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PRESIDENT’S LETTER

Update on Board Actions
by Ram Narasimhan, President, DSI

Dear Colleagues, in this column, I would like to inform you about some of the initiatives that the Board is pursuing to reposition the Institute for competitive strength. A mid-year meeting of the DSI Board was held in Chicago, in conjunction with the Academy of Management annual conference, to
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FROM THE EDITOR

KRISHNA S. DHIR, Editor, Berry College

Once again, it is that time of year when leaves change color, music fills the air, and our thoughts turn to fellowship and our gathering at the annual meeting of the Institute. Four decades have passed since the founding of the American Institute of Decision Sciences, re-named the Decision Sciences Institute, in 1986. As we do at the end of each decade, we shall meet during the season of Thanksgiving in New Orleans, the city of music, art, culture, and fine cuisine, where the 100 charter members met for the very first meeting.

The Institute’s Board of Directors has been busy developing new initiatives and services to enhance the value of your membership. These include development of new Special Interest Groups, a new chapter for the European Region, and a new journal. In his letter, DSI President Ram Narasimhan of Michigan State University provides an update on these activities. You will find it most informative. As usual, the members of the Board and our president will be delighted to hear your comments and suggestions.

In the feature article of this issue, Douglas Hales and Shaw Chen of the University of Rhode Island describe the challenges of partnership between business schools and industry as experienced by their College of Business Administration. They discuss 10 specific challenges confronting them and how these were managed: “University faculty and administrators facing similar challenges have a daunting task of overcoming elements of academic tradition, scarce resources, accreditation boards, industry and parental expectations, administrative checks and balances, and of course student expectations in incorporating “industry relevance” into the curriculum.”

In the Production/Operations Management feature column, Mikko Ketokivi of Helsinki University of Technology discusses the dilemma of incorporating the “human element” into operations management research. He states, “For the behavioral theorist, giving up rationality constitutes a fundamental theoretical challenge, which is not solved by adding an error term to the model....Yet, leaving out any one factor may fundamentally hamper one’s understanding of the decision. Hence, the dilemma.” The essay discusses specific guidelines for “an emerging OM behavioral theorist.”

Arash Azadegan and Lisa McLain-Sharp of New Mexico State University offer thoughts on “Enhancing Course Delivery in Operations Management: Integrating Web Technology and Face-to-Face Learning” in the Classroom feature column. In their search for the “right blend of technology and interpersonal teaching,” they explore “how some tools traditionally associated with face-to-face or web-based deliveries can be combined to enhance course delivery....” They believe that “when merged properly, the two can provide a winning recipe for delivering courses in Operations Management.”

Unlike traditional websites that allow users to only view and receive content, Web 2.0 facilitates users to add to the website by creating and sharing content as well. J. P. Shim of Mississippi State University, Kyung-Mo Ahn of Korea Culture & Content Agency and Kyung Hee University, and Juyeon Kim of International Tourism Strategy Institute and Kyung Hee University discuss the trends and differences of perception among Web 2.0 users. In the e-Commerce feature column, they explore lessons gleaned from their study for future use of Web 2.0. They point to the necessity of “multi-dimensional research to grasp Web 2.0 usage trends and to consider users’ psychological factors such as lifestyles and values.”

Jean Harris of Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg and Gary Cunningham of Sweden's Jönköping International Business School observe that with the adoption of commercial models for their operation, “universities face an array of governance issues.”

Editor, see page 25
The two candidates for the position of DSI president-elect—Krishna S. Dhir of Berry College and Marc J. Schniederjans of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln—provide their vision statements for this year’s election of officers.

Krishna S. Dhir

Year after year, successive presidents and boards of directors have emphasized a consistent set of issues confronting the Institute. Tom Callarman, as president during 2005-2006, pushed the Institute to become “an international organization rather than an organization with international members” (Decision Line, 36(3), p. 29). Mark Davis, 2006-2007 president, recognized that in our academic environment, “teams have replaced the individual; trans-disciplinary has replaced disciplinary; global has replaced national” (Decision Line, 37(5), p. 48). The Institute took a giant stride towards its internationalization when Norma Harrison became the first president (2008-2009) elected from outside the United States. She encouraged us to “stretch the art of decision sciences into areas... that ultimately... improve the social fabric of life” (Decision Line, 39(5), p. 59).

Ken Kendall, 2007-2008 president, and Ram Narasimhan, our current president, responded to members who sought a multi-disciplinary focus and collegiality within the Institute, while returning to the time-tested values of inclusiveness. Additionally, our members identified openness in communication, opportunities for participation, and quality of services as important values. President-elect Keong Leong looks to enhance the Institute’s reputation through improved international engagement, quality publications, annual meetings, and applied technology (Decision Line, 39(5), pp. 4-5).

These issues continue to be the key factors shaping our Institute today. They require ongoing, diligent attention of our officers and members. The call of the day is for consistency of action. We need to stay the course and emphasize continuity. Making of an international, trans-disciplinary and cross-functional, collegial and mentoring, and value-creating organization requires continuity of vision and strategy over time. Let me elaborate.

International issue—Providing a global view. Globalization of the business education industry is having a profound impact on business schools, irrespective of the scale of operation. At one end of the spectrum, business schools are going into partnership with their counterparts across the globe to offer students opportunities to travel and experience the international scene through immersion in-situ. At the other end of the spectrum, programs are being designed to serve place-bound students in far-flung geographic locations, with business schools establishing campuses in their neighborhoods. Many faculty members manning the entire spectrum have been educated in the United States. It is common for universities throughout the world to recruit in the United States. Yet, our members have had limited exposure to these emerging trends. I see an opportunity for us to prepare our members to meet these challenges of globalization.

Trans-disciplinarity and cross-functionality issue—Redefining decision sciences. Problems facing decision makers usually transcend disciplines. However, we in the business of analyzing decision-making processes have not taken advantage of the wide range of disciplines available to us. Meanwhile, concerned with the impact of decisions on human condition, some corporate CEOs contemplate recruiting liberal arts graduates in preference over business administration graduates. Increased emphasis being placed on cross-functionality in the business curriculum has generally remained within the boundaries of business schools. We need to increase our involvement in liberal arts and humanities, as well. The diversity emerging from such openness has been at the heart of the Institute’s success from its inception. A trans-disciplinary approach to the human condition allows individuals of different preparation, training, and traditions to collaborate in a complimentary manner. The Institute can offer an overarching synthesis of ideologies drawn from various liberal arts disciplines to broaden the analytical base of decision sciences.

Collegial and mentoring issue—Going back to the basics. Recently, Clay Whybark voiced concern about the prevalent approach to business education: “We may end up like law schools. We need to evolve more like medical schools” (Decision Line, 39(3), p. 6). Our members need to develop a balance between their academic skills and clinical competencies so that they may instill the same in their students. However, in the early stages of their careers, our members experience tremendous pressure to quickly develop a strong research agenda that promises a steady flow of mainstream publications in highly rated, specialized journals. Our success depends on their success. Their appropriate mentoring is of critical importance to our profession. For instance, emphasis on multi-disciplinary research might make more sense for academics in the post-tenure phase of their careers, with newly qualified academics concentrating on their primary disciplines of specialization. I would like to see our Institute re-dedicate itself to mentoring its members through various stages of their respective career-cycle.

Value proposition—Enriching and promoting our members. As the Institute moves to enhance value to members through international engagement, quality publications, annual meetings, and applied technology, we should re-define the role of research to include enhanced visibility of scholarship, teaching to include learning, and service to include professional practice. The Institute should be a forum for:

DHIR VISION STATEMENT, see page 9
My vision statement is a function of my 29+ years of experience with the Decision Sciences Institute. My current position on the DSI’s Board of Directors has revealed some challenges that need to be addressed. For example, in the last 10 years DSI has lost membership, while other competitive organizations have increased theirs. The current leadership of DSI has recognized this and other problems, and is moving our organization toward a more successful direction, but much more needs to be done. Many of the problems we currently face and many of the goals the DSI Board of Directors have set can be addressed by growing our membership.

My vision is to create an environment where membership in DSI is valued, sought after, and prized above all other organizations of which our faculty or practitioners may be members. It should be an organization that motivates faculty to want to be members, come to meetings, and participate in leadership roles. I am a lifetime member in two or other academic organizations, but DSI is the one I am active in and whose meetings I attend. I would like to see DSI be the “go to” organization when important decisions are to be made, not just in areas of management information systems or operations management (which represent about 90% of our membership), but decisions in broader areas of business, healthcare, government, and education.

To accomplish this vision, I would seek to guide DSI to undertake a substantial marketing/promotion effort. The DSI Board has recently begun to view marketing/promotion as a strategic goal. We need to implement this goal aggressively, both internationally and regionally. The Decision Sciences Institute needs to use its influence to help elevate decision making to a science equal to any of the behavioral or quantitative sciences. This in turn will help broaden DSI membership in underrepresented fields, such as accounting, finance, marketing, and in relatively non-existent represented fields, like economics, engineering, mathematics, psychology, or other behavioral disciplines. Any area where decision making is undertaken should be viewed as a potential market for inclusion in our organization. My vision of inclusion in this regard is limitless. This will enhance DSI’s own vision statement that claims we are an interdisciplinary organization. The DSI Board has recently established a strategic goal of developing Special Interest Groups (SIGs) that may attract additional members. Opportunities to cooperate (e.g., joint meetings, mutual SIGs, etc.) with other academic organizations in underrepresented fields could also be a method to attract new members and further advance decision making as a science. The fact that Decision Sciences Journal is one of the highest ranked journals in business is but one feature of excellence that DSI offers that can be leveraged to attract the best scholars’ research and their membership. In my vision of DSI and its potential, there are thousands of faculty who, if they only knew about our organization and we would encourage them to join, would do so with enthusiasm.

In a global context, governments, as well as businesses, are desperately seeking to find excellence in decision making from interdisciplinary sources of knowledge. DSI can be that source if we choose to make our capabilities better known. Key to promoting our role is both of our journals and our U.S. annual meeting, as well as the international and regional meetings. The leadership role of the president requires many tasks, including guiding the DSI Board of Directors and members to achieve greater notoriety for the organization in academic and professional environments. The goal of enhanced attention is to make membership desirable by increasing the prestige of DSI as “the” source for high quality decision-making research and knowledge. To accomplish this, the president should have extensive knowledge of DSI, knowledge of external competitive organizations, and experience in board meeting leadership.

My experience with DSI includes my years of membership and numerous positions I have held. I have served as the program chair for the annual meeting and program chair for a Midwest regional meeting. I am currently a vice president at large and have served as a vice president in the Midwest and Western regions, as well as a DSI board member. I have also served in a variety of differing roles, including track chair, coordinator, and committee member positions for both the annual and Midwest meetings.

External to DSI, I have also served as co-program chair for the 1992 and 1996 Production and Operations Management Society (POMS) annual meetings, and as a vice president, and member of various committees for that organization. I have also served on the program committee for the Information Resources Management Association (IRMA) international conference. Other external experience relevant to heading the DSI board meetings includes having been elected to and served as chairman of the board for both public and private organizations.

My priorities would be: (1) develop a long-term strategic marketing plan to promote DSI annual meetings (both international and regional) and enhance the quality of the meetings; (2) develop a long-term strategic plan to expand all efforts to increase membership and prestige of DSI; (3) develop tactics and operational plans to increase awareness of the quality of all DSI journals and implement other long-term strategic plans.

We have much to be thankful for from those prior faculty who built up DSI during the early years. They have given us a great foundation to build on, and I know we all appreciate what they have given us. It is up to the rest of us now to be more than caretakers; we must grow this organization into the greatest decision making society in the world. Regardless of who is elected, if we all work together, we can make DSI the “go to” organization for decision making.
Partnering with Industry—Easier Said Than Done: Ten Lessons Learned

by Douglas N. Hales and Shaw K. Chen, University of Rhode Island

Reading President Norma Harrison’s recent article (Decision Line, Vol. 39, No.5, October, 2008) on academia partnering with industry reminded us of the challenging journey that the University of Rhode Island’s College of Business Administration encountered during a recent overhaul of its curriculum. The overhaul included revamping four majors, eliminating one, and introducing two new degrees in Supply Chain Management and International Business Program. University faculty and administrators facing similar challenges have a daunting task overcoming elements of academic tradition, scarce resources, accreditation boards, industry and parental expectations, administrative checks and balances, and of course student expectations in incorporating “industry relevance” into curriculum. This article highlights the major hurdles we faced during this process and the methods used to overcome some of them. We do not claim to have discovered all of the answers nor have we achieved all of our objectives, but we have been successful in meeting many of the expectations of our constituents while preserving academic rigor.

**Disruptive Innovations**

Facing resource constraints and a growing demand for its majors, the new dean of the University of Rhode Island’s College of Business Administration, Mark Higgins, requested that each area review its curriculum with a vision to incorporate industry relevance along with traditional academic rigor into coursework. Ultimately this meant more required courses and fewer electives for students, but undeniable benefits for the college. This was easier said than done considering the university existed in a very competitive environment. Located less than two hours from five Ivy-league universities and a host of other outstanding, world-class schools, the university competes every day for some of the best students in New England, the U.S., and the world. As Professor Bob Hayes implied in his article in the 2000 POMS journal (Hayes, R., POMS, 2000), the best universities like Harvard are outstanding because they attract outstanding students. He also described how the eminent scholar Wickham Skinner, department head of Harvard’s Business School at the time, lead the faculty through a similar process to become industry relevant by interacting with top industry leaders and helping solve major industry problems. But URI is not Harvard University and does not have the same resources as an Ivy League school, so how does a large state university with limited resources do it? This article is written primarily from the experience of curriculum development for the Supply Chain Management major in the College of Business Administration at the University of Rhode Island.

Realize first that the College was not suffering enrollment. Year after year, the College has been forced to raise admissions standards because the student demand for business courses consistently exceeds its capacity to deliver. Some of the programs have 100% placement prior to graduation. To differentiatate the supply chain program from others in the area, the goal was to develop a program extending beyond the traditional Logistics, Purchasing, and Operations curriculum, and the popular Supply Chain Operations Reference model. The faculty wanted to include the traditional topics...
plus others that a supply chain industry advisory committee felt were important, such as Customer Relationship Management, Supply Chain “Greening,” Customer Service Management, and Transportation Management in a global context. Rather than reinvent the wheel, the faculty began by surveying other supply chain and logistics programs in the U.S. and abroad and found quite a variety—none of which met our local or regional demands. This is important because as a land grant, sea grant, and urban grant institution URI’s first obligation is to meet the state and regional needs. The vision of the Dean was to continue to attract better students by ensuring that in addition to a four-year degree, the curriculum would qualify students to sit for important industry certification exams such as the Certification in Public Accounting (CPA) exam, the Certified Financial Analyst (CFA) exams, American Production and Inventory Control System (APICS) exams, and the Certification in Transportation and Logistics (CTL) exam. In doing so, the College better meets the needs of organizations in our state and region. As discussed earlier, this meant that the curriculum had to be both academically rigorous and industry relevant.

Streamlining Academic Rigor and Industry Relevance
To meet the criteria, the first challenge was to develop a supply chain curriculum that was academically rigorous. While there are several good academic models, the faculty found none that claim to be supply chain “industry relevant.” While the faculty could represent the academic requirements, they felt that an advisory committee could better represent the needs of industry. This resulted in the formation of a supply chain advisory committee comprised of supply chain executives and managers from Rhode Island and Massachusetts. After substantial review, the closest academic model that covered the requisite topics important to both the faculty and supply chain advisory committee was the Global Supply Chain Forum model (GSCF) at The Ohio State University. This model is presented in the textbook, *Supply Chain Management: Processes, Partnerships, Performance*, edited by Douglas M. Lambert of The Ohio State University (SCMI Press, Sarasota, Florida).

The second challenge was to ensure “industry relevance,” a concept easy to discuss but difficult to operationalize. In following with the financial discipline models, we reviewed existing certifications offered by industry associations—many of whose members were also members of the supply chain advisory committee. To be of value, the associations must adequately represent the industry knowledge in supply chain management. To our surprise, there are dozens of organizations claiming to represent supply chain interests—many of which had little foundation to do so. Examples of strong representative associations in certain areas of supply chain management include the American Production and Inventory Control System (APICS), Institute for Supply Management (ISM), The Council of Supply Chain Management, American Society of Transportation and Logistics (AST&L), and the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals (CSCMP). However, no single association had a certification that covered the range of topics as our major required. Ultimately, the supply chain faculty and advisory committee approved the American Society of Transportation and Logistics Certification in Transportation & Logistics (CTL). Although lesser known than CSCMP, APICS, and ISM, this certification was very rigorous because it incorporated the body of knowledge covered by APICS and ISM certifications as well those recommended for inclusion in the new curriculum. An additional benefit was that the CTL partnered with APICS so that completion of the CPIM and CRIM fulfilled two of the six modules required by the CTL.

This led to the third challenge. The average business student was taking more than four years to complete their degree because they were hampered by changing majors, double-majoring, or taking more electives than required. Our challenge was to cover the requisite knowledge for a rigorous and relevant curriculum without extending the time needed to complete a degree. To achieve our curriculum objectives, a relatively large number of courses were required. While a student could technically graduate without the additional courses, they could not qualify for the CTL unless all were completed. This resulted in the elimination of virtually all professional electives. The elimination of electives not only affected the students, but also the faculty. There was no longer space in the curriculum for the occasional special course that may have contemporary appeal, or for a specialized course based on a faculty’s cutting-edge research. While stream-lining the process, this removed flexibility from the curriculum while ensuring that all requisite courses were taught each year.

