or private homes). Furniture, glassware, and other pieces of the decorative arts are conserved at the Musée de l’École de Nancy, which is housed in the 1909 villa of Eugène Corbin, a Nancy businessman and supporter of the Art Nouveau there.

from Wikipedia
The Place Stanislas in Nancy, France, was added to the World Heritage Sites list by the UNESCO in 1983.
**WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Positions - Atkinson Graduate School of Management**

Due to the success of its MBA programs Willamette University’s Atkinson Graduate School of Management invites applications for several tenure-track faculty positions in the following areas: Information Systems and Economics/Finance to begin August 2009.  

The Atkinson School is a growing, professional graduate school within a private, liberal arts university (www.willamette.edu/mba). The School offers an MBA degree in two different formats. In Salem, Oregon we offer a full-time program; in Portland and Salem, we offer evening MBA programs for working professionals. We also provide a variety of executive education programs in Salem, Portland, and other Northwest locations. The School offers an MBA for Business, Government, and Not-for-Profit Management, one of only two MBA degrees in the world accredited by both the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). The faculty is not departmentalized, and faculty members value interdisciplinary collaboration, integrative teaching, experiential learning, high quality research that crosses sectoral and functional boundaries, collegiality, and helping students to achieve their intellectual and professional goals.  

Required: Completed doctorate, coupled with a strong record of teaching and scholarship; ability and motivation to pursue scholarly work, both independently and collaboratively; demonstrated ability to design, develop and deliver MBA and executive-education courses. Appointment rank open and salary commensurate with experience, teaching and research record.

How to Apply: Electronic applications should include the following materials (MS Word or PDF formats) are required and should be submitted to agsmfacsearch@willamette.edu:

- Current Curriculum Vitae.
- Evidence of teaching excellence (teaching assessments) and continuing scholarly achievement (reprints of up to three recent articles).
- Names, addresses (postal and e-mail), phone numbers of three academic references.

Application Deadline: Applications will be considered until the positions are filled, please apply immediately.

Believing that diversity contributes to academic excellence and to rich and rewarding communities, Willamette University is committed to recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, staff and student body. We seek candidates, particularly those from historically under-represented groups, whose work furthers diversity and who bring to campus varied experiences, perspectives and backgrounds.

---

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN**  
**Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering**

The Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering at the University of Michigan invites applications and nominations for faculty positions beginning September, 2009.

We seek outstanding candidates for faculty positions in the areas of Health Systems Engineering, Financial Engineering, and Quality Engineering at all levels. Exceptional applicants in any of the above areas, broadly construed, as well as candidates in other research areas of the department are encouraged to apply.

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

Candidates should provide (i) a current C.V., (ii) a list of references, and one page summary statements describing: (iii) career teaching plans; and (iv) research plans. The application review process will begin on November 1, 2008, but the positions will remain open and applications will continue to be reviewed until appointments are made.

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

Send inquiries and responses to:

Professor Lawrence M. Seiford, Chair  
Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering  
University of Michigan  
1205 Beal Avenue  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-2117

The University of Michigan is a non-discriminatory, affirmative action employer.
2008 Independent Auditors’ Report

To the Members of the Decision Sciences Institute, Inc.

I have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. (the “Institute”) as of June 30, 2008, and 2007, and the related statements of activities and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Institute’s management. My responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on my audits.

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

In my opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. at June 30, 2008, and 2007, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

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

James Dykhouse, CPA
August 28, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATESMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>248,296</td>
<td>199,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>454,783</td>
<td>464,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, less allowance for doubtful accounts of $2,700 in 2008 and $3,955 in 2007</td>
<td>28,898</td>
<td>25,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred charges</td>
<td>20,031</td>
<td>18,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>754,992</td>
<td>710,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, less accumulated depreciation of $140,613 in 2008 and $129,173 in 2007</td>
<td>24,261</td>
<td>18,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets - unrestricted</td>
<td>779,253</td>
<td>729,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities and Net Assets

| Accounts payable                  | 44,996 | 23,924 |
| Accrued vacation expense          | 23,354 | 23,354 |
| Accrued retirement benefits       | - | 3,803 |
| Deferred revenue:                 |      |      |
| Convention deposits               | 7,905 | 3,890 |
| Membership dues                   | 77,968 | 84,550 |
| Total current liabilities         | 154,223 | 139,521 |
| Net assets - unrestricted         | 625,030 | 589,602 |
|                                  | 779,253 | 729,123 |

