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**PRESIDENT’S LETTER**

Board Proposes Restructuring the Governance of the Institute

By E. Powell Robinson, Jr.,
University of Houston

The Board of Directors held a strategic planning workshop in August 2012 to discuss making DSI more efficient, agile, and responsive to member needs and changes in the competitive landscape. As one output of this discussion, the board recommends a constitutional amendment to restructure the board of directors such that board member responsibilities are better aligned with the core activities necessary for DSI’s long-term success. Amending the constitution requires
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FROM THE EDITOR

Maling Ebrahimpour, Editor, University of South Florida, St. Petersburg

It is with great pride that we present to you the last issue of Decision Line for 2012. This issue is filled with very informative articles written by colleagues from several universities. In addition, this issue contains information about the upcoming Decision Sciences Institute’s Annual Conference to be held in San Francisco, California. Make certain you read the President’s Letter written by Powell Robinson from the University of Houston.

In his letter, President Robinson discusses key issues that have major implications for our organization’s future. He describes the current governing structure and limitation of the existing organizational structure and then proposes changes to the current structure. If these changes are approved by the membership of DSI, it will have a significant impact on how we run this organization. Please read the President’s Letter, and if you plan to come to the conference in San Francisco, attend the DSI’s Annual Business Meeting which is scheduled for Sunday, Nov. 18, 6:00 pm–7:00 pm, in the Yerba Buena Ballroom, Salons 10-11, and let your Board hear your opinion. I cannot emphasize enough that if you have any opinion, you should let us hear it. If you are not attending the conference, please let me know your thoughts and I will make sure they are conveyed to the board. My email is bizdean@usfsp.edu.

The statements from the two candidates running for president-elect, Professor Parent (from Utah State University) and Professor Schniederjans (from University of Nebraska-Lincoln), are very interesting. Reading them will give you insight on each candidate’s vision on how DSI should move forward and evolve. Please read the statements so you will be prepared when the time comes to vote on who you want to lead DSI. Your vote is important and your decision in this election will help shape the future of DSI.

Along with the President’s letter and the candidates’ statements, this issue is packed with interesting articles and you will benefit greatly from reading them. We have two feature articles from the section “In the Classroom.” In the first article, Professors Spivey and McMillan (both from Clemson University) discuss their study on “Capturing Student Effort and Establishing Its Relationship to Performance.” These authors used three specific resources for their online course: PowerPoint sides that were posted online, “recorded instructor calculator entry lecture,” and Excel spreadsheet lectures that were made available online. The result of the study indicated that in taking the online courses, student performance was not significantly different from student performance when taking the same course in a traditional classroom. The majority of students liked the ability to be in control of their time (when they want to study), control of environment (where they want to study), and accessibility of materials online (whenever and as often as they wish). The authors concluded that online education resources might be an effective and economical option to be included in the portfolio of course offerings.

The second Classroom article reports on millennial students’ preferred learning environment. Professor Rhodes from California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, used a survey questionnaire to study students in capstone courses at her university. First, she identifies traits attributed to millennial students. Second, she describes the current college and university environment. Professor Rhodes proposed five hypotheses which she tested based on the data gathered using a survey instrument. According to the results, it appears that there is a significant difference between the traits of millennials as discovered in this study against those traits discussed in other current literature. Another significant finding was the difference that existed in terms of self-reported traits among millennials with regard to
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The two candidates for the position of DSI president-elect—Mike Parent of Utah State University and Marc Schniederjans of the University of Nebraska—provide their vision statements for the 2013 election of officers.

Mike Parent

What motivates my interest in serving as president of DSI? My DSI experience. By experience I am not referring to responsibilities I’ve enjoyed involving the board, various committees, publications, or programs at the Institute and regional levels. These may be tied to qualifications, but the experiences I treasure are linked to the values and vision that we share as members of DSI.

First, I met, know, and have transitioned from colleague to friend with people from more cultures and countries through my association with DSI than any other professional or personal endeavor. I don’t even want to consider how dull a career would have been without this opportunity.

Second, as most of you do, I belong to discipline-specific professional associations. Isn’t it refreshing to attend DSI meetings where we are exposed to the issues and interests of colleagues in multiple disciplines but with a common belief that quality decisions must embrace the interactions among these disciplines? Many of you have served in administrative positions within your college or university; yet, you probably know more people from more disciplines and universities through DSI than at your own institution.

Third, DSI members are welcoming and inclusive. Among those of our colleagues who have accepted leadership positions within the Institute, the politics of personal agenda have been checked at the door. Every candidate for every contested position lists serving its members as one of the DSI essential values.