Application Oriented Curriculum and Research
The fourth challenge was getting the new curriculum approved through the various layers of academic governance before the scheduled start date of the major in fall 2007. Developing new curriculum requires the approval of several university organizations including the discipline’s faculty, area leaders, associate deans, college dean, faculty senate, and the provost. This invoked a vigorous debate over the CTL certification and the role of higher education versus the role of training. Traditionally, curriculum at the university level is theory-focused rather than applied. Many university faculty believe that the role of higher education is to teach concepts and terms that describe the basics and explain the variance within a discipline, and that extending curriculum to application-oriented industry certifications is inappropriate for a university level education. While this debate will continue for many years to come, the decision was ultimately made to incorporate the CTL requirements because our business advisory committee (potential employers) recommended it to the faculty. The beliefs of many of the advisory committee members apparently paralleled those described by Norma Harrison, in that most university
Recruiting and Internship

The sixth challenge came from our students themselves. Being keenly aware of the disciplines of accounting, finance, marketing, entrepreneurship, international business, and management, they had little idea of what a supply chain was, much less what a career in supply chain management entails. Even though supply chain issues are mentioned daily in the popular and business press, and the demand for supply chain graduates is high, interest on the part of U.S. students was marginal. Therefore, the faculty embarked on a recruiting effort to attract some of the best and brightest students to the major. As a result, the major has grown since its inception, but only gradually as the news of continued employment filters through the student ranks.

The seventh challenge came from our supply chain industry advisory committee. In reviewing the top U.S. programs, we found that they recommend or require at least a one-semester or summer internship in the supply chain field as part of the degree requirements. However, most students at these schools complete two or three internships by the time they graduate. Our advisory committee subscribed to the multiple-internship approach—providing more intern slots than we had junior and senior students to fill. While this will not be the case by 2010, in the short term it created a problem in properly allocating the limited number of students among interested industry partners. It is becoming somewhat of a convention to use the internship process as screening for potential new hires. This affords a company the opportunity to review a student’s job performance before fully committing as an employer.

The World Is Flat

The eighth challenge was to globalize our curriculum. Even in a down economy and with increasing public pressure to source locally to reduce carbon emissions, all of the industry partners felt that global sourcing was here to stay and that countries such as Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, and South Africa will become increasingly competitive against India and China as sources of goods and services. Additionally, India and China will continue to provide new markets for U.S. goods and services as the economy improves. To address this issue we leveraged our Global U-8 partner universities. The GU-8 is a consortium of 12 universities located on seaports worldwide. The purpose of the consortium is to facilitate seamless research collaboration among faculty, exchange students, and faculty teaching exchange programs. Partners include Xiamen University in China, Inha University in Korea, University of Haifa in Israel, LeHarve in France, Hull in Great Britain, The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology in Australia, a university in Japan, and three U.S. universities—The University of Rhode Island, The University of Washington, and the University of Hawaii. Based on recommendations from the 2008 Yale Conference on globalizing university curriculum, the college used the GU-8 for faculty exchange, the development of mini-cases on covering topics from an international perspective, and integrated international students in virtually every program of the college. While language and dialect issues made this process slower than expected, it has been a positive learning experience for faculty and students. Through this experience the college has been able to appreciate many of the research methodology barriers that Norma Harrison alluded to in her article. Many cultures do not answer surveys or grant interviews without the development of personal relationships, still others do not have standardized business practices or accurate reporting is not the prevalent convention, nor is the sharing of information even when it is available. Some foreign governments prohibit the exchange of information from government organizations, except through official channels, which can take years to gather. These realities require the use of non-traditional methodologies and strong relationship building that takes many years to develop.

The ninth challenge was to “green” the supply chain curriculum. Most international students—especially those from Europe—were more aware of the environmental issues and initiatives to mitigate them than the U.S. students. This is important because many of our industry partners are concerned with carbon credits, so they are in the process of calculating carbon emissions for their products and facilities and they desire graduates with knowledge of international environmental issues to assist in these ventures. While we are
in the process of incorporating carbon emission estimate methods and environmental stewardship into several of our courses, this process will take some time to fulfill.

**Top Line, Bottom Line**

Lastly, do not rely solely on university funds to fund curriculum redesign efforts. The U.S. Department of Education and other federal agencies offer grants to modernize curriculum. A good example is the National Science Foundation project to introduce Lean/JIT practices into Industrial Engineering curriculum nationwide. This grant provided printed education materials, simulation and software for demonstration and practice by students and faculty, and travel funds for program promotion, training, and research. Using external grants to design and implement new curriculum allows for greater flexibility and leverage to incorporate elements the faculty feel are vital to excellent rigorous curriculum, provides the necessary research funds to support it, and somewhat insulates the effort from university politics. To this end, the supply chain management faculty at URI were awarded competitive external grants exceeding $700,000 to design and equip the new major, and have applied for another $400,000 to continue the effort. When partnering with international faculty and universities for case development, the faculty received an additional $92,000 in foreign government support.

**A Perfect Ten?**

The journey described in this article was somewhat risky, expensive, time consuming, and took many years to develop. It was visionary and required a great deal of patience and support on the part of the Dean Mark Higgins, Associate Dean’s Shaw Chen, and Deborah Rosen to allow it to develop. URI’s supply chain faculty were innovative, creative, and surprisingly collaborative in reaching agreement on almost all major issues. This could easily be characterized as the 11th lesson, and probably the most difficult to achieve considering the plethora of agendas that exist in most universities.

---

**DHIR VISION STATEMENT, from page 4**

- Research and scholarship of theoretical and applied nature through integration of the art and science of managerial decision-making across functional disciplines, and an international forum for dissemination of this research through presentation and publication. I would like to see us venture into social sciences as well. We traditionally rely on analytic treatment of the decision-making processes. However, as we address the broader consideration of human condition, we stand to benefit from subjective approaches of social sciences as well. Also, we need to ensure that our journals continue on the path of ongoing improvement.
- Teaching and learning through focus on instructional innovation including curriculum design and delivery, and by recognition of teaching excellence. For instance, showcase videos of the innovative instructional presentations and best paper presentations at conferences could be posted on the web for retrieval by members and others at will.
- Professional practice support through exchange of ideas between leading professional practitioners and educators and a focus on decision systems. We have a variety of technologies available to us for this purpose, including Facebook, LinkedIn, Podcasts, Webcasts, Webinars, etc.

Ultimately, our Institute is about its members. I am delighted by the prospect of giving back and serving the Institute. As stated before, I believe we need to stay the course by emphasizing continuity of value-creating vision and strategy, providing a global perspective, promoting trans-disciplinarity and cross-functional ity, going back to the basics, and enriching and supporting our members.

---

**NOMINATIONS, from page 1**

The 2008-09 Nominating Committee, chaired by Kenneth E. Kendall (Rutgers University) has completed the slate of nominees for the 2010 election of officers. The Nominating Committees for the regional subdivisions are also compiling the names of nominees who are running this year for the office of vice presidents elected by the regional subdivisions.

Ballots will be sent in January 2010. Additional nominations may be made by November 30, 2009. Each additional nomination must be made by petition signed by at least five percent of the members and submitted to the Institute’s Secretary, c/o the Institute’s Home Office, 35 Broad Street, Atlanta, GA 30303.

Additional nominations for vice presidents elected by the regional subdivisions may be made upon petition signed by at least five percent of the regional subdivisions’ members.

Please be sure that the DSI Home Office (dsi@gsu.edu) has your current email address!

---

Ballots will be sent in January 2010. Please be sure that the DSI Home Office (dsi@gsu.edu) has your current email address.

---
The Dilemma of Trying to Understand the “Real World”
by Mikko Ketokivi, Helsinki University of Technology

Behavioral theory is rapidly gaining popularity in operations management (OM) research (e.g., Journal of Operations Management special issue in 2006). The idea, simply put, is to incorporate the “human element” into our research. The goal is ambitious and admirable: to understand decisions made in authentic decision situations.

My argument is that we face a dilemma in trying to incorporate the human element, and that the sooner we acknowledge this, the less confused we will be. Confusion abounds in the general strategy literature already (e.g., Bromiley, 2005), and avoiding confusion in OM requires some preparation. Understanding the dilemma will also safeguard us from unwarranted optimism about the prospect of understanding authentic decisions.

The Dilemma and Its Manifestations
The dilemma, succinctly stated, is this: we are always required to make simplifying assumptions to keep arguments tractable, yet, with every simplifying assumption the risk of abstracting out something pertinent increases.

Consider the business location decision. Should the assembly plant of the consumer products division be built in mainland China or in Malaysia? How would an OM researcher—eager to incorporate behavioral theory—approach this authentic decision situation? What kinds of assumptions would be appropriate?

In light of the basic tenets of behavioral theory, one might first incorporate bounded rationality (Simon, [1946] 1997). But what exactly is the assumption? Optimization under uncertainty? Perfect rationality with a whiff of white noise added? An assumption of costly information?

For the sake of argument, let us embrace the—many would argue reasonable—assumption that information has a cost. Could we derive a theory of decision-making from the idea of optimizing search effort under bounded rationality? We certainly could, but it would not be a behavioral theory because it is well known that in complex decision situations decision-makers simply do not engage in optimization of any kind (Simon, [1946] 1997). Theories that incorporate optimization (rationality) favor theoretical simplification over understanding the decision, thus running squarely counter to behavioral theory (Bromiley, 2005). Simon ([1946] 1997, p. 119) elaborates: “[Decision-makers] choose without first examining all possible behavior alternatives and without ascertaining that these are in fact all the alternatives. Because they treat the world as rather empty and ignore the interrelatedness of all things (so stupefying to thought and action), they can make their decisions with relatively simple rules of thumb that do not make impossible demands upon their capacity for thought.”

Behavioral theorists take human behavior seriously. They do not pick and choose assumptions as they see fit. Consequently, merely relaxing one or two of the “unrealistic” assumptions of extant theories does not constitute behavioral theory. The quote from Simon also demonstrates that from assuming bounded rationality it does not follow that decisions are boundedly rational. What Simon describes was not boundedly rational behavior but human behavior, which is affected by a host of factors, many of which have little to do with rationality, bounded or otherwise: politics, agency, emotions, intuition, coercion, deception, mistake, randomness,
social desirability, et cetera. March (2006, p. 86) elaborates: “[Some of us] are more inclined to see the limits on rationality as minor perturbations, easily accommodated within some variation of neoclassical economic theory, than as fundamental challenges.” For the behavioral theorist, giving up rationality constitutes a fundamental theoretical challenge, which is not solved by adding an error term to the model.

At the same time, it is impossible for a theorist to consider everything that affects decision-making. No audience is interested in eclectic theories that incorporate everything but the kitchen sink. Yet, leaving out any one factor may fundamentally hamper one’s understanding of the decision. Hence the dilemma.

There is an intriguing finding with regard to plant location decisions in particular that merits attention. In a classic study published in the prestigious American Economic Review, Mueller and Morgan (1962, p. 209) found that the most common reasons for plant location decisions reported by managers were “personal reasons” and “chance.” Now there is a finding for the emerging behavioral OM theorist to digest. To be sure, contemporary researchers have reported a plethora of rational reasons as well (e.g., Brush et al., 1999). Let me suggest, however, that this likely reflects the fact that these researchers have typically spoon-fed their informants a rational frame of reference. Specifically, the informant is asked to choose from a list of reasons that lend themselves to rational analysis (e.g., tax incentives and labor costs). Conspicuously missing from this list are—you guessed right—personal preference and chance. Of course, in many research settings incorporating the less-than-flattering options is not a legitimate thing to do. I would no doubt feel very uncomfortable asking a corporate-level Senior Vice President of Operations, whom I have just met for the first time, whether the decision to locate the plant in Malaysia was simply a matter of a coin toss; although my embarrassment would be dwarfed by the VP’s confession that the main decision criterion that the six-month feasibility study produced was “heads, China; tails, Malaysia.”

Who Gets to Decide What Behavioral Theory Is?

Any declaration regarding the scope of behavioral theory assumes that someone has the authority to define the domain. Arbitrariness of all definitions notwithstanding, every researcher who uses the label must acknowledge the pioneering contributions of the Carnegie trio: Richard Cyert, James March, and Herbert Simon (Cyert and March, [1963] 1992; March and Simon, [1958] 1993; Simon, [1946] 1997). Talking about behavioral theory without referencing these works is likely to invite confusion. As an analogy in OM research, writing about the focused factory without referencing Wickham Skinner’s work would be puzzling.

To be sure, OM researchers are likely to develop their own, somewhat idiosyncratic definitions of and approaches to behavioral theory. But if we wish to build on the pioneering work in organization theory and, in particular, share our insights with the organization theorist, we must use terminology consistently. Most importantly, understanding the potential causes of confusion in OT might help us avoid similar confusion in OM.

Who Gets to Decide What Reality Is?

Oh gosh, that stuff, can we go back to talking about correlations and regression models? Ontological and epistemological questions are uncomfortable territory for most of us, and we struggle to see their relevance in our research.

There is, however, an important ontological question that anyone who genuinely wishes to understand the “real world” cannot sidestep. Since we are unable to incorporate all the assumptions that are required to understand an authentic decision, to what does our theory ultimately refer? Approximate reality? No, the only defensible answer is that it is the reality constructed by the researcher. Starbuck (2004, p. 1250) elaborates: “The systems we are trying to understand are much more complex and flexible than prevalent research methods are capable of comprehending. The phenomena that I once called ‘realities’ are partly products of our research.” All claims to the contrary are either ignorant or dishonest.

Some of us like to draw parallels between OM and the natural sciences. This is almost guaranteed to lead to misrepresentation and misunderstanding. When physicists examine phenomena, they often engage in idealization: conclusions are derived by assuming point masses, perfectly elastic molecules, spheres of perfect roundness, and the like. Such idealization is, however, fundamentally different from abstractions OM scientists make in trying to understand their object of inquiry. In contrast with the physicist, OM researchers trying to understand authentic decisions unavoidably abstract out pertinent factors from their models, which is why the idea of approximating reality or approaching the truth is merely wishful thinking.

The position is well established in the philosophy of science: “Given the notorious difficulties with notions of ‘approximate truth’… it is implausible that characterizations of scientific progress which view evolution towards greater truthlikeness as the central aim of science will allow one to represent science as a rational activity” (Laudan, 1981, pp. 144-145). As a reminder of this, the concept “real world” appears in quotation marks throughout this essay. Frustrating as this may be, I want the reader to feel a little uncomfortable every time the concept appears. Indeed, the quotation marks symbolize an important aspect of the dilemma.

Behavioral theorists lose all credibility if they become naive ontological realists who assume that the breathtakingly complex “real world” is waiting to be discovered (with some error term) by our rationalized reconstructions and linear regression models. All research results are reconstructions, representations, and interpretations, not approximations. But this is not an altogether pessimistic stance. Quite the contrary: the upside of a constructed reality is that it can be changed (Starbuck, 2004).
Coping with the Dilemma—
A Personal Reflection

We truly face a dilemma, a problem that does not have a solution. There are only alternative courses of action, all of which have their strengths and their weaknesses. I am partial to adding complexity to arguments instead of simplifying. In my research career, not once have I encountered a situation where something turned out simpler than I had previously thought, or that my theory needed simplification instead of elaboration. Echoing this experience, here are a few guidelines to an emerging OM behavioral theorist:

1. Revisit your assumptions about the decision maker. Abandon models that look at decisions by abstracting out the decision-maker.

2. Give up simplicity. Complex questions do not have simple answers. Do not abuse Ockham’s Razor: Ockham never suggested that simple explanations are better or more likely to be correct. And to be sure, the 14th-century logician and philosopher is not an expert on operations management and information systems of the 21st century.

3. Be parsimonious, but do not equate parsimony with simplicity. Parsimony does not mean you have to simplify your argument; it means you should avoid unnecessary assumptions. Do not incorporate bounded rationality just because the concept appeals to you. Even in the most established and the most rigorous management theories, authors tend to make assumptions that they do not need in their argument (Peli et al., 1994).

4. No matter what your assumptions are, making them explicit has many benefits (e.g., Blalock, 1991, p. 332). Do not leave your audience guessing.

5. Understand that assumptions are made about theory, not the “real world” (e.g., Blalock, 1969, p. 11). Assuming bounded rationality does not mean you assume decisions in the “real world” are boundedly rational. We use assumptions as premises in our theorizing, but they are not declarations about the object of our inquiry. Statements about the “real world,” if any, emerge at the end, not the beginning of research.

These guidelines are meant not so much as normative as an invitation to self-reflection. Without knowing the specific research question and the context, giving normative advice is premature.

In a recent paper co-authored with Fabrizio Salvador (Ketokivi and Salvador, 2009), we thought long and hard about these questions, and I wish to acknowledge this joint work as the primary source of the guidelines listed. Our decision was ultimately to give up the title behavioral theory in favor of sensible decision-making under uncertainty. We gave up behavioral theory because we realized—with help from behavioral theorists such as Phil Bromiley—that labeling our theory of fit and focus a behavioral theory was inconsistent. The label did not add any value to our theory. Even worse, in fact, it led to confusion. A sixth guideline could be added:

6. “Labeling exercises” likely do not add value to the argument, in particular if the label is adopted from another theoretical domain. Beware in particular situations where you run the risk of confusing your audience.