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

2008 Treasurer’s Report

by Christine Kydd, University of Delaware, Lerner College of Business

It is the policy of the Institute to publish the annual auditor’s report containing the financial statements and schedules in Decision Line. Within this issue, you will find the independent auditor’s report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2008, compiled by James Dykhouse, CPA. In addition to the auditor’s report, since 1994 a brief report from the Institute’s Treasurer has been published to explain the outcome for the year, compare it to the previous year, and to point out any unique circumstances.

To summarize, comparing Fiscal Year 2008 to 2007, the Institute’s total revenue increased by $19,621 (from $861,453 in 2007 to $881,074 in 2008), and the Institute’s total expenses increased by $130,983 (from $714,663 in 2007 to $845,646 in 2008).
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

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

(b) Principles of Combination
The financial statements include the combined operations of the Institute and six regional organizations. For the fiscal years ended June 30, 2008, and 2007, the accounting transactions of the regions were handled through Decision Sciences Institute, Inc. All material interregion balances and transactions have been eliminated.

(c) Basis of Accounting
Assets and liabilities and revenue and expenses are recognized on the accrual basis of accounting.

(d) Basis of Presentation
The Institute’s net assets and revenues, expenses, gains, and losses are classified based on the existence or absence of donor-imposed restrictions. Accordingly, net assets of the Institute and changes therein are classified and reported as follows:
Unrestricted net assets: Net assets that are not subject to donor-imposed stipulations.
Temporarily restricted net assets: Net assets subject to donor-imposed stipulations that may or will be met either by actions of the Institute and/or the passage of time.
Permanently restricted net assets: Net assets subject to donor-imposed stipulations that they be maintained permanently by the Institute. Generally, the donors of these assets permit the Institute to use all or part of the income earned on related investments for general or specific purposes.

As of June 30, 2008, and 2007, all net assets of the Institute are unrestricted.

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

**Year ended June 30, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Northeast DSI</th>
<th>Southeast DSI</th>
<th>Midwest DSI</th>
<th>Southwest DSI</th>
<th>Western DSI</th>
<th>Asia DSI</th>
<th>Mexico DSI</th>
<th>India SC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$226,099</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>227,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>399,664</td>
<td>48,425</td>
<td>36,067</td>
<td>22,820</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>56,775</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>750,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>63,749</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>8,914</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>9,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and interest income</td>
<td>6,980</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized and unrealized losses on investments</td>
<td>(8,410)</td>
<td>(175)</td>
<td>(288)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>(289)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(9,493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed support from affiliate</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>708,456</td>
<td>48,350</td>
<td>36,803</td>
<td>22,695</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>56,486</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>881,074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>256,819</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>3,099</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>265,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>286,479</td>
<td>48,126</td>
<td>37,340</td>
<td>12,893</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>39,265</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>427,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>71,305</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>73,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement</td>
<td>34,148</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>34,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>45,602</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>45,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>694,353</td>
<td>48,738</td>
<td>39,020</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>845,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in net assets</strong></td>
<td>14,103</td>
<td>(388)</td>
<td>(2,217)</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>12,122</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>(612)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>35,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>336,872</td>
<td>42,792</td>
<td>71,188</td>
<td>5,802</td>
<td>47,643</td>
<td>61,017</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>589,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$350,975</td>
<td>42,404</td>
<td>68,971</td>
<td>34,992</td>
<td>49,803</td>
<td>76,437</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>(612)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>625,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Home Office net assets differ from the Internal Financial Statements by the amount of accrued vacation expense, $23,354.