Lastly, renewal: this is actually a combination of many small experiences. It could be an idea we were exposed to while reviewing a manuscript. Maybe it was a comment or question during a program session that offered the necessary encouragement to continue a particular research initiative. Doesn’t everyone return home after the annual meeting more positive (notwithstanding the early winter travel challenges)? Making these experiences available for our newest member and preserving them for those who have been with DSI since its founding is an important priority.

The uniqueness of our profession and the role of our academic associations like DSI were clearly illustrated to me during a casual lunch among friends recently. One, a vice-president from the non-academic side of campus, retired a couple of years ago. He was speaking to another non-academic professional retiring this year about the differences between faculty and professional approaches to retirement. His generalized assertion was that the professional retiree leaves, never to be heard from again, while faculty visit the library, may have an office on campus, and remain interested at least for a time in curriculum changes and new hires. Could it be that the non-academic professional works for the university while a professor works at the university? The distinction being: serving students and society by disseminating and discovering knowledge occurs within the scope of employment but beyond the reach of the employer. If so DSI has a critical role in serving our members and the universities that employ them.

How can we best serve our membership, and what is the best course to chart for DSI’s future? These are not new questions. Considerable effort has been put forth to examine these in depth employing various strategic models. I’ve studied several of these reports. One activity that is NOT in my vision for DSI is another strategic planning exercise. In a word, most of these reports correctly identified “positioning” issues for DSI: competing organizations, global initiatives, service quality and scope, strategic alliances, and deliverables including journals and regional and annual meetings. Data continue to be collected and various committees are considering options. (See Powell Robinson’s excellent description of these in his President’s Letter, “Standing at the Crossroads” in the previous Decision Line.) Of the many possibilities presented in these reports there seems to be one common denominator: no matter what course we chart for the future, DSI must have in place a “best-of-breed” information system, related technology, and people with the expertise to operate it. The next DSI president-elect must follow through on the considerable commitment to this initiative and the recent progress made by adopting the conference system for 2012. DSI cannot achieve its self-identified goals without it. This may mean that a future board will expand in number but narrow the scope of ad hoc committees so that we can draw on the specific expertise of our members to implement these IT changes.

There are three other initiatives that as president I shall personally explore with assistance from colleagues who may be interested in one or each of them. They are related to on-going efforts and should not affect other priorities nor require Institute resources. In no particular order of importance they are: First, CSR (corporate social responsibility) initiatives are commonplace among organizations that employ our students. Just before the DSI annual meeting in San Diego, I accidentally happened upon a public service project sponsored by an accounting firm holding its annual meeting there. They were planting trees and shrubs, developing an animal habitat area at the San Diego Zoo. Perhaps DSI could identify a public service activity to support at each of our annual meeting sites. As we explore the creation of SIGS,
Marc Schniederjans

It is my belief that DSI has a greater potential for growth than almost any other academic organization. Growth in single discipline organizations like Production and Operations Management Society (POMS) and Academy of Management (AOM) has continued to increase during the last ten years, whereas the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) has not been growing during the same period. Yet DSI has a major competitive advantage over most other academic organizations because the decision sciences are not limited to a single discipline or functional area as is the case for most of our competitor organizations.

With great leadership and the hard work of members in the recent past, DSI has been moving toward greater diversity in representation of academic disciplines. While we have some representation in all the disciplines representing the functional areas of business, we have room to grow in a number of different areas. While we have a growing number of international regions, we don’t have a region in every nation. The effort that brought our organization to this point has left us much to do, but has also positioned us for a much greater role in guiding decision making in every discipline in every nation that has university-level business education.

My vision is that DSI should be recognized world-wide as the best source for decision-making methodology, research, and wisdom to guide business, government, healthcare, military, education, and every other entity that makes decisions. To achieve this vision we must grow our membership. To that end I would seek the guidance and leadership of the DSI Board and the membership to expand our use and development of special interest groups, colleges, schools, divisions, focus groups, and multiple social networks in an effort to reach out to a more diverse group of scholars covering subject areas in every field of the social sciences. 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 support DSI’s vision statement that asserts that we are indeed an interdisciplinary organization.

Identifying new markets for growth is not enough. We have to sell the value that DSI offers to potential members. One of the specific tasks that I would suggest for the appropriate DSI committees would be to review, evaluate, and develop a marketing plan that would aggressively promote the value of membership in DSI. My goal would be to communicate an image where membership in DSI is valued, sought after, and highly prized above membership in other organizations. Make potential members understand that DSI offers more inclusive, diverse membership in DSI is valued, sought after, and highly prized above membership in other organizations. Make potential members understand that DSI is the ideal place to further their scholarly endeavors, to social network and to have fun. With the digital platform that now interfaces DSI operations and services with their membership and the use of social media we are ideally equipped to reach new members with our value message.