New Theory, Better Understanding?

In a provocative essay, Schmenner (2009) argued that there is “too much theory, not enough understanding” in OM research. In what I thought of as a particularly controversial part of the essay, Schmenner suggested that “[g]ood empirical work does not need to be based on theory, it can be independent of theory.”

Sounds odd enough to the conventional theorist. Let me try to interpret this from the point of view of the behavioral theory dilemma discussed in this essay:

1. Deriving hypotheses about how the “real world” operates using existing OM theories may indeed be futile. Most theories are not aimed at understanding the “real world,” they are aimed at (a) filling gaps in the literature, and (b) deriving normative implications under highly restrictive assumptions. Skinner’s work on the focused factory is a good example. Yes, Skinner gave us a wealth of insight on the benefits of focus, but did not help us understand why so many factories in the industry were unfocused. Why, over 20 years since its introduction, was the application of the focused factory—in Skinner’s (1996, p. 8) own words—“on the slow, sputtering point on its ‘S’ curve”?

2. “Independent of theory” should not be read “independent of all theoretical consideration.” Yes, we need to revisit our views of theory, but abandonment is not an option. If we think the field is fragmented now, consider what will happen if we just start running around looking for operations-related problems to solve? How do we keep score of which problems have been solved and which have not? How do we label them, catalogue them, and consolidate findings? The answer: theory. But perhaps a different kind of theory than what we have today.

3. Finding a gap in the literature (or theory) is not the same as finding a gap in our understanding of the “real world.” We must come to terms with this: most contributions to the academic literature have no implications to managerial practice. Researchers who do not even try to understand decisions in authentic settings will find their prescriptions rejected. Managers are not fond of listening to academics critique something they have difficulty demonstrating that they understand.

I want to close with a wonderful quote from the Harvard Business Review interview of James March, one of the pioneers of behavioral theory. March is a scholar who has spent well over half a century trying to understand decision making. Asked whether he—with decades of ground-breaking research insights in
his arsenal—does consulting with businesses, he replied (March, 2006, pp. 84-85): “If a manager would like to talk to me, I’m inclined to respond that I almost certainly don’t have anything useful to say… I think that it would ordinarily be difficult to discover any practical use for such conversations, but I may occasionally have a way of looking at things that is sufficiently different to help a manager in some marginal way… If there is relevance to my ideas, then it is for the people who contemplate the ideas to see, not for the person who produces them.”

A wave of embarrassment washes over me as I dig out a paper I published three years ago and start reading the section 5.8 Managerial Implications starting with: “Our results have strong implications for practice…”
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Enhancing Course Delivery in Operations Management: Integrating Web Technology and Face-to-Face Learning

by Arash Azadegan and Lisa McLain-Sharp, New Mexico State University

In the last few years, technology has allowed for more efficient and flexible delivery of course material. In parallel, the demand for online delivery of higher education courses continues to rise. Online courses provide more time and location flexibility for students and allow universities to expand their course offerings by expanding their virtual infrastructure. The challenge facing many instructors is in finding the right blend of technology and interpersonal teaching that meets students' need for flexibility and the university’s need for rigorous coursework.

Operations management courses carry a mix of quantitative concepts and qualitative theories. For example, OM students can be exposed to methods for calculating economic order quantity (EOQ) in one week, the ramifications of the product process matrix on manufacturing strategy the next week (Hayes & Wheelwright, 1989), and case analyses on Total Quality Management the week after. Effective teaching in OM requires the ability to combine a broad base using a multitude of teaching techniques. Whereas detailing the key aspects of EOQ on the whiteboard may work better than showing a static PowerPoint, a video on practices at Toyota may be the most effective way to illustrate the key attributes of Toyota Production System. Seasoned OM instructors recognize the value of having a large “teaching toolbox” for delivering such an eclectic profile of concepts.

An increasing number of OM instructors are combining the tools provided through online course platforms such as WebCT, Blackboard, and e-College with their face-to-face classroom settings. For many, the question is not whether online or face-to-face is the better format, but rather how both approaches can be combined to deliver a high quality OM course. In this article, we explore how some tools traditionally associated with face-to-face or web-based deliveries can be combined to enhance course delivery in OM.

Our insights come from several years of combined teaching experience. We have been fortunate to teach OM in online, face-to-face, and hybrid formats for over a dozen educational institutions during the past decade. Through the years, a handful of tools have become central in our “teaching toolboxes” when teaching OM courses. Some of these were initiated from face-to-face classes and were then incorporated to the online version. Others were initiated in online classes and subsequently integrated into face-to-face sessions. We explain each in a brief paragraph or two below, in hopes to provide our colleagues with new ways of enhancing their course delivery.

From Face-to-Face to Online

Lectures

A hard to replace element of face-to-face classrooms is the course lecture. As a time honored tradition, the course lecture allows the instructor to share their wisdom and understanding of the material in a format that is different and complementary to the textbook. Clearly, a well
developed and delivered lecture moves beyond restating what the textbook covers. Good lectures help motivate students by stimulating critical thinking skills and can be the basis for further inquiries. Lectures in Operations Management are particularly useful, since much of the topic has to do with practical application of theory to manufacturing or service environments.

There are at least two key aspects of the traditional lecture that makes it a potent tool. First is the insight and perspective delivered by the lecturer. Thankfully, with today’s communication technology, video and audio recordings are easy to share. More OM instructors are recording their face-to-face delivered lectures and posting them to the online course platform for students to revisit later. However, a downside to this approach is the loss of instant interaction. Students cannot ask questions during a recorded lecture. Nor can the instructor stop and request for the class to complete a short in-class exercise. So the second element of an effective lecture is feedback and involvement by the class. Communication technology allows for this to occur as well. Most web platforms now include a feature that allows for synchronous delivery of material. In many cases audio-enabled sharing of presentation slides and audio connection is becoming standard practice.

Some instructors combine the delivery and feedback steps using a “synchronized” lecture. We do not use synchronized methods for lecture delivery. Instead, our students are expected to make comments about the recorded lectures in an online discussion forum. Our lectures are purposefully designed to be engaging and typically include questions in the midst of the recorded presentation. Students are tasked with finding the answer and posting their reply in an online discussion forum. This is equivalent to having students reply to a question posed during a face-to-face lecture and provides an archive for students to use during their exam review.

Today’s technology allows for various means to record animated presentations. One particular tool to help OM instructors is screen recording software. Screen recording allows for uncomplicated combination of instructional material from different software sources. Screen recording programs allow for presentation slides, lecture notes, excel sheets, calculator results, and hand written notes to be strung together into video by recording them right on a desktop computer. Software packages including Camtasia, Camstudio and Adobe Captivate 4 allow for easy recording of video and the addition of audio to the file with the help of a microphone. The multimedia files can then be imported into a course content management system as streaming video or podcasts. We believe screen recording programs can be helpful when teaching the quantitative aspects of OM courses. For example, when teaching linear programming in Excel, functions such as Lookup tables and analysis tools such as Solver can be taught more effectively by creating step-by-step how-to videos customized for the course.

**Guest Speakers**

Local guest speakers allow for students to become acquainted to the local industries and recognize possible opportunities for jobs, internships or class projects. Guest speakers provide practical validation and reinforcement to what the students learn in an OM course. In a recent class, students were asked to submit questions to be posed to a Director of Operations about his company and their manufacturing and supply management practices. Top questions were rewarded with extra points. The speaker was impressed with the level of preparedness of the class and gave a generous sample of his company’s product to each of the students in the class.

Guest speakers can be used in an online class as well. Simultaneous webcasts are one option but these are more difficult to do and require more preparation and planning. We have been more successful in posting video recordings of a speaker’s talks to the course content management system. Recorded videos are also reusable. To make sure there is feedback and participation, students are required to prepare questions before the talk and the guest speaker replies to select questions. This approach is well-received by both students and guest speakers.

**Group Presentations**

Presenting findings in front of a group of peers can be stressful, but it can also be a great motivator. Aside from grades and scoring, there is peer pressure involved, which forces many students to work more diligently on a presentation. Since the presentations are related to a topic of interest, there is enhanced intrinsic motivation as well. Presentations are required to be made in groups of two or more which requires team effort and collaboration.

One of the authors is offering his face-to-face students the option to submit video recordings instead of physically presenting their report to the class. We believe these recorded video presentations have several benefits. First, they provide viewing flexibility. They can be viewed as part of the classroom time or outside of the class. Face-to-face classroom sessions dedicated to student presentations are bound to be a race against time to make sure all of the scheduled presentations are covered. Instead, the recorded presentations can be reviewed and evaluated with less concern for classroom time limits. Using video recordings also allows us to better focus on assessing the presentation rather than maintaining schedule in the classroom. Third, in many cases we note that the quality of the recorded videos is better than what students deliver physically. Most indicate that they spend more time preparing for a video than a face-to-face presentation. Recorded presentations are quite useful in an online classroom as well. In online classes, the presentations are posted to the class web platform so that other teams can review and comment on the contents. In general, we believe video presentations encourage students to be creative and enable them to find new ways to share information with their classmates.
From Online to Face-to-Face

Enhanced Material Delivery

These days there is a wealth of material that can be shared to enhance a typical OM class. There are case studies, magazine articles, web links, blogs, podcasts, and other recorded media to fill in megabytes of memory. The real difficulty for OM instructors is in properly filtering, summarizing and organizing the material so that students are not overwhelmed. Course content management systems (WebCT, Blackboard, eCollege) are quite useful for this type of effort. For example, Internet-based videos such as YouTubes, podcasts and other similar links can be categorized in one section. Links to professional sites, (APICS, ISM, etc.) can be placed in another. Recent event articles and other matters of interest can be placed in yet another organizer page. These specialized areas can then be integrated through the use of hyperlinks.

The benefit of using enhanced material delivery is in the ease of distribution and access of information. It is seldom necessary to create a large bundle of handouts for class and worry about shortages or excess copies for the students. Using an online course content management system, class hand-outs are carried in their own section and are linked to the appropriate week’s material. Students are then free to download and print as they wish. This approach saves both time for the instructor and money for the university by avoiding unnecessary printing and copying expenses.

Discussion Questions

Good OM instructors are well aware of the need to engage students in their lectures by asking for comments and input. Nevertheless, involving a face-to-face classroom in course related discussions can be difficult, time consuming, and distracting if the discussion does not lead to much learning. Unlike some MBA cohorts, most undergraduate students have minimal basis for a deep enough opinion to share with the rest of the class. However, we find that students in online classrooms are more engaged and have more to say about the course topics. Unlike face-to-face students, online students do not have time limitations and can therefore contemplate and better develop their thoughts. Online discussion boards allow students to post their impressions, opinions, and experiences on the weekly material in discussion threads specialized by topics. Furthermore, online discussions are maintained on the course website, allowing for other students to read and respond to one another. Implemented properly, a great thread of discussions can occur without the need for the instructor to continually redirect and motivate student responses.

There are other benefits to having online discussion threads. From a student’s perspective – be they online or face-to-face – having a well administered area for discussion threads reduces feelings of isolation and helplessness. Reading other students’ questions and responses helps enhance the feeling of group-belonging. For the instructor, benefits of threaded discussions include decreased repetition as students can see when a question has already been posed. Without a discussion thread, the same question may be asked a few dozen times. Having a record of the conversation means an answer need only be posted once. Also, many simple questions are answered by other students. This leaves the instructor to deal with fewer administrative minutiae and allows more time to create innovative course content.

Virtual Office Hours

We all know how rare it is to get students to drop by during office hours. Except for a select few, most students prefer to ask their questions just before or after class or by sending an email at odd hours of the day (or night). The downside of email is that it does not allow for instant interaction. When teaching material requiring significant interactions (mathematical concepts, programming, trouble-shooting of spreadsheets), sending emails back and forth can actually create more confusion.

We have found that virtual office hours where students can drop by (using a Messenger system such as Yahoo or AIM or Skype) and discuss their questions via voice chat or text message have been quite helpful. When necessary, a shared whiteboard (available in WebCT and Blackboard programs) to draw and explain a concept can help students understand concepts more easily. A hybrid office hour for our face-to-face classroom gives students an opportunity to send an instant message to ask their question and get an instant reply instead of stopping by the office. This not only saves travel time, but also helps increase traffic to our office hours. Some instructors include instant messenger IDs, Skype and web page information on their syllabi to improve their accessibility. Students sincerely appreciate this and, in our experience, rarely abuse the privilege.

Group Assignments

Group projects play an important role in enhancing student learning. Research has shown that groups are more creative than individuals in developing novel solutions to non-linear and complex tasks. Group projects not only help develop better results, but also help enhance collaboration, a key attribute that hiring organizations request from new recruits. However, group projects are not without challenges. Inevitably there are difficulties in arranging meetings and in dealing with free-loaders. Also, for many students, meeting in person is a luxury of time not readily available.

Group presentations are a required aspect of most of our online OM courses. Students are not obligated to be physically present for these. Instead, students are required to video record their work and submit it to me via the course website. Students have commented that even though “video submittals” require more work, they are happier with the end result. We have found that compared to in-person presentations, video recorded student presentations are of better quality and generally include more creativity in the use of the presentation software.

Student groups are encouraged to meet through electronic means as often as possible. Most of the groups meet via
online conference, phone conference, and video conferences using a variety of instant messaging and Voice over Internet Protocol tools (such as Skype) freely available online along with group workspaces within the course content management system. It seems that even when there is a possibility of physically meeting, students prefer to virtually collaborate. An additional benefit of virtual collaboration is that this approach familiarizes students with methods they will use in the workforce.

With any group project, there is the possibility of free riders who do not contribute their share to the work. We have minimized this by requesting frequent peer-evaluations. An online survey tool included in the course content management system or a standalone tool such as Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com) allows each team member to provide candid feedback for their team members at every milestone in their group project.

Concluding Remarks

In this article, we focused on the positive attributes of both online and face-to-face classrooms and how they can enhance one another. We believe neither approach is perfect. For example, face-to-face classrooms can be a scheduling burden for working students. In contrast, the weakness of online education is in its inability to efficiently verify learning. As of yet, technology does not allow practical means of assuring that every student is taking their own examinations and doing so without help from other sources. However, technology is improving and perhaps we will see answers to the issue. A recent article by Heizer, Render and Watson on the topic introduced some means that can help in that regards. Nevertheless, until there are means to reliably evaluate online students, we believe the use of a purely online course will not carry the same level of quality as face-to-face classes.

However, shortcomings of either delivery method should not prohibit us from leveraging the clear benefits they can provide in enhancing teaching. As noted, there are distinct advantages to online and to face-to-face delivery of instruction. At the root of these is the richness of delivery provided in a face-to-face environment and the removal of temporal and geographic constraints by the online environment. When merged properly, the two can provide a winning recipe for delivering courses in Operations Management. Clearly, as advocates of continuous improvement OM instructors should be the first to recognize, test, and incorporate tools that can help improve our course deliveries.

References


Submitting articles to Decision Line

Members are invited to submit essays of about 2,000 to 2,500 words in length on topics of their interest, especially articles of concern to a broad, global audience. Please send essays (including brief bio and photo) to either the respective feature editor or to Editor Krishna Dhir.

Deans’ Perspective & Editor

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

Doctoral Student Affairs

Xenophon Koufteros, Texas A&M University
xkoufteros@mays.tamu.edu

E-Commerce

Kenneth Kendall, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
ken@thekendalls.org

From the Bookshelf

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

In the Classroom

Bih-Ru Lea, Missouri University of Science and Technology
leabi@mst.edu

Information Technology Issues

Vijayan Sugumaran, Oakland University
sugumara@oakland.edu

In the News

Carol Latta, Decision Sciences Institute
clatta@gsu.edu

International Issues

John Davies, Victoria University in Wellington, New Zealand
john.davies@vuw.ac.nz

Membership Roundtable

Robert L. Andrews, Virginia Commonwealth University
rlandrew@vcu.edu

Production/Operations Management

Daniel A. Samson, University of Melbourne, Australia
d.samson@unimelb.edu.au

Research Issues

Miles Nicholls, RMIT University, Australia
miles.nicholls@rmit.edu.au

Milex Nicholls, RMIT University, Australia
miles.nicholls@rmit.edu.au
I’m sure you’ve been approached by someone who asked you “Why do we need to buy this expensive textbook when there is so much free information out there on the Web?” What was your answer? In this month’s column Shim, Ahn, and Kim ask questions about perceptions of Web content usefulness and Wikipedia reliability. They also describe the users who create and post information to the Web. This is a particularly appropriate article following last month’s column by Tony Clement on the phenomenon of social computing. Reliability of information is particularly interesting to me because in 1986 I published an article in Information & Management about using folklore in documenting software. I thought then that even information that was not proven to be true (or may not be true at all) might still be useful to users attempting to get their software to work. Has anything changed in the last twenty-some years? Read what Shim, Ahn, and Kim have to say about contributing to collaborative content on the Web. [Kenneth E. Kendall, Feature Editor]

Trends and Differences of Perceptions among Web 2.0 Users: Lessons for the Future Use and Study of Web 2.0

by J. P. Shim, Mississippi State University; Kyung-Mo Ahn, Korea Culture & Content Agency and Kyung Hee University; and Juyeon Kim, International Tourism Strategy Institute and Kyung Hee University

The era of Web 2.0 has propelled Internet use to a higher level of interactivity, openness, and sharing among users. One of the notable characteristics of Web 2.0 is the “user-centered” feature in which users can add value by creating and sharing data with other users on the Website, whereas on traditional Websites the users are limited to viewing and receiving the content and there is no method of input.