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.

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

**Year ended June 30, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home Office</th>
<th>Northeast DSI</th>
<th>Southeast DSI</th>
<th>Midwest DSI</th>
<th>Southwest DSI</th>
<th>Western DSI</th>
<th>Asia DSI</th>
<th>Mexico DSI</th>
<th>India SC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>$239,873</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>241,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>346,138</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>33,986</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>476,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>55,302</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>14,085</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and interest income</td>
<td>16,837</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized and unrealized losses on investments</td>
<td>19,098</td>
<td>3,447</td>
<td>4,631</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed support from affiliate</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>702,722</td>
<td>31,971</td>
<td>41,752</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>14,019</td>
<td>56,489</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>861,453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership services</td>
<td>237,061</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>242,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention</td>
<td>229,069</td>
<td>30,897</td>
<td>23,826</td>
<td>11,589</td>
<td>5,288</td>
<td>48,396</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>357,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>76,247</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>78,247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive services</td>
<td>36,501</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>36,501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>578,878</td>
<td>39,512</td>
<td>24,477</td>
<td>12,204</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>53,191</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>714,663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in net assets</strong></td>
<td>123,844</td>
<td>(7,541)</td>
<td>17,275</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>8,099</td>
<td>3,298</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>146,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>213,028</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>53,913</td>
<td>25,802</td>
<td>47,643</td>
<td>64,315</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>442,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net assets, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$336,872</td>
<td>42,404</td>
<td>68,971</td>
<td>34,992</td>
<td>49,803</td>
<td>76,437</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>(612)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>589,602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

See accompanying independent auditors’ report.
(f) Investments

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

A summary of investments with cost and unrealized appreciation at June 30, 2008, and 2007 is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Unrealized Appreciation</th>
<th>Fair Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money market fund</td>
<td>$54,240</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>54,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond mutual funds</td>
<td>109,428</td>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>109,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stock mutual fund</td>
<td>310,553</td>
<td>(19,295)</td>
<td>291,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$474,221</strong></td>
<td><strong>(19,438)</strong></td>
<td><strong>454,783</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(g) Deferred Charges and Deferred Revenue

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

(h) Contributed Support from Affiliate

Georgia State University (the “University”) provided office space to the Institute in the amount of $8,000 and administrative support totaling $3,000 in both 2008 and 2007. These amounts have been reflected in the accompanying financial statements. The Institute makes payments to the University for any other supporting services received.

(i) Equipment

Equipment is carried at cost. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the related assets. When assets are retired or otherwise disposed of, the cost and related accumulated depreciation are removed from the accounts and any resulting gain or loss is recognized in income for the period. The cost of maintenance and repairs is charged to income as incurred; significant renewals and betterments are capitalized. Depreciation expense is $11,440 and $8,202 for 2008 and 2007, respectively.

(j) Use of Estimates

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

(2) Income Taxes

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

(3) Pension Plan

All eligible employees of the Institute are participants in the Georgia State University Retirement Benefits Program. Participants in this benefit program must contribute 5% of their annual salaries to either the Georgia State University Retirement Plan (the “Plan”) or the Teachers Retirement System (the “System”), a multiemployer, cost sharing public employee retirement system. The University makes contributions to the Plan or the System, based on actuarially computed funding requirements. The Institute makes payments to the University based on the University’s estimation of the cost allocated to the Institute’s participating employees. Payments to the University for the Plan totaled $10,889 in 2008 and $14,333 in 2007.