Another competitive advantage DSI has over many competing academic organizations is the regional subdivisions. As president I would do everything I could to further strengthen and support them. My very first paper presentation was given in the Southeast Region before I had even joined DSI. My first administrative position as a member in an academic organization was for the Western Region. For many years I served in a variety of positions in the Midwest Region, which I call my home. I know the value of these supportive organizations, and appreciate what they offer to all of us.

As a Fellow of DSI, I possess insight into the rigorous academic quality and standards that DSI represents. I will uphold those standards. In terms of my qualifications to lead DSI, I can say my years of executive experience with DSI include numerous positions I have held such as vice president at large on the DSI Board of Directors and as vice president in the Midwest Region. Other external executive experience relevant to serving as president of DSI includes having been elected to and serving as chairman of the board for both public and private organizations.

My operational experience with DSI includes having served as the program chair for the DSI Annual Meeting and serving as program chair for a Midwest regional meeting. I have also served in a variety of differing roles, including track chair, coordinator, and committee member for the Annual Meeting and Midwest meetings. External to DSI, I have also served as program co-chair for the 1992 and 1996 Production and Operations Management Society (POMS) annual meetings and as vice president and member of various committees for that organization. Additionally, I have served on the program committee for the Information Resources Management Association (IRMA) International Conference.

In summary, I feel we owe our thanks to our predecessors, especially the original faculty who built up DSI during the early years. They have given us a solid 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 continue to grow this organization into the greatest interdisciplinary society in the world. If we all work together, we can make DSI the “go to” organization for decision-making.

Marc Schniederjans is C. Wheaton Battey Distinguished Professor of Business in the College of Business Administration at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
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Capturing Student Effort and Establishing Its Relationship to Performance with an Online Course Management System

by Michael F. Spivey and Jeffrey J. McMillan, Clemson University

Like most, we have taken notice of the rise of online education over the past several years. Today’s students access the Internet daily via their computers, tablets, or smartphones—sometimes using all three in the same day. Thus, the convenience of online learning is very appealing to most of them. Furthermore, today’s tight fiscal environment has intensified the pressure on university administrators to deliver instruction in an economical manner. Together, these two factors support why Zuckweiler (2012) points out that there is no denying that the demand for online education is strong and expected to increase.

This article describes a project where we used an online course management system to investigate questions of great interest to us—how might instructors monitor the effort their students are putting forth in a course and whether or not a relationship exists between the amount of effort exerted by the students and their performance in the course. We used the university’s course management system (i.e., Blackboard) to deliver online educational resources and collect data that could be used as a proxy to measure the effort exerted by students.

Delivery of Our Course Materials

As stated above, we decided to take advantage of Clemson’s Blackboard course management system to make educational resources available online to students enrolled in sections of an undergraduate finance course. We chose to utilize our Blackboard for two main reasons. First, both of us were fairly proficient in the use of our Blackboard system as we have been using it for several years. Secondly, our students would be able to access the system via the Internet from anywhere in the world 24 hours a day 7 days a week at no additional costs to them.

For the purposes of this course we developed and provided three different kinds of educational resources that our students could access online via Blackboard. These online educational resources complemented and expanded upon concepts presented in a traditional course text. One of the educational resources we made available to the students was PowerPoint lectures we produced using Adobe Presenter. A second educational resource we made available were recorded instructor calculator entry lectures. The third educational resource was recorded Excel spreadsheet lectures made with Adobe Captivate.

We developed all three of these educational resources ourselves, and they could only be viewed online through Blackboard. These online educational resources complemented and expanded upon concepts presented in a traditional course text. These all were packaged resources that could not be downloaded. We made it a point to make sure it was clear to students that the online educational resources emphasized concepts and computational problem-solving they would be responsible for in their course examinations. Thus, we believe we did all we could to give students a reason and motivation to make sure they took advantage of the online educational resources throughout the semester.
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is a professor in the School of Accountancy & Finance at Clemson University, where he teaches accounting and MBA courses. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Tennessee. He has published widely in the areas of commercial banking and corporate finance, and his work has appeared in many of the top journals in banking and finance such as Journal of Financial Economics, Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis, and Journal of Banking and Finance. He has also published articles in prominent law journals and has written chapters for scholarly textbooks.
spive@clemson.edu