User created content (UCC) is the core of Web 2.0 and it flows in a variety of forms such as photos, images, text, moving pictures, and music through communities, media or portal site platforms. For example, a “netizen” (net citizen) might discover an interesting piece of information which she posts on her own homepage or blog. Other users are invited to post their opinions on the Internet forum board which becomes a powerful medium in forming public opinion. The netizens’ interests are expressed through UCC, and is circulated and re-created.

Questioning Usefulness and Reliability on Web Information

A new form of the users’ campaign and participatory democracy has been revealed through the Web network. Web users are now actively participating in forming public opinion on various subjects. However, there are some criticisms regarding the usefulness and reliability of Web information that has not been proved objectively.

This criticism can occur because of distorted information which spreads widely and is caused by information from unreliable and unfiltered sources. In addition, security and privacy are important issues which have become a
concern due to occurrences of personal information exposure and the breaching of financial accounts. As Shim and Yang (2009) pointed out, with many more users interfacing with Web 2.0 applications the reliability of Web information (e.g., Wikipedia) and the security of the Web system has to be solved completely.

The purpose of this research is to find out how Web users utilize the new service system of Web 2.0 according to characteristics of demographic information. The research goal is to find out whether there are perceptual differences on the usefulness and reliability of Web 2.0 information between Web users who are actively participating in Web 2.0 activities, including creating and posting user-created content (UCC), and Web users who are not actively participating in Web 2.0 activities.

Research Methodology

The research measurement items are based on previous survey results from Internet users: i.e., users’ possession of a personal Web page or blog, Web page activity frequency, content creation, posting experiences onto Web page, as well as having the motivation for creating and posting. It includes questions about their perception of the usefulness of Web information and reliability of Wikipedia, and demographical information about the respondents. In addition, questions on the users’ perception of Web security and Web information reliability are included as a factor in facilitating Web 2.0.

To measure the reliability of Web information, believability, accuracy, and trustworthiness presented by Flanagin & Metzger (2000) were used. The users’ perception on the importance of security and reliability was measured on a five point Likert scale (1 = very unimportant, 5 = very important). The survey collected data using a direct entry method in schools and office areas in the Seoul metropolitan area. Survey period was mid-January 2009.

In total, although 343 questionnaires were collected, 23 were incomplete thereby rendering them invalid, so 320 questionnaires were used for analysis (Gender – 167 males and 153 females; Age – teens (52 participants), 20s (107 participants), 30s (102 participants), 40s (39 participants), and over 50s (20 participants); Occupation – public service (22), housewife (22), student (134), employee (92), professional (20), self-employed (17), other (13); Education – high school graduate (51), high school student (45), university student (78), university graduate (122), post graduate (24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>3.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school student</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>3.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University student</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>3.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduate</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>3.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Education-UCC usefulness perception Duncan test.

Users’ Perception of Web Information Usefulness

To figure out the relations between demographical statistics and the perception of UCC usefulness, this research did ANOVA analysis. As a result, there were insignificant relations between gender, ages, and careers and the perception of UCC usefulness according to small groups. According to the Duncan test (see Table 1), high school graduates and high school students were classified as a group with a low perception of UCC usefulness; on the other hand, the results of university students and university graduates ranged in the middle, while graduate students and university graduates were a group with a high perception of UCC usefulness.

Users’ Perception of Wikipedia Reliability

Among the factors of demographical statistics, academic backgrounds showed a significant difference in perception on Wikipedia reliability, and the groups had significant differences in the usefulness perception of Wikipedia. According to the Duncan test (see Table 2), graduate students, university graduates, and university students were classified as a group with a low perception of Wikipedia usefulness; on the other hand, high school graduates and high school students were classified as a group with a high perception of UCC usefulness.

Perception of Web Security

This research studied the differences according to gender, ages, careers, and academic backgrounds to understand whether there are perceptual differences on the security of Web 2.0. Results
revealed only gender and age showed significant differences on security perception. More females thought a security system establishment was necessary than their male counterparts (Mean of female=4.445, Mean of male=4.090). In terms of ages, participants in their 50s showed the lowest perception of security, followed by teens, 30s, 20s, and those in their 40s, in that order. According to the Duncan test (see Table 3), participants over 50, teens, and those in their 30s were classified as an equivalent group, and participants in their 20s and 40s belonged to the same group.

Discussion
This study deduced distinctive results and implications from empirical research. First, there are significant relations between ages, careers, and academic backgrounds and UCC creation and posting experiences. The younger users (teens, 20s, 30s) have much more experience and a higher frequency of UCC creation and posting than the older users (40 years and over). As a result, this supports the existing study (Rosen & Weil, 1995), in which age is a crucial factor in using new technology. In terms of careers, students and professionals showed a high usage of UCC creation which indicates the characteristics of careers that influence UCC creation and posting. Second, differences in motivation for creating content and characteristics of careers that influence UCC creation and posting. Therefore, it is necessary to do multi-dimensional research to grasp Web 2.0 usage trends and to consider users’ psychological factors such as lifestyles and values.

Table 2. Education-Wikipedia reliability perception Duncan test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school student</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University student</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0357</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Age-Web security perception Duncan test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 50s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teens</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>4.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
This study features a variety of practical dimensional viewpoints with a focus on perceptual differences, and it deals with issues such as usage trends and perception according to the characteristics of computer or Internet users. It is worthwhile to conduct a study on users who ‘participate’ in activities via Web network, regardless of whether they actively or passively participate, thus showing positive attitudes on Web information. It is expected that their attitudes on receiving Web information the effect of the communication, or information exchange efficiency through UCC depend on whether they are passive receivers, active participators, or passive participators.

Although there may be research limitations due to the fact that the survey was only conducted in Korea, the exploratory research results provide implications regarding future trends and differences of perceptions among Web 2.0 users in other countries. Since Korea is leading in every segment of telecommunications, social networking, and the Internet, exploring the Korean sample shows meaningful trends in this area. It is expected that the above research results will be crucial information for companies providing Web service or for researchers interested in users’ characteristics. However, in addition to studying Web users’ general features or participation forms used in this study, it is necessary to do multi-dimensional research to grasp Web 2.0 usage trends and to consider users’ psychological factors such as lifestyles and values.
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The Times are Changing: A Call for Governing Boards of Universities to Awaken to Sarbanes-Oxley and Practice of Good Governance

by Jean Harris, Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg; and Gary Cunningham, Jönköping International Business School, Sweden

State U. is under review. A senior executive of ABC, Inc. serves on the board of governance for State U. while one unit of the university is “independently” testing and developing products for ABC and another unit is offering in-house educational programs to employees of ABC. The senior administrators are involved with ABC. One serves on the board of directors of ABC, another is a highly paid consultant, and a third invested heavily in ABC stock prior to the introduction of a new product developed in a university lab. Last year, State U. secured substantial resources from ABC. The managing partner of Barrister, LLP also is on the boards of State U. and of ABC; both are clients of Barrister which does all bond work for State U.

Because of the adoption of commercial models of operation, universities face an array of governance issues. The economic influence of some universities may equal or exceed the economic influence of large for-profit corporations. The budgets of such universities may rival those of publicly traded corporations. For universities large and small, the generation of revenues from non-traditional sources creates new relationships that expand the potential for conflicts of interest. And, for all universities, public awareness of the importance of transparency and accountability is building within the culture. Thus, the commercial corporatization of higher education may lead to demands for good practices of corporate governance. As in the private sector, demands will most likely be directed to governance practices that promote oversight, control, transparency, and disclosure relative to the operations of governing boards. University governing boards are moving center stage to be as important to the governance of higher education as boards of directors are to the governance of for-profit corporations.

Although interests in governance practices predate the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX), its adoption fostered an educational process that brought good practices of governance to the forefront. Subsequently, awareness about the governance practices set forth in SOX crossed from for-profit organizations to non-profit organizations. Primarily, SOX requires certain governance practices for publicly-traded companies. But its influence extends beyond its statutory scope. Stakeholders in both non-publicly traded companies and in non-profit organizations are pressing for those organizations to adopt governance practices similar to those required by SOX. Many of these practices are adaptable to universities, and they merit consideration.

Good governance is not merely a collection of practices. But absent good practices, good governance is difficult to achieve. Governance refers to practices that provide for oversight, control, disclosure, and transparency. Good practices of governance are designed to ensure the integrity of governing boards, senior administrators, and organizational operations. There are many relevant
promotes confidence that decisions are not influenced by the decision-maker’s self-interest. Relevant governance policies affects the ways that conflicts of interest may arise such as direct or indirect participation in transactions with a university, the use of insider information for private gain, and the manipulations of measures that affect personal compensation. Of course, a basic conflict-of-interest policy should describe violations and specify the consequences of violations. But broadly based ethical concepts must guide policies to avoid the absence of specific rules serving as permission. And effective governance should be supported by a record of processes that exist and operate to provide for monitoring and enforcement.

Questions

Does a policy preclude any board member or university personnel from profiting personally by engaging in transactions that directly or indirectly involve the university?

Does a policy preclude board members and university personnel from engaging in insider trading by the direct or indirect use of privileged information, such as information that might derive from research or joint ventures?

Does a pay-for-performance policy provide for the compensation of university personnel directly via growth in revenues and/or grants or indirectly via enrollments or other measures of performance that may be subject to governance practices outside of SOX, but looking only to SOX as a guide, practices that are adaptable to universities may be classified into six areas: (I) conflicts of interest, (II) disclosure, (III) audit, (IV) audit committee and whistle blowing, (V) financial statements and tax returns, and (VI) internal control. The discussion of each of these areas begins with the background of context and proceeds to key questions relevant to governance policy.

Conflicts of Interest

A central objective of good governance practices is to ensure the integrity of the governing board and senior administrators. Eliminating conflicts of interest...
temporary manipulation for private

Does a policy require university personnel to reimburse the university for performance-based compensation if after payment is made it is learned that performance was less favorable than originally reported?

Does the governing board have a policy that loans and other forms of indirect compensation to board members and university personnel are prohibited?

Does a policy permit the compensation of board members and/or university personnel to be escrowed when it appears that a serious violation of university policy has occurred?

Is there a reporting procedure to identify potential violations? Is there a due process procedure to determine if a violation occurred? And, if a violation is determined to have occurred, are penalties specified?

Disclosure, Public Disclosure and Private Disclosure

Some disclosures operate to keep the public informed, and such disclosures should be made externally to the public in a prompt and understandable manner. Other disclosures that operate to sustain monitoring and promote the integrity of operations should be made internally. For example, when potential conflicts of interest may be difficult to avoid, disclosure may operate to lessen the impact of such conflicts by excluding parties with an actual or potential conflict of interest from participating in certain decisions. The importance of disclosure is so fundamental to governance that the governing board may find it useful to appoint a disclosure committee, with responsibilities similar to disclosure committees on corporate boards.

Questions
Do the policies specify the kinds of information, both financial and non-financial, that should be disclosed internally to various authorities and externally to the public?

Is a systematic process in effect to gather and to evaluate information that should be disclosed?

Do the policies identify to what authority (governing board, organizations with oversight over the governing board, regulatory bodies, financial statement auditors, etc.) information should be disclosed?

Audit, Auditor Rotation, Non-Audit Services, Audit Protection

The audit function is central to good governance because it provides an independent assessment of financial performance and condition of an organization. Accordingly, practices that provide for partner rotation, prohibition of non-audit services, and protection of the audit are fundamental.

Audit (oversight practices)

For universities that seem to be similar, audits may be conducted in dissimilar ways. For example, for public and private universities the sources for accounting standards and auditing standards differ. Also, the types of auditors employed may differ, and the audit entity may differ. Audits may be performed by CPAs, a state auditor, or other parties. Some state-operated universities are audited as a part of total state activities. Thus, no separate audit opinion is issued with respect to university activities.

Payment for an audit may be from a state’s budget or from the university’s budget. The matter of payment for an audit relates to two issues: responsibility for changing auditors and potential conflicts of interest. The auditor’s real customers are the user of the financial statements who rely on the auditor for assurance. Thus, the payment of the auditor by the client fosters a conflict of interest that is nearly inescapable. In general, as universities become increasingly commercialized, stakeholders may press for (a) separate audit opinions restricted to university activities, (b) the harmonization of accounting standards and of auditing standards, and (c) audits of universities to be somewhat similar to the audits of public companies. At a minimum, governing boards should be informed about the nature of the conduct of an audit.

Questions
Does the audit result in a separate audit opinion for the university?

What organization establishes applicable accounting standards and applicable auditing standards?

Does the audit of the university extend to related organizations such as foundations, athletic associations, university hospitals, performance of subcontracted research, etc.?

Is the audit performed by an independent CPA, a state auditor, or another party?

Is the cost of the audit paid from the university’s budget or another budget?

Auditor Rotation

Most audits of publicly traded companies are managed by a lead partner and reviewed internally by a separate concurring partner. For public companies, the lead or in charge partner must be rotated every five years. The reason for mandatory rotation is to bring a fresh perspective to the audit and to lessen the possibility of the lead partner being co-opted by the audit client. Many consider the periodic rotation of the auditing firm to be a better governance practice than merely rotating the lead partner. If audit partner rotation is possible, both audit firms and governing boards will be expected to implement policies with respect to the rotation of audit partners. Also, for public companies, revolving-door restrictions apply to interchange of employees between client and auditor because such a pattern suggests an auditor’s judgment may be influenced by a pending offer of employment with a client. Accordingly, both audit firms and governing boards will be expected to restrict revolving door exchanges.

Questions
Have the auditor and the governing board implemented policies that re-
requires the lead or in charge partner to rotate periodically?
Is the auditing firm rotated periodically?
Does a concurring partner review the work of the lead partner?
How often is the concurring partner rotated?
Have the auditor and the governing board implemented policies to identify and to restrict "revolving door" conflicts of interest arising from the interchange of employees between the auditor and the audit client?

Non-Audit Services
Auditors of public companies are restricted severely as to the types of non-audit services that may be performed for an audit client, and the performance of permissible non-audit services must be approved by board. The reason for this restriction is that fees for non-audit consulting services may impair the auditor’s independence by influencing or appearing to influence the auditor’s independence. Because auditing is undertaken to secure an independent opinion, the independence of the auditor is critical to the creditability of the audit. Universities that seek to pursue good practices of governance will be expected to limit the non-audit services that its financial statement auditor may perform and to require specific authorization by the governing board for the auditor’s performance of non-audit services. While this model is adaptable to private universities and some public universities, its application to public universities audited as a part of a state-wide audit may be challenging.  

Audit Protection
Audits of public companies are protected by oversight from federal authority, clients, and the auditing firm. Auditors of public companies are subject to inspection by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB), a federal entity. The managements of public companies are required to protect against auditors being misled and to preserve all relevant documents. University administrators will be expected to adhere to similar standards. For auditors, conflicts of interests may take many forms, all of which may operate to impair their independence and diminish the creditability of their audit opinions. Thus, it is imperative that both the audit firm and the governing board implement policies to guard against such conflicts of interests. The governing board or its audit committee should expect to review the policies of the auditor with respect to its definition of conflicts of interest, the identification of persons with conflicts of interest, and the exclusion of such persons from participation in the audit. 

Questions
Are policies of the governing board in effect to protect against board members, senior administrators of the university, and other relevant persons from taking any action to fraudulently induce, coerce, manipulate, or mislead any external auditor and/or internal auditor?
Are policies of the governing board in effect to ensure that records pertaining to investigations or potential investigations are not altered, destroyed, mutilated, or concealed?
What processes are in place by the audit firm and the by governing board of the university to ensure the independence of its auditors?
With respect to auditor, how is conflict of interest defined by the audit firm and the governing board?
Has the auditor implemented a policy to preclude audit staff with a conflict of interest from participating in audit?

Audit Committee and Whistle Blowing
For public companies, a strong audit committee composed of board members who are informed and independent is a keystone for good governance. The conventional notion of an independent board member is one who is independent of management or administration. But a university governing board may find it useful to extend the notion of independence for board members to exclude any person who may personally benefit, directly or indirectly, from transactions with the university. For example, under this notion of independence, an attorney with clients who conduct business with a university may not be able to serve as an independent board member. For university governing boards, creating strong audit committees will be central to implementing good practices of corporate governance. Beyond having independent board members on the audit committee, the independence of board members to act in the public interest is a concern for the board in general, its compensation committee, and its nominating committee.

Audit Committee
Is there an audit committee? How many persons serve on audit committee, and what are the qualifications for service on the committee?
Is one member a financial expert and how is financial expert defined by the governing board?
Must all the members of the audit committee be independent, and how is independence for board members defined by the governing board?
What are the responsibilities of the audit committee? Does the audit committee appoint, compensate and oversee auditor?
Does the external auditor report to the audit committee including reporting about disputes with administrators, audit adjustments, and weaknesses in internal control?

Does the internal auditor report to the audit committee?

Does the audit committee approve any permissible non-audit services performed by the auditor of financial statements?

May the audit committee engage independent counsel and other advisors? How is independent counsel defined?

Is the audit committee funded for the payment of independent counsel and advice?