In 2000, the Institute’s board of directors approved a retirement plan qualified under IRS code section 401(a). The purpose of the plan is to make up for the past absence of retirement benefits on supplemental salaries paid by the Institute. All full-time employees of the Institute that receive supplemental salaries and meet certain requirements for years of employment and vesting will receive benefits under this plan. The following payments were made under this plan for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2008 and 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments under the plan</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current years obligation</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to reduce unfunded liability</td>
<td>3,816</td>
<td>6,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total payments under the plan</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>8,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Related-Party Transactions

During 2008, the Institute’s board of directors approved payment of a monthly stipend of $1,000 to two of its members to act as information technology liaisons between the Institute and the company to which the information technology functions has been contracted to. One of these members is a significant shareholder in the company who will provide the information technology. Total payments under this contract amounted to $3,500 during 2008.

The increased revenue in fiscal year 2008 was largely attributable to a $93,803 increase in convention revenues from the 2007 annual meeting in Phoenix compared to the 2006 meeting.

The increase in expenses in fiscal year 2008 is partially due to a $34,148 shown as Placement expenses. In the past these expenses were not shown under Placement but rather were allocated to General Management expenses. The increase was also attributable to increased allocation to Georgia State University (a $9,101 increase in management and general-supportive services expense).

Total revenue in fiscal year 2008 was $35,428 greater than total expenses, compared with a change in net assets of $146,790 for the prior year. This increased the Institute’s net assets to $625,030 in fiscal 2008 from $489,602 in 2007.

If you have any suggestions to offer regarding the financial management of the Institute, please contact me at kyddc@lerner.udel.edu.
OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS

The Institute’s 2008-09 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Treasurer, and Vice Presidents elected at-large to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2010.

Your recommendations should include the affiliation of each nominee, the office recommended for the nominee, and a brief statement of qualifications of the nominee. If you would like to recommend persons for the offices of regionally elected Vice Presidents from the Asia Pacific, Mexico, Midwest and Northeast regions, please indicate so on the form below. These names will be forwarded to the appropriate regional nominating committee chair.

Please send your recommendations by no later than October 1st to the Chair of the Nominating Committee, c/o the Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

The Nominating Committee is most appreciative of your assistance.