Does the audit committee get a representation letter from chief legal counsel, internal counsel, and external counsel, of material violations of law, breaches of fiduciary duty?

Does the audit committee have a procedure for receipt of confidential and anonymous complaints regarding accounting, internal accounting controls, and auditing matters?

Does the audit committee have a procedure for retention and treatment of complaints?

Does the audit committee have a procedure that protects informants and provides for the absence of retaliation against them?

**Financial Statements and Tax Returns**

Financial statements are fundamental to financial accountability. For public companies, financial statements are certified by the chief executive officer (CEO) and by the chief financial officer (CFO), off-balance sheet transactions are disclosed in financial statements, changes in financial condition and in operations are promptly disclosed to public, and tax returns are signed by CEO. The reason for certification is to confirm that it is a core responsibility for senior officers to be informed. Stakeholders will expect universities to adopt similar practices and for its senior officers to provide similar certifications.

Are the financial statements certified by senior administrators of the university?

What representations are made in certification, and who signs certification?

What processes exist to ensure senior administrators are informed with respect to financial statements?

What organizations establish applicable accounting standards?

Are off-balance sheet transactions disclosed in notes to financial statements?

Are all material changes in financial condition or operations promptly and publicly disclosed in plain English including as appropriate trends, qualitative information and graphics presentations?

If the university files federal income tax returns, who signs the tax returns?

**Internal Control**

Having strong internal control is essential to the credibility of reporting. If the internal controls are extremely lax, an auditor may not be able to render an opinion on financial statements and users may not be able rely on the financial statements. Universities engage in many forms of reporting to account for disbursement from grants, the validity of degrees granted, adherence to accreditation standards, etc. In all cases the credibility of reporting depends on whether or not the validity of internal controls is sufficient to ensure the integrity of the supporting information system. The auditor must evaluate the internal controls that may affect financial reporting.

**Questions**

In the annual report, does the administration state its responsibility for internal control and assess effectiveness of internal control structures and procedures pertaining to financial reporting?

Does the audit opinion separately address the effectiveness of the internal control structures and procedures pertaining to financial reporting?

Are financial statements available on public website?

In what way do internal controls extend beyond financial statement reporting and how are these controls documented and evaluated?

**Conclusion**

It is unlikely that university governing boards will escape demands for the adoption of good governance practices. Some universities will follow a path of resisting these demands while other universities will seek to become leaders in establishing good practices of governance. One motivation for the leaders is that universities that succeed in implementing models of good governance will enhance their reputation for operating with accountability, transparency and integrity. And the likely benefit of an enhanced reputation is an improved ability to sustain existing resources and attract new resources. Whether required by regulation or by expectation, it is likely that good practices will move from being an option to being a necessity. Now is the time for the governing boards that want to establish leadership to begin to create model structures that will serve as guiding examples of good governance.

**EDITOR, from page 3**

They issue a call to the governing boards of universities in the Deans' Perspective feature column to pay heed to SOX and promote practice of good governance. They go on to offer clear suggestions in the mode of a checklist to aid university administrators. “Whether required by regulation or by expectation, it is likely that good practices will move from being an option to being a necessity."

We hope that this issue will be useful in helping you get the most out of the upcoming annual meeting. We look forward to seeing you in New Orleans. As always, we urge you to share with your colleagues your views on topics of your interest. Please send us essays, suggestions, and letters. We look forward to hearing from you. Happy reading!
Essentials of Operations Management
by Keah Choon Tan, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The operations management book market is mature and saturated with a number of excellent multi-color textbooks, some of which have evolved through multiple editions to dominate the market. Over the last decade, a few new entrants have emerged, but many have failed to get past the first edition due to fierce competition. Moreover, a good operations management textbook typically costs well above US$100. To combat escalating textbook costs, some authors and publishers have resorted to publishing e-Books. There is no dispute that the cost of textbooks is an important factor that affects instructors’ textbook choices.

Essentials of Operations Management, on the other hand, is one of the most economical operations management textbooks on the market, retailing for $62.95. This unadorned (paperback, single-color) 456-page textbook is organized in three parts and fifteen chapters. Three hundred and seventy-four pages are devoted to chapter content, and forty-three pages in the appendix are allotted to three interesting global cases. However, its coverage of subject matter is rather brief in most instances, making it less likely to be adopted for advanced or graduate operations management courses unless used in conjunction with other materials. Based on content and coverage, it is a candidate for an introductory course in operations management, particularly for those who want to cover essential concepts without dwelling on detailed theories or formulas. The end-of-book cases are also potential candidates for term or team projects.

In addition to covering traditional content in operations strategy and management, Essentials of Operations Management provides business students with some contemporary topics not always found in other texts, such as human resource management in operations, “green” operations, and the balanced scorecard. Some key features of the text include:

• A chapter on managing the workforce. While managing the workforce is a crucial responsibility and daily task for the operations manager, it is not always discussed in operations textbooks, which tend to focus on inventory and machine aspects of operations.

• A chapter is devoted to the balanced scorecard, introducing students to measures of firm performance that balance customer, internal processes, and learning and growth measures against traditional financial measures.
There is a discussion of sustainable and “green” operations and why they are important in operations. This is an increasingly important aspect of operations because the earth cannot eternally sustain the exploitation of limited natural resources.

End-of-chapter review questions, key terms, projects, problem sets, summary terms, and cases. The cases provide opportunities for instructors and students to discuss or apply concepts to real-life situations.

Instructor resources (on CD) that include PowerPoint slides, chapter overviews, lecture outliers, review questions, and additional end-of-book cases.

Instructors accustomed to advanced operations texts may find the coverage of essential topics too brief and inadequate to fully illustrate the concepts. Coverage of some key topics (e.g., outsourcing, EDI, postponement, and customization) is limited to a brief description of the key terminologies. In addition, discussion of some topics ends abruptly, and new topics are sometimes brought up absent substantive connection to the previous topic. The text focuses on qualitative material and largely avoids quantitative concepts. One may get the feeling that it is about “what is it” rather than “how to do it” as most operations texts emphasize.

Following an introduction chapter, the text consists of three major parts. Part 1 (management and strategy) consists of six chapters, part 2 (planning) consists of four chapters, and part 3 (inventory, logistics, and supply chain management) consists of four chapters. The following provides a brief highlight of each chapter.

The learning objectives of Chapter 1, “Introduction to Operations Management and Productivity,” are to introduce the operations management topic, trace the development of the field, and note the applications of operations management in both manufacturing and service industries such as aircraft manufacturing (Boeing), hotels, and universities. This chapter ends with a short description of the three major parts of the textbook. The title of the chapter is a little misleading since productivity is not discussed in this short and to the point introductory chapter.

**Part I – Management and Strategy**

Chapter 2, “Productivity and Process Analysis,” discusses productivity and its measurement, time study, the Define-Measure-Analyze-Improve-Control (DMAIC) process, process analysis, flowcharting, and streamlining processes. It discusses productivity using examples but does not address limitations of productivity measures. Coverage could be more precise. For example, while comparing improvements in global productivity between 1992 and 2005, the caption in Table 2.2 lists “2005 output per hour in manufacturing”, but the text explains that the table does not show total productivity, but rather improvement in productivity, with Korea making the greatest improvement since 1992. While it was not specified in the text, the author was referring to South Korea, though the source of the information was not provided. The chapter is short and uses simple, everyday examples to demonstrate operations management concepts.

Six cases accompany the chapter.

Chapter 3, “Operations Strategy,” describes the role of operations management in organizational strategy, strategic questions to be addressed, the importance of operations to the value chain, and stages of dynamic manufacturing. Porter’s (1980) competitive strategy is used to outline the generic competitive strategies of cost leadership, differentiation, and focus. Specific topics covered include nine ways to compete through operations (quality, flexibility, inventory system, human resources management, speed, location, vertical integration, and technology), the profit chain, and dynamic manufacturing. The concept of the value chain is also introduced, but not clearly differentiated from the supply chain. The popular Vermont ice cream maker, Ben & Jerry’s, is used to illustrate the product, economic, and social missions of an organization. The chapter concludes with five review questions, five projects, and three cases.

Chapter 4, “Managing the Operations Workforce,” addresses the managerial role of the operations managers. Its learning objectives focus on leadership, motivations, and human resource management. As pledged by the author, coverage focuses on qualitative concepts, and topics are covered briefly without going into depth. For example, in the discussion of motivation, hygiene theory that addresses basic needs of employees and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs are covered, yet less than a page is devoted to the topic. Other topics include human resource management in operations management, training and development, compensation, and retention. Specific issues such as what is fair compensation or how employees should be compensated are not addressed. The text also uses the ranking approach developed by Jack Welch at General Electric as an example of how to motivate and inform employees, and introduces performance reviews and job satisfaction. However, it does not address how to review performance or ensure job satisfaction. The stated learning objectives cite Wal-Mart as the example that will be used to demonstrate concepts, though Southwest Airlines is in fact used. While an important inclusion in the text, those accustomed to more conventional operations management texts may find that coverage of concepts is limited. The chapter ends with eight review questions, six projects, and three cases.

Chapters 5-7 are relatively short chapters. “The Balanced Scorecard Approach to Operations” briefly covers the basics of the balanced scorecard framework, followed by five review questions, three projects, and two cases. “Total Quality Management” addresses basic total quality management topics but is somewhat terse. However, some common topics such as assignable versus random variation and in-control versus out-of-control processes are not discussed. Hence, it may be difficult for students to fully appreciate the role of statistical process control techniques in detecting assignable variations. Although a major differentiating factor of this text, only twelve pages are devoted to Sustain-
able Operations, with several sections as short as one to two paragraphs. Economic prosperity, environmental quality, and social justice are used to explain why firms should consider ‘green’ or sustainable operations. Specific topics discussed include environmental impact analysis, operations and waste, operations and the air, conservation, green building, and energy. The environmental efforts of companies including Wal-Mart, Starbucks, General Electric, Ford, and Toyota are also discussed. However, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and legislation that regulates U.S. environmental policy are not discussed.

**Part II - Planning**

Chapter 8, “Forecasting and Aggregate Planning,” discusses the most common qualitative and quantitative forecast techniques, introduces linear regression, and describes the bias and mean absolute deviation error measures. It avoids coverage of more complex quantitative materials. Although a stated learning objective was to examine the role of capacity in planning, only a quarter of a page was devoted to capacity management.

Stated objectives for Chapter 9, “Scheduling for Operations,” include coverage of methods for scheduling job shops, establishing the master production schedule, labor scheduling, scheduling for manufacturing and service organizations, and the theory of constraints. Job shop scheduling techniques such as the shortest processing time, first-come-first-served, earliest due date, and Johnson’s rule are covered. A good, if lengthy, example is used to describe labor scheduling. The chapter includes several examples, such as scheduling faculty to classes, railroad scheduling, emergency room scheduling, and the scheduling of professional football and basketball games. There are seven review questions, six problems, seven projects, and one case in this chapter.

Learning objectives for Chapter 10, “Facility Location,” include strategic issues in facility location and how locations are selected. Several U.S. and overseas locations such as Chicago, China, India, Taiwan, and Belfast are discussed. Specific topics covered include global, regional, city, and site issues, the factor rating and center of gravity methods, Geographic Information Systems, and fast-food locations. A survey of the best European cities was discussed, although it was without the appropriate reference.

Chapter 11, “Facility Layout and Waiting Lines,” covers waiting line management, major layout types, assembly line balancing, and simulation. While the chapter covers the usual topics in a chapter of this nature, there is a noticeable lack of diagrams to demonstrate concepts. For example, various waiting line structures (i.e. one/multiple line, one/multiple server) could be illustrated by a couple of simple diagrams. Another weakness of the chapter is that unnecessarily large amounts of space are devoted to providing a list of random numbers and illustrating a waiting line simulation.

**Part III – Inventory, Logistics, and Supply Chain Management**

Chapter 12, “Supply Chain Management,” addresses concepts including stages of supply chain management, transportation, the bullwhip effect, outsourcing, make-or-buy, warehousing principles, and customer relationships. Although EDI was introduced as a main heading, only a very short paragraph was provided to explain the section. Similarly, description of another key supply chain technology, radio frequency identification (RFID), could have been a little more precise. While present, coverage of customer relationships management is somewhat terse as is discussion of supply chain ethics. The chapter includes a substantial end of chapter case.

Chapter 13, “Inventory Management and Purchasing,” addresses basic inventory policy topics including purchasing, negotiation, inventory cost, EOQ, and ABC inventory control. The chapter also includes details of the Institute for Supply Management’s Principles and Standards of Ethical Supply Management Conduct. The discussion of the EOQ model is somewhat limited because the formula for EOQ is introduced without discussion of its origin or relationship with the broader discussion of cost dynamics. Five inventory management problems are provided at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 14, “Resource Planning,” the shortest chapter with just eight pages, discusses dependent demand, the components of material requirements planning (MRP), master production scheduling, and the bill of materials. Coverage of capacity planning is limited. However, the chapter does include two interesting ERP cases. Chapter 15, “Project Management,” describes the work breakdown structure, the critical path method (CPM), and project evaluation and review technique (PERT). Some may find that there is a lack of diagrams to showcase the critical path method. Although slack is discussed, the chapter does not discuss the effect of activities that are delayed beyond a project’s slack on project duration.

Overall, this text covers both key and contemporary operations management concepts, if not briefly, and avoids more quantitative material. It is a potential candidate for an introductory operations management course, although some may feel that the content in each chapter merely explains the terms used and as such serves more as a reference.

---

**Future DSI Annual Meetings**

**November 14-17, 2009**
New Orleans Marriott
New Orleans, Louisiana

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

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

**November 17-20, 2012**
San Francisco Marriott
San Francisco, California
DSI Announces Journal Editor Vacancy

Pursuant to Institute procedures, the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) is seeking qualified candidates for the Editor of the Decision Sciences Journal. The Editor will serve four years, starting with July 1, 2010, and may be reappointed to a second two-year term. The basic responsibility of the Decision Sciences Editor is to publish four high quality issues of the Journal in February, May, August, and November of each year.

The mission of the journal is to publish “scholarly research about decision making within the boundaries of an organization, as well as decisions involving inter-firm coordination. The journal promotes research advancing decision making at the interfaces of business functions and organizational boundaries.” As a flagship journal of the Decision Sciences Institute, the journal has a rich history and a record of publishing high quality multidisciplinary research, from a variety of disciplines. The articles published in the journal have had a high impact over time and influenced the evolution of knowledge in different management disciplines.

The committee seeks individuals who are thought leaders and internationally renowned scholars in their chosen discipline. With respect to intellectual interests, the Decision Sciences Editor should have familiarity with virtually all functional and methodological areas related to managerial decision making. Equally important, the Editor must be willing to bend personal preferences in favor of the eclectic interests represented by the membership of the Institute.

Each candidate or nominee for the Editorship position is requested to provide the following information:

1. Current curriculum vita that includes information about education, academic and administrative positions, publications, honors and awards, professional affiliations and activities, and other relevant items.

2. Description of editorial experience with scholarly journals or other publications.

3. Statement of interest and availability to serve as Editor, including a description of anticipated academic and professional responsibilities for the next four years.

4. Statement of editorial philosophy, including views on editorial policy, directions the publication should take, and composition of and approach to working with Associate Editors and reviewers.

5. Vision for an editorial structure that might be appropriate for attracting and managing high quality submissions from multiple disciplines represented by the Decision Sciences community.


7. Brief description of Institutional commitment for the support of the editorial office for the next four years.

The due date for nomination/application for the position is October 15, 2009, though the process will be kept open until the position is filled. All nominations/applications should be addressed to Manoj Malhotra, Chair of the Search Committee, (Malhotra@moore.sc.edu), while enquiries about the position could be addressed to the Committee Chair or any one of the Search Committee Members including Vallabhajosyula Sambamurthy (sambamurthy@bus.msu.edu), Kingshuk K. Sinha (ksinha@umn.edu), and Peter Ward (ward_1@fisher.osu.edu).

DSI Plans New Journal in Supply Chain Management Research

The Board of Directors of the Decision Sciences Institute is pleased to announce a new journal, Supply Chain Management Research (SCMR), in the broad interdisciplinary area of supply chain management, to be published by John Wiley & Sons. Ram Narasimhan (Michigan State University, narasimh@msu.edu) and Soumen Ghosh (Georgia Tech, sghosh@gatech.edu) will be the founding co-editors-in-chief. The primary motivation for DSI to start this journal is the fact that other than a few related practitioner-oriented journals, there is currently no top-tier, scholarly journal dedicated entirely to supply chain management. Since the volume of research and researchers in supply chain management is growing rapidly, this new journal will fulfill the need for a premier outlet for publishing high quality, scholarly research in the supply chain management domain. Further elaboration of the editorial policy and review system are currently being finalized. The details of the journal including the editorial board will be published on the DSI website soon. Paper submissions in electronic form will be accepted after August 31, 2009. Please direct your inquiries to one of the co-editors-in-chief.
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 was April 1, 2009. Contact Program Chair Maling Ebrahimpour, University of South Florida - St. Petersburg, dsi2009@stpete.usf.edu
http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

The Asia Pacific Region held 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. Program co-chairs were Tom Callarman and Norma Harrison, CEIBS.


The Indian Subcontinent Region will hold its third annual conference at the lush green ASCI, Hyderabad campus on December 28-30, 2009. For more information, see the website below or contact Karuna Jain, President, ISDSI; SJMSoM, IIT Bombay; kjain@iitb.ac.in

http://www.icgids2009.in

The Mexico Region. For more information, contact Antonio Rios, Instituto Tecnologico de Monterrey, antonio.rios@itesm.mx.

http://www.wdsinet.org

The Midwest Region will hold its 2010 Annual Meeting on April 22-24, 2010, in Toledo, Ohio. Submission deadline is February 15, 2010. For more information, contact Program Chair Udayan Nandkeolyar, University of Toledo, unandke@unet.toledo.edu.

http://mwdsi2010.utoledo.edu

The Northeast Region will hold its 2010 Annual Meeting at the Hilton Alexandria Old Town in Alexandria, Virginia, on March 26-28, 2010. Submission deadline was October 9, 2009. For more information, contact Program Chair Neet Hikmet, Nicholls State University, Thibodaux, LA, 985.448.4206, chair@nedsi10.org

http://www.nedsi10.org

The Southeast Region will hold its 2010 Annual Meeting on February 17-19, at the Hilton Wilmington Riverside in Wilmington, North Carolina. Submission deadline for regular papers was September 18, 2009, and October 26, 2009, for student papers. All student papers (undergraduate, Masters, and PhD) are welcomed. Accepted papers submitted by students will receive a $100 travel stipend. We have a wonderful conference planned with individual paper presentations in all areas of business as well as special workshops, tutorials, and panels on areas such as Humanitarian Relief, Disaster Management, Energy Sustainability, and Geographical Information Systems, to name a few. SE DSI will publish electronic Proceedings in CD-ROM form containing all papers presented at the meeting as well as summaries of all symposia, tutorials, and workshops. SE DSI will provide LCD projectors in all presentation rooms. For more details, please see the website below or contact Quinton Nottingham, the Program Chair, at 540-231-7843 or notti@vt.edu.

http://www.sedsi.org

The Southwest Region will hold its 2010 (31st) Annual Meeting on March 2-6, 2010, at the Sheraton Hotel Dallas in Dallas, Texas, USA. Submission deadline is September 30, 2009. For more information, contact Program Chair Roderick B. Posey, University of Southern Mississippi, roderick.posey@usm.edu.

http://www.swdsi.org

The Western Region will hold its 2010 (39th) Annual Meeting on April 6-9, 2010, at the Hyatt Regency Lake Tahoe Resort in Lake Tahoe, Nevada. Submission deadline was October 1, 2009. For more information, contact Program Chair John Davies, Victoria University of Wellington, +644-463-5382, vms-wdsi2010@vuw.ac.nz

http://www.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers

Conferences
The Production & Operations Management Division of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada (ASAC) invites papers or symposium proposals for the 2010 Annual Conference to be held May 22-25, 2010, in Regina, Saskatchewan. All contributions must be received no later than 31st January 2010.

www.uRegina.ca/asac

The International Annual European Operations Management Association (EurOMA) Conference will be held in Porto, Portugal, 6-9 June 2010. The conference is organized jointly by EurOMA and the Catholic University of Portugal in Porto. Abstract submission deadline is 15 January 2010.

http://www.euroma2010.org

The 24th European Conference on Operational Research (EURO XXIV) will be held July 11-14, 2010, at the University of Lisbon, Portugal. Abstract submission and registration are done online, via the Conference web page. The abstract submission deadline is February 28, 2010.

http://www.euro2010lisbon.org

The 2nd International Conference on Intelligent Decision Technologies (IDT 2010) will be held July 28-30, 2010, in conjunction with the 3rd International Conference on Intelligent and Interactive Multimedia: Systems and Services. The venue is the Inner Harbor in Baltimore, MD, at the Pier 5 Hotel. Submission deadline is February 15, 2010.

http://idt-10.kesinternational.org/
It is with great pleasure that we invite you to the 40th Anniversary Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute. The theme of this year’s meeting was selected to reflect the spirit and dedication of our members and their efforts to advance all aspects of decision making in both for- and not-for-profit organizations. We celebrate 40 years of fellowship, learning and advancing the practice of decision making.

We have received over 1,074 submissions representing a combination of abstracts, completed research papers, invited papers, workshops, and symposiums. In addition to 27 tracks with over 300 regular sessions, there are over 100 additional sessions that are spread among several consortia, mini- conferences, invited panel discussions, and workshops. This year’s meeting includes the Curricular Issues Miniconference, coordinated by André M. Everett of University of Otago; the Doctoral Student Consortium, coordinated by Rhonda Hyde of University of Delaware; the New Faculty Development Consortium, coordinated by Vijay R. Kannan of Utah State University; the Professional and Faculty Development Program coordinated by Krishna S. Dhir of Berry College; the Technology in the Classroom Miniconference, coordinated by William Johnson of Penn State Erie.

Every year the exemplary work of our colleagues is recognized through various award competitions. This year recognition is provided through the Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition, coordinated by Funda Sahin of University of Tennessee; the Instructional Innovation Award Competition, coordinated by Christine Kydd of University of Delaware; the Best Papers Award Competition, coordinated by Dwight Smith-Daniels of Wright State University; the Best Case Studies Award Competition, coordinated by M. Johnny Rungtusanatham of University of Minnesota - Twin Cities; and the Best Student Paper Award Competition, coordinated by Kathryn M. Zuckweiler of University of Nebraska at Kearney.

In addition to research and pedagogically oriented sessions, various events are offered to provide opportunities to enjoy the conference, network, and build camaraderie among our members. A special event has been scheduled on Saturday to welcome our new members to DSI. As part of our 40th anniversary celebration, I invite you to attend a performance by the “Capitol Steps Comedy Group.”

The Program Committee, consisting of over 50 dedicated DSI members, worked hard to develop a program worthy of the 40th anniversary of our organization. We hope to see you in New Orleans!
We are pleased to announce the winner and honorable mention for the 2009 Elwood S. Buffa Dissertation Award Competition. The purpose of the award is to identify and recognize outstanding doctoral research in the development of theory and/or applications of decision sciences completed during 2008. The competition is co-sponsored by McGraw-Hill/Irwin and the Decision Sciences Institute. The Competition coordinator was Funda Sahin, Associate Professor of Logistics at the University of Tennessee.

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

The winner will receive a $1,500 check and a plaque at the 2009 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana on November 17, 2009. The Honorable Mention Awardee will receive a plaque.

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 dissertation, should be proud of their efforts, since the reviewers were highly complimentary of all of the research submitted.

**Winner**
Amrou Awaysheh, Instituto de Empresa - IE Business School

*Socially Responsible Practices in Operations & Supply Chains*

**Dissertation Advisor and Degree Granting Institution:** Robert D. Klassen, University of Western Ontario

**Honorable Mention**
Christoph Bode, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETHZ)

*Causes and Effects of Supply Chain Disruptions*

**Dissertation Advisor and Degree Granting Institution:** Stephan M. Wagner, WHU - Otto, Beisheim School of Management, Germany

Thanks and appreciation to the following individuals, who assisted with reviewing:
- Elliott Bendoly, Emory University
- Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
- Li-Lian Gao, Hofstra University
- Sebastian Heese, Indiana University
- Jay Jayaram, University of South Carolina
- Murat Kristal, York University
- Ann Marucheck, University of North Carolina
- Roberta S. Russell, Virginia Tech University
- Kaushik Sengupta, Hofstra University
- Suresh Sethi, University of Texas
- Dallas Chuck Sox, University of Alabama

For more information, please contact the Dissertation Award Competition Coordinator:
Funda Sahin, The University of Tennessee, fsahin@utk.edu

---

2009 Instructional Innovation Award Competition Announces Finalists

**Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 8:00-9:30 a.m.**

*The Integration of Real-World Student Projects into a MBA Program*
Robert P. Sroufe (Duquesne University)

This case study can serve as a roadmap for how other business schools and faculty can develop their own approach to the integration of sustainability into project management and curricula. Real-world projects present opportunities for cross functional integration of an overall MBA curriculum and enrichment of individual classes.

*Academic Service-Learning in Operations Management*
Ravi S. Behara (Florida Atlantic University)

This paper presents the author’s efforts to integrate the emerging emphasis on community service in the United States with the undergraduate Operations Management course through the implementation of Academic Service-Learning into the curriculum. Academic Service-Learning is a pedagogy that integrates intentional ways of community service with instruction and reflection. Three community partners, a local food-pantry, an environmental protection organization, and a community garden, were involved.

*Integration of Study Abroad with Information and Communication (ICT) Technology Solutions and Decision Making*
P. Candace Deans (University of Richmond)

This teaching innovation integrates the study of communications technologies and IT decision making in the context of a two week study abroad. The focus of the study abroad is the Middle East and Asia. This initiative is interdisciplinary in nature and incorporates hands-on experimentation with the technology in the country being studied.

For more information, please contact the Competition Coordinator:
Christine Kydd, University of Delaware, kyddc@lerner.udel.edu
Over twenty-five years ago, the Capitol Steps began as a group of Senate staffers who set out to satirize the very people and places that employed them. In the years that followed, many of the Steps ignored the conventional wisdom (“Don’t quit your day job!”), and although not all of the current members of the Steps are former Capitol Hill staffers, taken together the performers have worked in a total of eighteen Congressional offices and represent 62 years of collective House and Senate staff experience.

Since they began, the Capitol Steps have recorded 29 albums, including their latest, Obama Mia! They’ve been featured on NBC, CBS, ABC, and PBS, and can be heard 4 times a year on National Public Radio stations nationwide during their Politics Takes a Holiday radio special.

The Capitol Steps were born in December, 1981 when some staffers for Senator Charles Percy were planning entertainment for a Christmas party. Ronald Reagan was President when the Steps began, so co-founders Elaina Newport, Bill Strauss and Jim Aidala figured that if entertainers could become politicians, then politicians could become entertainers! Their first idea was to stage a nativity play, but in the whole Congress they couldn’t find three wise men or a virgin! So, they decided to dig into the headlines of the day, and created song parodies & skits which conveyed a special brand of satirical humor that was as popular in Peoria as it was on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Most cast members have worked on Capitol Hill; some for Democrats, some for Republicans, and others for politicians who firmly straddle the fence. No matter who holds office, there’s never a shortage of material. Says Elaina Newport, “Typically the Republicans goof up, and the Democrats party. Then the Democrats goof up and the Republicans party. That’s what we call the two-party system.”

Although the Capitol Steps are based in Washington, DC, most of their shows are out-of-town or for out-of-town audiences, whether it’s the National Welding Supply Association, a University audience, High Schoolers, or State Legislators. In fact, the Capitol Steps have performed for the last 5 Presidents (6, if you include Hillary). The only complaints the Steps seem to get are from politicians and personalities who are not included in the program!

The material is updated constantly. Current examples include the media’s love affair with the Nation’s 44th President Barack Obama (“Obamamia”) and Illinois Governor Blagojevich’s attempted sale of the Senate seat (“Come Buy With Me”). The Capitol Steps tackle international issues as well. We are the only show to feature North Korean leader Kim Jong Il singing show tunes (“How Do You Solve a Problem Like Korea?”) and Vladimir Putin showing his ‘soul’ in “Midnight Raid to Georgia.” No matter who’s in the headlines, the Capitol Steps are equal opportunity offenders promising an evening full of bipartisan lampooning.
Distinguished Track Papers

Accounting: Theory, Applications and Practice

A Sound Foundation
Chauncey M. DePree, Jr. (University of Southern Mississippi)

In Search of New Accounting Metaphors
Richard L. Jenson (Utah State University)

Ecommerce

An Empirical Study on Online Auction Buyer Satisfaction
Rupak Rauniar (University of St. Thomas - Houston), Greg Rawski (University of Toledo)

The Determinants of Online Insurance Behavior: An Empirical Study in Taiwan
Mei-Ching Chiu (National Cheng-Kung University / Kao-Fong College), Yung-Ming Shiu (National Cheng Kung University)

Business Ethics and Leadership

Whose Ethics and How to Deal with this Reality
James W. Beckman (University of Applied Sciences, Fulda), Norton E. Marks (California State University, San Bernardino)

An Ethical Dilemma: Smoker’s Rights, Are There Really Any?
Nohealani J. Dietz (Cameron University)

Health Care Management

Managing Healthcare Process Knowledge: The Role of Governance
Varol O Kayhan (University of South Florida), Neset Hikmet (Nicholls State University), Anol Bhattachjee (University of South Florida)

Innovative Education

The Impact of a Computer Proficiency Exam on Business Students’ Admission to and Performance in a Higher-Level IT Course
Patrick J. Rondeau (Butler University), Xiaolin Li (Towson University)

Organizational E-Learning Evaluation
Anne-Marie Oulai (Western Michigan University), J. Michael Tarn (Western Michigan University)

Operations Course
Brad C. Meyer (Drake University)

Information Systems

The Domain Name System – Past, Present and Future
Michael Brian Pope (Mississippi State University)

Merrill Warkentin (Mississippi State University), Leigh A. Mutchler (Mississippi State University), Xin Luo (The University of New Mexico)

Relating Acceptance and Optimism to E-file Adoption
Megan E. McBride (West Virginia University), Lemuria D Carter (North Carolina A & T State University), Ludwig Christian Schaupp (West Virginia University)

Influence the Capabilities of ERP Vendors on ERP Project Success and the Moderating Effect of Government Support
Jaehyun Paek (University of Central Florida), Taesoo Moon (Dongguk University), Shih-Chieh Hsu (University of Central Florida), Ross T. Hightower (University of Central Florida)

Knowledge Management

R & D Investment Strategy and Market Performance
Tsung-Chi Liu (Institute of International Business, National Cheng Kung University), Yi-Jen Chen (National Cheng Kung University)

Marketing: Theory, Models, and Applications

A Conceptual Model of Pro-Environmental Consumer Decision and Action
David M. Nelson (The University of Toledo), Jeen-Su Lim (University of Toledo)

Manufacturing Management

Comparison of Different Forms of Shop Floor Knowledge Transfer
Marc Zielinski (University of Siegen), Peter Letmathe (University of Siegen), Marcus Schweitzer (University of Siegen)

Best Papers Awards

Best Application Research Paper

Decision Model for the Application of Just In Sequence
Stephan M. Wagner, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich
Victor Silveira Camargos, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

Best Interdisciplinary Research Paper

The Impact of Cyber Terrorism on Investment for Information System Security
Jian Hua, University of the District of Columbia
Sanjay Bapna, Morgan State University

Best Theoretical/Empirical Research Paper

Does Quality Still Pay: A Reexamination of the Relationship between Effective Quality Management and Firm Performance
Peter G. Zhang, Georgia State University
Yusen Xia, Georgia State University

Honorable Mention

Crashing Stochastic Lead Times
Jack Hayya, Pennsylvania State University
Terry P. Harrison, Pennsylvania State University
X. James He, Fairfield University

Best Student Paper Award

Aligning Sources of External Knowledge in New Product Development with Choice of Generic Strategy
Anil Akpinar, PhD Candidate, Operations and Technology Management Department, Instituto de Empresa, Spain
A Game Theory Approach to Price and Advertisement Decisions in a Manufacturer-Retailer Supply Chain
Jinfeng Yue (Middle Tennessee State University)
Jill Austin (Middle Tennessee State University)
Zhimin Huang (Adelphi University)
Bintong Chen (Washington State University)

Information Security
Exploring Internet Hacking Trend With Agent-based Modeling
Zaiyong Tang (Salem State College)
Kalioi K. Bagchi (University of Texas, El Paso)
Anurag Jain (Salem State College)

Strategy and Policy
The Effect of Top Management Team (TMT) Composition on Corporate Turnaround Performance under Environmental Stability and Turbulence
Michael A. Abebe (University of Texas-Pan American)
Arifin Angriawan (Purdue University Calumet)

Effects of Parental Business Experience on the Activities, Motives, and Funding of Nascent Entrepreneurs: An Exploratory Investigation
Anat BarNir (University of North Texas)
Erin McLaughlin (University of North Texas)

Statistics and Decision Analysis
First-Order Statistic-Based Control Charts for Monitoring Weibull Percentiles
Xiaohui Huang (Washington State University)
Francis Pascual (Washington State University)

Notes On Multivariate EWMA Control Schemes
Xia Pan (Macau University of Science and Technology)
Jeffrey E. Jarrett (University of Rhode Island)
Doctoral Student Consortium

DC-1: Continental Breakfast and Registration
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 7:30-8:00AM

DC-2: Doctoral Student Consortium Welcome
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 8:00-8:15AM

DC-3: Start Preparing Now for an Academic Position
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 8:15-9:15AM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Christine T. Kydd (University of Delaware), Janelle Heineke (Boston University)

DC-4: Conducting the Job Search
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 9:30-10:30AM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Christopher W. Craighead (The Pennsylvania State University), David (Xiaosong) Peng (Texas A&M University)

DC-5: Coffee Break
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 10:30-10:45AM

DC-6: The Interview Process
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 10:45-11:45AM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Paul Mangiameli (University of Rhode Island), James R. Evans (University of Cincinnati), Mark M. Davis (Bentley College)

DC-7: Joint DSC and NFDC Luncheon
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 11:45-12:45PM

DC-8: Insights on the Art of Teaching
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 12:45-2:15PM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Harvey Brightman (Georgia State University)

DC-9: Insights on Research
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 2:15-3:15PM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Ira Horowitz (University of Florida)

Dr. Ira Horowitz, Graduate Research Professor Emeritus at the University of Florida, will share his insight and secret for success as a professor in academia. Dr. Horowitz is a past-president and fellow of DSI as well as a former editor of Decision Sciences. He is the author/co-author of 5 books and more than 150 refereed journal articles.