Office ____________________________________________________________

Nominee’s Name & Affiliation _______________________________________

Statement of Qualifications _________________________________________

Nominator’s Name & Affiliation _____________________________________

FELLOWS’ NOMINATIONS

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

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

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

Decision Sciences Institute Fellows

Adam, Everett E., Jr., Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
Anderson, John C., Univ. of Minnesota
Benson, P. George, Univ. of Georgia
Beranek, William, Univ. of Georgia
Berry, William L., The Ohio State Univ.
Bonini, Charles F., Stanford Univ.
Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia State Univ.
Buffa, Elwood S.*, Univ. of California-Los Angeles
Cangelosi, Vincent*, Univ. of Southwest Louisiana
Clapper, James M., Aladdin TempRite
Collins, Rodger D., Drexel Univ.
Couger, J. Daniel*, Univ. of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummins, Larry L.*, Univ. of Minnesota
Darden, William R.*, Louisiana State Univ.
Davis, K. Roscoe, Univ. of Georgia
Davis, Mark M., Bentley College
Day, Ralph L.*, Indiana Univ.
Digman, Lester A., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Dock, V. Thomas, Maui, Hawaii
Ebert, Ronald J., Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
Edwards, Ward, Univ. of Southern California
Evans, James R., Univ. of Cincinnati
Fetter, Robert B., Yale Univ.
Flores, Benito E., Texas A&M Univ.
Flynn, Barbara B., Indiana Univ.
Franz, Lori S., Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
Glover, Fred W., Univ. of Colorado at Boulder
Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State Univ.
Grawoig, Dennis E.*, Boulder City, Nevada
Green, Paul E., Univ. of Pennsylvania
Groff, Gene K., Georgia State Univ.
Gupta, Jatinder N.D., Univ. of Alabama in Huntsville
Hahn, Chan K., Bowling Green State Univ.
Hayya, Jack C., The Pennsylvania State Univ.
Heineke, Janelle, Boston Univ.
Hershauer, James C., Arizona State Univ.
Honowitz, Ira, Univ. of Florida
Houck, Ernest C.*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Huber, George P., Univ. of Texas-Austin
Jacobs, F. Robert, Indiana Univ.
Jones, Thomas W., Univ. of Arkansas-Fayetteville
Kendall, Julie E., Rutgers Univ.
Kendall, Kenneth E., Rutgers Univ.
Keown, Arthur J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Khunavala, Basheer M.*, Univ. of Houston
Kim, Kee Young, Yonsei Univ.
King, William R., Univ. of Pittsburgh
Klein, Gary, Univ. of Colorado, Colorado Springs
Koehler, Anne B., Miami Univ.
Krajewski, Lee J., Notre Dame Dept.
LaForge, Lawrence, Clemson Univ.
Latta, Carol J., Georgia State Univ.
Lee, Sang M., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Luthans, Fred, Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Mahbod, Vincent A., Indiana Univ.
Malhotra, Nanot K., Univ. of South Carolina
Malhotra, Navin K., Georgia Institute of Technology
Markland, Robert E., Univ. of South Carolina
McMillan, Claude, Univ. of Colorado at Boulder
Miller, Jeffrey G., Boston Univ.
Monroe, Kent B., Univ. of Illinois
Moore, Laurence J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Moskovitz, Herbert, Purdue Univ.
Narasimhan, Ram, Michigan State Univ.
Neter, John, Univ. of Georgia
Nutt, Paul C., The Ohio State Univ.
Olson, David L., Texas A&M Univ.
Perkins, William C., Indiana Univ.
Porter, William S., Univ. of New Mexico
Philippatos, George C., Univ. of Minnesota
Raina, Howard, Harvard Univ.
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Reimnuth, James R., Univ. of Oregon
Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College
Roth, Aleda V., Clemson Univ.
Sanderson, Nada, Texas Christian Univ.
Schkade, Lawrence L., Univ. of Texas at Arlington
Schniederjans, Marc J., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Scriber, Thomas J., Univ. of Michigan
Schoeder, Roger G., Univ. of Minnesota
Simone, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology
Slocum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist Univ.
Sobel, Marlen C., Southern Methodist Univ.
Sorensen, James E., Univ. of Denver
Sprague, Linda G., China Europe International Business School
Steinberg, Earle, Touche Ross & Company, Houston, TX
Summers, George W.*, Univ. of Arizona
Tang, Kwee, Purdue Univ.
Taylor, Bernard W., Ill, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Trott, Marvin D., Kent State Univ.
Uhl, Kenneth P.*, Univ. of Illinois
Vanzoory, Andrew*, Univ. of San Francisco
Vois, Christopher A., London Business School
Wasserman, William, Syracuse Univ.
Wemmerlov, Urban, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
Wheelwright, Steven C., Harvard Univ.
Whitten, Betty J., Univ. of Georgia
Whybark, D. Clay, Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wickland, Gary A., Capricorn Research
Winkler, Robert L., Duke Univ.
Woolsey, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines
Wormann, Max S., Jr.*, Iowa State Univ.
Zmud, Robert W., Florida State Univ.

*deceased
Decision Sciences Institute
Application for Membership

Name, Institution or Firm

Address (☐ Home ☐ Business)

Phone Number

Dues Schedule: ___ Renewal ___ First Time ___ Lapsed
(circle one) U.S./Can. International

Regular Membership .........................$125 $125
Student Membership .........................$25 $25

(Student membership requires signature of sponsoring member.)

Emeritus Membership ......................$35 $35
(Emeritus membership requires signature of member as a declaration of emeritus status.)

Institutional Membership ..................$125 $125
(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.

For more information, see page 22.

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION: ☐ Visa ☐ MC ☐ AmEx ☐ Disc.
Total amount $__________________
Card No. ____________________________ Expires: ___ /___
Card Holder’s Name ____________________________________________
Signature _____________________________________________________

(Please Print)

Decision Sciences Institute