DC-10: Coffee Break
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 3:15-3:30PM

DC-11: Information About Specific Research Areas—Small Group Meetings with Mentors
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 3:30-4:30PM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Craig Carter (University of Nevada), Norma J Harrison (China Europe International Business School), Jatinder Gupta (University of Alabama in Huntsville), G. Keong Leong (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), Linda G. Sprague (Rollins College), Christine T. Kydd (University of Delaware), Chetan S. Sankar (Auburn University), Matthew Liberatore (Villanova University)

World-class research faculty from a variety of specific subject areas (e.g., supply chain management, MIS, educational research) will meet with students whose specific research area matches that of the faculty. This faculty ‘mentor’ will offer advice and guidance on appropriate journals, current popular topics of research, potential co-authors and suggestions for focusing on a specific research topic area. This session will provide doctoral students an opportunity to meet one-on-one with leading researchers from their respective general field of study.

DC-12: Doctoral Student Consortium, New Faculty Development Consortium Reception
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 5:00-6:00PM
New Faculty Development Consortium

NF-1: Continental Breakfast and Registration
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 7:30-8:00AM

NF-2: New Faculty Development Consortium Welcome
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 8:00-8:30AM
Session Facilitator: Vijay R. Kannan (Utah State University)

NF-3: Managing the Academic Career
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 8:30-10:00AM
Participants: Linda G. Sprague (Rollins College), Natasa Christodoulidou (California State University-Dominguez Hills), Christopher W. Craighead (The Pennsylvania State University)
Panelists at various career stages will discuss a variety of issues such as leveraging successes and failures, career development, networking, organizational politics, and ethics.

NF-4: Coffee Break
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 10:00-10:15AM

NF-5: Promotion and Tenure
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 10:15-11:45AM
Participants: Janelle Heineke (Boston University), Subhashish Samaddar (Georgia State University), Paul Rubin (Michigan State University), Laura Birou (Louisiana Tech University), Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University), Binshan Lin (Louisiana State University-Shreveport)
Senior faculty from a variety of disciplines will address the promotion and tenure process, and provide insight into how to successfully navigate it. Separate panels will examine promotion and tenure at teaching and research schools.

NF-6: Luncheon
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 11:45-12:45PM

NF-7: Insights on the Art of Teaching (with DC)
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 12:45-2:15PM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Harvey Brightman (Georgia State University)

NF-8: Insights on Research (with DC)
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 2:15-3:15PM
Session Facilitator: Rhonda Aull-Hyde (University of Delaware)
Participants: Ira Horowitz (University of Florida)
Dr. Ira Horowitz, Graduate Research Professor Emeritus at the University of Florida, will share his insight and secret for success as a professor in academia. Dr. Horowitz is a past-president and Fellow of DSI as well as a former editor of Decision Sciences. He is the author/co-author of 5 books and more than 150 refereed journal articles.

NF-9: Coffee Break
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 3:15-3:30PM

NF-10: Managing Professional/Life Balance
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 3:30-4:30PM
Participants: Ina S. Markham (James Madison University), Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College), Thomas W. Jones (University of Arkansas)
Faculty with experience balancing their careers with other interests will share their experiences in how to maintain perspective while being a productive academic.

NF-11: New Faculty Development Consortium Wrapup
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 4:30-5:00PM
Session Facilitator: Vijay R. Kannan (Utah State University)

NF-12: New Faculty Development Consortium, Doctoral Student Consortium Reception
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009, 5:00-6:00PM

Case Studies Award Finalist Presentation
Sunday, Nov. 15th, 2009, 3:00-4:30PM
Session Facilitator: Johnny Rungtusanatham (University of Minnesota)
Participants: Rebecca Grant (University of Victoria), Matthew J. Drake (Duquesne University), Elliot Raboinovich (Arizona State University, Main Campus), Susan Meyer Goldstein (University of Minnesota), Wendy L. Tate (University of Tennessee)
Netflix.com: You’ve Got Mail
Brandy S. Cannon (Berry College)
Louis Le Blanc (Berry College)
Banneker Industries, Inc. – “Your Strategic Sourcing Solution”
Christopher J. Roethlein (Bryant University)
Cheryl W. Snead (Banneker Industries)
John K. Visich (Bryant University)

Tips for Doctoral Students—Getting the Most from the DSI Annual Meeting
The Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting provides an opportunity for doctoral students to network, develop professional skills, interview for faculty positions—and have a good time!

For students who want to know how to get the most out of the Annual Meeting, see “Tips for Doctoral Students” on the DSI Web site at
http://www.decisionsciences.org/people/doctoral.asp
See past Decision Line articles focusing on doctoral student issues at
PD-1: Faculty Liability Issues
Sunday, Nov. 15th, 2009 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Karen L. Fowler (Colorado State University-Pueblo)
Authors/Presenters: Shirley A. Hopkins (California State University, Chico), Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College), Karen L. Fowler (Colorado State University-Pueblo)
This session covers faculty liability issues. Research is presented citing heightened civil liability for faculty involved in situations of inappropriate student behavior that may occur while serving as advisors to student clubs, and so on. Performance evaluation pressure to serve as advisors is discussed in light of serious potential repercussions.

PD-2: Best Practices in Faculty Development: A Benchmarking Audit
Sunday, Nov. 15th, 2009 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Bruce C. Raymond (Montana State University)
This paper provides an overview of best practices regarding university faculty development. Published descriptions of innovation and successful programs for faculty development are reviewed. A structured approach for institutional audit of faculty development practices, along with a formal process for new program implementation, is provided. Consideration is given to literature regarding relationships between faculty development, turnover and performance.

PD-3: Developing an Effective Undergraduate Research Program: A Panel Discussion Based on the Research Group™ Model
Sunday, Nov. 15th, 2009 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Kenneth R. Bartkus Participants: Konrad S. Lee (Utah State University), Christopher J. Skouzen (Utah State University), Vijay R. Kannan (Utah State University)
This panel discussion starts with a review of a nationally recognized mentorship program located in the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business at Utah State University. The panel will share their experiences and reflect on the benefits and challenges of participating in the program. A question and answer section follows.

PD-4: Life After Tenure: Would You Continue to Develop or Retire on Active Duty?
Sunday, Nov. 15th, 2009 3:00-4:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: William B. Carper (University of West Florida)
Authors/Presenters: William B. Carper (University of West Florida), James A. Pope (University of Toledo)
You finally made it through the tenure process; now what? The past six or seven years have been a real torture for you with a lot of stress. You showed you could do it, and now you are set—or are you. You may feel that a great weight has been lifted from your shoulders and that you deserve a break with some well deserved time off—but now is not the time to retire. Join us to discuss the pros and cons of various strategies for your future academic career.

PD-5: Scholarship Thought and Practice
Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix)
Scholarship as an area of study has evolved significantly over decades, as new models and emphases have emerged. This research examines the philosophical and conceptual foundations of scholarship as an educational outcome and activity for faculty and students. Scholarship models and interpretations are reviewed to highlight key directions and trends.

PD-6: Developing Executives as Faculty: Strategies for Promoting Teaching Excellence
Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix)
Authors/Presenters: Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix), Lee III Melancon (University of Phoenix), Barbara Holloway (University of Phoenix), Kevin Browning (University of Phoenix)
As business schools hire full time and adjunct faculty with executive experience, teaching skill can be an issue. Without prior teaching experience, executive faculty may struggle to translate their professional experience into effective classroom teaching moments. This paper will address development programs for practitioner faculty and strategies for teaching excellence.

PD-7: Are Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Research Important: Business Dean Perspectives
Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 1:00-2:30 p.m.
Session Facilitator: Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University)
This panel of Business Deans will discuss the importance of teaching and the value of pedagogical research for faculty in promotion/tenure decisions and career development. Each Dean will describe the procedure for evaluating teaching effectiveness at his/her institution, the importance placed on teaching contributions, and the means of rewarding teaching excellence. In addition, the deans will discuss how pedagogical research contributes to the mission of the school and is recognized.

PD-8: Managing Academic Vitality
Tuesday, Nov. 17th, 2009 8:00-9:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College)
Authors/Presenters: Krishna S. Dhir (Berry College), G. Keong Leong (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)
The authors describe the emerging trends in the management of academic vitality and offer an analytic framework an faculty members and their respective institutions can use could manage academic vitality. Faculty members tend to engage in different set of activities at different stages of their respective careers. These differences are discussed. Authors review various strategies that may be deployed faculty members and by academic institutions to fulfill their institutional mission and goals.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, see page 39
Technology in the Classroom Miniconference

TC-1: The Printing Press Was Invented in 1440, So Why do we Still Lecture?
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009 8:00-9:30AM
Session Facilitator: Roger Morefield
(University of Saint Thomas)
The use of a handheld interactive audience response system can help our students achieve a higher percentage of learning and retention than the inefficient “chalk and talk” method. At the session, Dr. Morefield uses the iClicker system to demonstrate the concept and usage of clickers to attendees. Attendees will be lent a clicker (up to a limit of 40) to use as they play the role of students in a clicker class. A number of methods for enhancing classroom instruction with clickers will be demonstrated.

TC-2: Statistics Homework: The Solution is the Starting Point
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009 10:00-11:30AM
Session Facilitator: Dennis R. Stevenson
(University of Wisconsin-Parkside)
Dr. Stevenson demonstrates a classroom technique for teaching statistics that he developed and used successfully for a number of years and has recently developed it to make available to other instructors. The Excel-based system efficiently handles significant amounts of statistics homework. The opposite of “black box” analysis, students build and check their models, then extend the solution by investigating relationships, finding optimum values, charting replications and writing summaries. Student reaction and comprehension are highly positive. Attendees will learn how these techniques may be incorporated into statistics courses to: (1) learn the method of accessing the software, and build and test basic solutions (2) learn more about the subject principles and techniques by analyzing relationships between given data and results items (called UpDown questions). Three methods of analysis can be covered: intuition, equation analysis and trial/error. (3) Investigate the effect of a critical input variable by creating copies of a basic solution, identical except for the critical variable. Plot the behavior of an important dependant variable and analyze the curve. (4) See how solutions are submitted and automatically added to the section grade sheet. Review the comment manager for written responses. Given the session’s integrated nature, please plan on attending the whole session. Also please contact Coordinator William H.A. Johnson at whjl@psu.edu if you plan to attend so that we can plan accordingly. Participants in the workshop need to bring a PC laptop with Excel. Dr. Stevenson will provide the demo software for free.

TC-3: From Spreadsheet to Simulation: The Education of an Accidental Techie Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009 1:00-2:30PM
Session Facilitator: Catharyn Baird
(EthicsGame)
When asked to teach business ethics to undergraduates, Dr. Catharyn Baird found herself faced with students who had no business experience and no context in which to hold the principles of business ethics. With a commitment to experiential learning, what is now the centerpiece of the EthicsGame family of ethics simulation, Core Values, came into being. The effort began as a paper and pencil simulation, loosely modeled on Dungeons and Dragons, and ended as a highly complex, interactive web-based simulation now used in dozens of universities ethics classes across the nation. The session will trace the development of the EthicsGame family of simulations, sharing the knowledge gained in the past 8 years as the simulations moved from spreadsheet to style-sheet. Emphasis is placed on combining leading edge ethical theory and decision making knowledge with emerging technology, ever mindful of finding the balance between education and entertainment.

From Spreadsheet to Simulation: The Education of an Accidental Techie
Authors/Presenters: Catharyn Baird
(EthicsGame)

TC-4: A Day in the Life of a LINKS Supply Chain Management Simulation Team: A Simulated Team Meeting
Saturday, Nov. 14th, 2009 3:00-4:30PM
Session Facilitator: Randall G Chapman
(Chapman and Associates)
To simulate an actual team meeting with the LINKS Supply Chain Management Simulation, Dr. Chapman will demo the web-based technology behind this sophisticated, competitive supply chain management simulation. No prior preparation is required of attendees, who will receive (abbreviated) sample LINKS output and will work through a typical set of challenges and decisions during the 90-minute session. During the session we will confront multiple supply chain management challenges; inventory pipeline management, procurement strategy and tactics, manufacturing policy, distribution network design, pricing, and forecasting. The LINKS author will lead attendees through: (1) an analysis of key elements of a team’s financial/operating reports and research studies; (2) decision structuring of the supply chain management challenges confronting the simulated firm; (3) interaction with the web-based LINKS Simulation Database for decision inputting; and, (4) post game-run debriefing. Given the session’s integrated nature, please plan on attending the whole session. Also please contact Coordinator William H.A. Johnson at whjl@psu.edu if you plan to attend so that we can plan accordingly.

Technology in the Classroom Miniconference Coordinator
William Johnson, Bentley University
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PD-9: Melding Faculty/Student Expectations: A Reality Check
Tuesday, Nov. 17th, 2009 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Session Facilitator: Thomas W. Jones
(University of Arkansas)
Authors/Presenters: Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University), Wilma M. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University), William B. Carper (University of West Florida), Thomas W. Jones (University of Arkansas), Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University)
A cultural change has occurred in education and manifests in various ways. Students demonstrate an entitlement attitude and a perceived lack of work ethic. Not receptive to critical thinking, they are taught to the test. Acustomed to being entertained, they are exposed to new communication technologies and have short attention spans. Many are non-traditional and have differing viewpoints of classroom responsibilities. In this session we discuss strategies to deal with this cultural change.

Professional and Faculty Development Program Coordinator
Krishna S. Dhir, Berry College
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.

SB-1 Learning Issues in the Business School Introduction to Statistics Course: Are We Engaging Our Students to Apply Their Knowledge Learned in this Course?

Sunday, Nov. 15, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Session Chair: Barry A. Wray (University of North Carolina at Wilmington)
Barry A. Wray (University of North Carolina at Wilmington), Hope M. Baker (Kennesaw State University), Barbara A. Price (Georgia Southern University), Norean R. Sharpe (Georgetown University)

The challenge facing Business Schools is to engage students to better comprehend and apply what they have learned in the Introduction to Statistics course and to retain this understanding in other coursework and throughout their careers. This panel will discuss causes, concerns, issues, and solutions to this challenge.

SB-2 Putting a Quart into a Pint Pot

Monday, Nov. 16, 8:00-9:30 a.m.

Session Chair: John D. McKenzie, Jr. (Babson College)

Symposium

Mark L. Berenson (Montclair State University), Keith Ord (Georgetown University), Betty M. Thorne (Stetson University)

The time available for statistics in the modern B-School curriculum seems to get less and less, yet the demands for topical coverage continually increase. This session will discuss what should be in the curriculum that will be of long term value and how we get students to obtain and retain statistical thinking rather than just memorize mechanics. We will survey audience views on their curricula in preparation for the discussion on the survey that will form the basis of the second session.

SB-3 Today's Statistics Curriculum

Monday, Nov. 16, 10:00-11:30 a.m.

Session Chair: Keith Ord (Georgetown University)
Timothy C. Krehbiel (Miami University), Heather N. Haskin (Miami University), John D. McKenzie, Jr. (Babson College)

The first two speakers will present the results of a survey of the statistics curriculum from all of the 2009 Business Week top 50 undergraduate business programs. The third speaker will comment on these results by comparing them to responses from other business programs and a similar survey presented at the 1997 MSMESB conference. These presentations will be followed by an ample opportunity for discussion from the audience.

SB-4 Technology: Opportunities and Challenges for Statistics Education

Monday, Nov. 16, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

Session Chair: Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)

Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University), Kim I. Melton (North Georgia College & State University), Kellie B. Keeling (University of Denver), Glenn Gilbreath (Virginia Commonwealth University)

Discussion with audience participation of big picture issues about using technology like computational software, automated homework systems, automated response systems and course management systems to effectively assist instruction in statistical thinking. The challenge is to keep the focus on statistical thinking and not on teaching the use of the technology. Knowledge of statistical software is not sufficient. Instructors must practice and advocate the importance of statistical thinking.

SB-5 Business Analytics

Monday, Nov. 16, 3:00-4:30 p.m.

Session Chair: Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)

Curt Hinrichs (SAS Institute, Inc.), Richard D. De Veaux (Williams College), Paul Dwyer (Willamette University)

Open discussion of business analytics relative to statistics instruction. What is business analytics? Is it just another passing fad? Does it belong in the business school curriculum? Is it only something for graduate students? What tools are needed for business analytics? Does the existence of tremendous amounts of data yielding extremely large sample sizes mean that the need for teaching statistics in the traditional way is less important in some business areas?

Miniconference on Making Statistics More Effective in Schools and Business

Coordinators
Robert Andrews, Virginia Commonwealth University; Keith Ord, Georgetown University; and John McKenzie, Babson College
Curricular Issues Miniconference

CI-1: DSJIE Best Teaching Briefs
Sunday, Nov. 15th, 2009 3:00-4:30PM
Session Facilitator: David C. Chou (Eastern Michigan University)

An Entrepreneurial Application of Geographic Information Systems
Dr. Barbara Fuller (Winthrop University),
David Bradbard (Winthrop University)

Winning Hearts and Minds: An Argument for Quantitative Analysis in an Operations Management Course
Vernon E. Francis (Graduate School of Management, University of Dallas)

The Art of War: Managing the Intricacies of SC Power and Trust
Stanley E. Fawcett (Brigham Young University), Cynthia J. Wallin (Brigham Young University), J. Bonner Richie (Brigham Young University), G. Scott Webb (Michigan State University)

CI-2: Panel Discussion: QM vs. OM plus MS
Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 8:00-9:30AM
Session Facilitator: Charles J. Teplitz (University of San Diego)

Quantitative Methods vs. Operations Management Plus Management Science
Charles J. Teplitz (University of San Diego)

CI-3: DSJIE Best Empirical Research Articles
Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 1:00-2:30PM
Session Facilitator: David C. Chou (Eastern Michigan University)

Investigating Business Schools’ Intentions about Offering E-Commerce Education Using an Extended Theory of Planned Behavior
Jean Baptiste K. Dodor (Jackson State University), Dharam Singh Rana (Jackson State University)

Enhancing Knowledge Transfer in Classroom Versus On-line Settings: The Interplay among Instructor, Student, Content, and Context
Louise Nemanich (Arizona State University), Michael Banks (University of Houston), Dusya M. Vera (University of Houston)

CI-4: Business Degree Design Issues
Monday, Nov. 16th, 2009 3:00-4:30PM
Session Facilitator: André M. Everett (University of Otago)

Development of an Executive MBA Module on Ethical Decision Making and Leadership
George J. Siedel (University of Michigan)

Designing and Developing a New Business Degree: An Integrative Model
Freda Z. Hartman (University of Phoenix)

CI-5: Application of Tools to Facilitate Learning
Tuesday, Nov. 17th, 2009 8:00-9:30AM
Session Facilitator: Kimberly Killmer Hollister (Montclair State University)

Enterprise Systems as a Tool for Teaching Systems Analysis and Design
Thomas C. McGinnis (University of North Texas), Anna Sidorova (University of North Texas)

Using a Knowledge Toolbox for Closing the Loop on Assessment of Student Learning
Kimberly Killmer Hollister (Montclair State University), Nicole Koppel (Montclair State University)

Curricular Issues Miniconference Coordinator
André M. Everett, University of Otago

While in New Orleans for the annual meeting, you might consider taking a cruise down the Mississippi River in a riverboat.
Discover a luxurious New Orleans hotel in the French Quarter, located steps from Bourbon Street, the Convention Center, downtown business district and iconic Big Easy attractions. Fresh from a recent $38 million renovation, the Marriott New Orleans French Quarter Hotel features over 1,300 guest rooms and suites, a fully equipped fitness center, updated Concierge Lounge and on-site business center. Highlights of this chic hotel in the French Quarter of New Orleans include a new lobby with stylish wine bar, Starbucks Coffee Shop, gift shop and convenient bell and concierge stands. The Marriott Hotel in New Orleans is home to the award-winning 5 Fifty 5, serving up a dining experience worthy of its French Quarter location.

For reservations at the Marriott New Orleans French Quarter Hotel and to receive the special offered group rate, your reservations must be made by Friday, October 31, and you must supply a credit card with the expiration date available from the following list: Visa, Master Card, American Express, Discover, Diners Club.

Note that the Decision Sciences Institute special group rate may not be available if the group room block becomes full, or after October 31, which is the cut off date for making reservations to receive the special group rate.

If for some reason your plans change, you may cancel your reservation up and until 6pm of date of arrival. Should you not cancel your reservation, you will be billed for one night room charge and tax.

*At previous Decision Sciences Institute meetings, Marriott hotels have permitted attendees to reserve rooms by faxing or mailing a hard-copy form. Starting in 2008, Marriott no longer accepts a reservation using a form that contains credit card number information.

** **

Need a roommate? Doctoral students, faculty and business leaders are often looking for someone to share a room with during the annual meeting. For online assistance, fill out our roommate match form at the url below and submit your information to DSI:

http://www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/meetinginfo/roommates.asp

Marriott New Orleans French Quarter Hotel
555 Canal Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 USA
1-504-581-1000
Toll-free: 1-888-364-1200

Marriott Centralized Reservations
1-888-226-2427
consider strategic initiatives that should be pursued to strengthen the Institute. There was concurrence among the Board members that the strength of the Institute is the broad disciplinary interests of its membership. To take advantage of this and to potentially increase the membership of the Institute, the Board decided to start three Special Interest Groups (SIG) in the following areas: (1) Project Management, (2) Healthcare Decision Making and Policy, and (3) Innovation and Entrepreneurship. These SIGs are intended to bring together scholars in multiple disciplines to focus on cross-disciplinary research topics, and the groups will be established with the help of scholars who have an interest in these multi-disciplinary topics.

The Project Management SIG is expected to be established with some involvement from the Project Management Institute (PMI), although we don’t have a firm commitment yet. I have initiated talks with PMI to assess their interest in this SIG. Gary Klein, a member of the DSI Board, is expected to play a lead role in establishing this SIG. The Healthcare Decision Making and Policy SIG will be established with Rachna Shah and Susan Meyer as the lead individuals from the Carlson School of Management at University of Minnesota. The Innovation and Entrepreneurship SIG will be established with Roger Calantone as the lead individual from the Broad Graduate School of Management at Michigan State University. These three special interest groups will provide an opportunity to involve scholars from allied disciplines such as healthcare economics, project management, product development and innovation management, strategic management and cognitive psychology in the Institute’s conference and other activities. Initially, two or three special sessions under these SIGs are being planned for the 2010 conference. The SIGs can promote intellectual discussion and exchange of ideas among a broad base of scholars through the conference sessions and the DSI website. The strategic objectives in starting these SIGs are to broaden our membership base and to involve strong researchers in allied fields in our annual conferences.

The Board also approved the establishment of the European Region of the Decision Sciences Institute (EDSI). In July, I chaired an organizing meeting that was held in Paris prior to the international DSI conference in Nancy, France. I had contacted a number of colleagues from major European schools to assess their interest in starting a European region. My enquiries were well received by all that I contacted. It was evident after some discussions that there was considerable enthusiasm and interest in starting a European region. The Board had earlier established the start of this region as a strategic objective. It contributes to growth in membership and further internationalizes the Institute. Although many scholars from Europe have been attending DSI annual conferences regularly, we hadn’t capitalized on this opportunity before. I think this strengthens and broadens the Institute further. A core group of five individuals has been working diligently to draft the bylaws and the mission statement for the region. This core group (“The G5” group) is comprised of Gyula Vastag from Hungary, Richard Pibernik and Constantin Blome from Germany, Marc Sachon from Spain, and Jan Arlbjorn from Denmark. There will be a special reception at the annual conference in New Orleans to celebrate the addition of the European Region to the DSI family.

There will be a special reception at the annual conference in New Orleans to celebrate the addition of the European Region to the DSI family.

ers for the DSI journals in addition to Blackwell-Wiley, the current publisher. The proposals are due October 15th. The Board will then discuss the proposals and select a publisher for the DSI journals. We have secured commitments from several prominent researchers to be department editors for SCMR. The associate editor team is currently being assembled. As of now, plans to launch SCMR in 2010 remain unchanged.

The Board is continuing to discuss and implement actions to strengthen the Institute and better serve its members. Some initiatives that are under consideration or underway include the following: marketing the Institute to our constituents, redefining the Fellows selection criteria, improvements to the design and quality of the annual conference, a redesigned DSI website with more useful and interesting content, podcasting of selected sessions from the annual conference, and leveraging web-based technology to share information with members and facilitating interactions among members. I have the privilege of working with a Board that is collegial, creative, and engaged in the strategic interests of the Institute. The Board has been truly focused on strategic change and effecting major improvements to many facets of the Institute’s operations. You should see constructive changes in what we do and how we do things as we move forward. Please feel free to contact any of us with exciting and creative suggestions for improvements. Ultimately, DSI’s future rests with all of us acting in concert to promote the interests of the Institute.
Operations Management/Quantitative Analysis

The Wake Forest University Schools of Business is seeking qualified candidates for Fall 2010 appointments in the areas of Operations Management and Quantitative Analysis with opportunities to teach in our Winston-Salem undergraduate programs and our Winston-Salem and Charlotte MBA programs. Qualified candidates at all ranks are welcome to apply. The positions offer a very competitive teaching load and package of compensation and benefits.

**JOB QUALIFICATIONS**

Position 1: Permanent, tenure, tenure track position teaching Operations Management: Ph.D. or D.B.A. in Operations Management; Experienced candidates should have a proven track record of excellence in teaching and research and be able to teach a range of operations classes such as Operations Strategy, Process Improvement, Six Sigma and Supply Chain Management.

Position 2: Visiting, at any rank: Ph.D. or D.B.A. in Quantitative Analysis/Operations Management; Ability to teach both Business Statistics and Management Sciences course along with a basic core Operations Management Course.

Wake Forest University is a private, coeducational institution dedicated to academic excellence in liberal arts, graduate and professional education. Founded in 1834, the University is ranked among the top thirty national universities. With 4,300 undergraduates and 2,200 graduate and professional students, the student-faculty ration is 10:1. Wake Forest is a collegiate university offering a vibrant intellectual community with a rich cultural life, an impressive array of facilities and an active athletics community. From its founding, the university adopted the motto “pro humanitate” which is exemplified by a deep institutional commitment to public service and engagement with the world. For quick facts about the University, go to http://www.wfu.edu/visitors/quickfacts.html

Wake Forest is located in Winston-Salem, North Carolina – part of the beautiful Piedmont Triad metropolitan region which has a population of more than 1.5 million and is listed among the top 35 best places to live in North America by Cities Ranked and Rated. Known as the state’s “City of the Arts,” Winston-Salem offers a vast array of arts experiences ranging from music venues to galleries to theatre and film festivals. The city is also ranked among the top 50 US cities for affordability on national surveys.

**APPLICATION PROCEDURE**

Candidates should electronically submit an application letter, vita and reference names to the following address:

Permanent tenure, tenure-track position in Operations Management: ops-permanent@mba.wfu.edu

Visiting Assistant or Associate position: qa-ops-visiting@mba.wfu.edu

For questions please contact:
Dr. Brooke A. Saladin
Associate Professor of Management
Schools of Business
Wake Forest University
P.O. Box 7659 Reynolda Station
Worrell Professional Center
Winston-Salem, NC 27109
brooke.saladin@mba.wfu.edu
p 336.758.5050
f 336.758.4514

Wake Forest University welcomes and encourages diversity and seeks applications and nominations from women and minorities. Wake Forest seeks to recruit and retain a diverse workforce to maintain the excellence of the University, and to offer students richly varied disciplines, perspectives, and ways of knowing and learning.
OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS

The Institute’s 2009-10 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Secretary, and Vice Presidents elected at-large to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2011.

Your recommendations should include the affliation 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 Indian Subcontinent, Southeast, South-west and Western 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

Markland, Robert E., Univ. of South Carolina
McMillian, 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.
Moskowitz, Herbert, Purdue Univ.
Narasimhan, Ram, Michigan State Univ.
Neter, John, Univ. of Georgia
Nutl, Paul C., The Ohio State Univ.
Olson, David L., Texas A&M Univ.
Parker, William C., Univ. of Indiana
Peterson, William S., Univ. of New Mexico
Phillips, George C., Univ. of Tennessee-Knoxville
Ragdall, Clif, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Raiffa, Howard, Harvard Univ.
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Reinmuth, James R., Univ. of Oregon
Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College
Roth, Aleda V., Clemson Univ.
Sanders, Nada, Texas Christian Univ.
Schade, Lawrence L., Univ. of Texas at Arlington
Schniederjans, Marc J., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Schriber, Thomas J., Univ. of Michigan
Schniederger, Roger G., Univ. of Minnesota
Simons, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology
Slocum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist Univ.
Sobol, Mariette G., Southern Methodist Univ.
Sprague, Linda G., China Europe International Business School
Steinberg, Earle, Touche Ross & Co.
Summers, George W.*, Univ. of Arizona
Tang, Kwee, Purdue Univ.
Taylor, Bernard W., Ill, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Troutt, Marvin D., Kent State Univ.
Uhl, Kenneth P., Univ. of Illinois
Vazsonyi, Andrew*, Univ. of San Francisco
Voss, Christopher A., Long Beach State
Wasserman, William, Syracuse Univ.
Weinmerle, Urban, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
Wheeler, Steven C., Harvard Univ.
Whitten, Betty J., Univ. of Georgia
Whybark, D. Clay, Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wickland, Gary A., Caprock Research
Winkler, Robert L., Duke Univ.
Woolsey, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines
Wright, Max S. Jr., Iowa State Univ.
Zmud, Robert W., Florida State Univ.

*deceased
DECISION SCIENCES INSTITUTE

2009 Annual Meeting Registration Form • New Orleans, Louisiana • November 14-17, 2009

All attendees must register for the meeting. Conference registrations must be postmarked by October 19, 2009, to avoid a late fee of $50. After October 19, requests for cancellation refunds will not be accepted. Mail form and payment for registration to: Decision Sciences Institute, 35 Broad Street, Suite 414, Atlanta, GA 30303, fax 404-413-7714.

We would appreciate your answers to the following questions, which will help us plan this and future meetings.

1. Where will you stay in New Orleans?
   - a. Conference hotel
   - b. Other (please specify)

2. Type of accommodation:
   - a. Single
   - b. Double

3. Date of arrival:
   - a. Fri. (11/13)
   - b. Sat. (11/14)
   - c. Sun. (11/15)
   - d. Mon. (11/16)
   - e. Tues. (11/17)

4. Do you plan to attend:
   - a. Sunday’s luncheon?
   - b. Monday’s reception?
   - c. Tuesday’s luncheon?
   - d. All?
   - e. None?

5. Interest Area (check one):
   - a. Academic Administration
   - b. Accounting
   - c. Economics
   - d. Finance
   - e. Health Care Systems
   - f. Innovative Education
   - g. International Business
   - h. Marketing
   - i. Microcomputer Systems & Apps.
   - j. IS/DSS
   - k. Managerial Problem-Solving
   - l. Organizational Behavior
   - m. Organizational Theory
   - n. Manufacturing/Service Management
   - o. Public/Nonprofit Management
   - p. Quantitative Techniques & Meth.
   - q. Stats, Decisions & Fore.
   - r. Strategic Management & Policy
   - s. Technology and Innovation
   - t. E-commerce
   - u. Other
   - v. None

6. What is your primary regional affiliation:
   - a. Asia-Pacific Region
   - b. Indian Subcontinent Region
   - c. Mexico Region
   - d. Midwest Region
   - e. Northeast Region
   - f. Southeast Region
   - g. Southwest Region
   - h. Western Region
   - i. At-Large
   - j. None

7. What is your interest in Placement?
   - a. As employer and employee
   - b. Employee only
   - c. Employer only
   - d. None

8. What was the primary reason you decided to attend the annual meeting?
   - a. Annual Meeting in general
   - b. Job Placement
   - c. Doctoral Student Consortium
   - d. New Faculty Development Consortium
   - e. Program Miniconferences
   - f. Professional Develop. Program

9. Please check if you are a member of Alpha Iota Delta and would like to be identified as such at the Annual Meeting.

Member and non-member fees for all registration categories include Sunday’s luncheon, Monday’s reception, Tuesday’s award luncheon, and the CD-ROM Proceedings (see information below about the Proceedings).

The Annual Meeting Proceedings will be produced in CD-ROM format and is included in the conference registration fee for all registered attendees. If you DO NOT wish to receive the Proceedings, please indicate below. Additional CD-ROM Proceedings can be purchased at a cost of $25 each, but must be ordered by October 1, 2009 (see form below).

☐ I DO NOT wish to receive the Annual Meeting Proceedings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member registration</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Member dues renewal</td>
<td>$160.00 (Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member registration</td>
<td>$485.00 (Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student member registration</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10 Student dues renewal</td>
<td>$25.00 (Outside U.S. &amp; Canada add $5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Member registration</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Non-Member registration</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION:
- Visa
- MC
- American Express
- Discover

Total Amount $_________

Card No. __________________ Core. Expires: ___/___

Card Holder’s Name ______________________________ (Please Print)

Signature_________________________________________

Billing Address____________________________________

City/State/Zip __________________________
CALENDAR

NOVEMBER 2009
November 14-17
40th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, to be held at the New Orleans Marriott Hotel in New Orleans, Louisiana. Program Chair is Maling Ebrahim-pour, University of South Florida - St. Petersburg. For more information, see pages 31-42.

DECEMBER 2009
December 28-30
The Indian Subcontinent Region will hold its third annual conference at the lush green ASCI, Hyderabad campus. For more information, see http://www.icgids2009.in

FEBRUARY 2010
February 15
Submission deadline for the Midwest Region’s 2010 Annual Meeting, to be held April 22-24, 2010, in Toledo, Ohio. See http://mwdsi2010.utoledo.edu

February 17-19
The Southeast Region will hold its 2010 Annual Meeting on February 17-19, at the Hilton Wilmington Riverside in Wilmington, North Carolina. See http://www.sedsi.org

MARCH 2010
March 2-6
The Southwest Region will hold its 2010 (31st) Annual Meeting at the Sheraton Hotel Dallas in Dallas, Texas. See http://www.swdsi.org

March 26-28

APRIL 2010
April 6-9
The Western Region will hold its 2010 (39th) Annual Meeting at the Hyatt Regency Lake Tahoe Resort in Lake Tahoe, Nevada. See http://www.wdsinet.org

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