Jeffrey J. McMillan
is a professor in the School of Accountancy & Finance at Clemson University, where he teaches accounting and MBA courses. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of South Carolina and his M.B.A. and B.S. from Louisiana State University. He is an active researcher with projects investigating various areas—behavioral, auditing, ethics, educational methods, and market valuation. Publications based on his research have appeared in such journals as The Accounting Review, Advances in Accounting, Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory, Issues in Accounting Education, Journal of Business Issues, and Accounting Education: An International Journal. In addition, Professor McMillan has made numerous presentations at international, national, and regional research conferences.
mjeffre@clemson.edu
Effort and Performance Investigations

We found that there have been a limited number of investigations of the effects of students’ efforts on academic performance in undergraduate finance courses. As most would expect, Johnson et al. (2002) and Rich (2006) found that students who attended class more often and spent more time working homework problems and quizzes made better grades than those who put forth less effort in these areas. On the other hand, Didia and Hasnat (1998) and Nofsinger and Perry (1999) found that the amount of time studying had no or even negative effects on their students’ grades. Thus, the results of these prior studies are conflicting.

Our investigation expands on these prior studies in two major ways. First, none of the prior studies examined students where the primary course content was being delivered via online educational resources. Secondly, unlike the prior studies that utilized self-reported data or required researcher classification judgments, our measures of student effort are based on objective observations.

Our Course Procedures and Tracking Our Students’ Effort

There were 158 students who completed the sections of the undergraduate finance course we administrated via Clemson’s Blackboard course management system. The course syllabus outlined the topics and specific online educational resources that would be addressed on each exam and provided recommended study timelines. Four equally weighted and evenly spaced tests were administered during the semester. Although the course content and study resources were delivered online, for security purposes, tests were administered in the classroom. Regular and timely updates and reminders concerning topic coverage and upcoming exams were posted on the class’s Blackboard’s announcement board (accompanying e-mails were often sent as well). Lastly, questions posted to the class’s Blackboard discussion board or received via e-mail were monitored and responded to on a regular and timely manner.

It was through the use of Blackboard’s tracking feature that we were able to observe when and how often students accessed each of the educational resources over the course of the semester (the system registers these as “views”). We tracked the number of times each of the study resources that were relevant for an upcoming test was viewed by each student. To get a complete picture of how the timing and how differing levels of effort (i.e., the number of views) exerted by the students of the online educational resources might affect their performance, we formed three different study period measures. With the first measure, we tracked how many times each student viewed the educational resources for each test from the day following the previous test (or start of semester with test 1) and the date of the test. This time period was roughly 25 to 30 days for each of the four tests. For the second effort measure, we used the number of views the 10 days prior to each test. Lastly, for the third effort measure we took the number of views two days immediately prior to each test. We believe that the 10 days prior measure can be viewed as a normal realistic study period while two days immediately prior to the exam is really a “cram” study period. For control purposes, demographic information available on each student that reflected common characteristics such as cumulative grade point average, academic class and major, gender and the current semester course load were also included in our analyses.

Findings and Effects Noted

The students’ mean overall final course grade was 73.46 and ranged from a low of 49.63 to a high of 95.55. Total views of the educational resources between tests over the semester averaged 47.27 with a low of 2 (as one would predict, this student flunked) and a high of 156. The sum of the number of views over the 10 days preceding each test for the semester averaged 34.12 with a low of 0 and a high of 100. The sum of the views during the two days preceding each test over the semester averaged 17.38 with a low of 0 and a high of 41. From these numbers, roughly 72% of the total views occurred during the 10 days preceding each test, with 36% of the total views occurring the two days preceding each test. The mean cumulative grade point average was 3.03 with a minimum of 1.78 and a high of 4.00 out of a 4.00 grading scale. Most of the students were seniors with only one sophomore. Together finance and accounting majors made up 86% of the sample and male students represented 76% of the sample. The credit hours being taken during the semester averaged 14.97 hours with a minimum of 3 hours and a maximum of 21 hours.

We used Pearson correlation analyses and ordinary least squares regressions to investigate the relationship between the timing and extent of the students’ efforts and the grades they earned on their exams. Our findings provide evidence that the students’ efforts positively influenced their performance in the course. In other words, the students who viewed the assigned online educational resources more often did better in the course (i.e., made significantly higher grades). Specifically, we found that students who studied (i.e., viewed the online educational resources) on a more regular schedule spaced-out during the periods between tests performed better than students who waited until just before the test to view the online educational resources. In other words, no matter the level of cramming, it was not significantly effective in improving students’ performance. The only demographic control variable to have a significant effect on the timing of the students’ efforts and performance was the students’ cumulative grade point average. As most would predict, the students with higher cumulative grade point averages on the whole tended to study more and also made higher grades in the course.

Closing Remarks

Overall we found our experience in utilizing Clemson’s Blackboard course management system to deliver our course content quite successful. The effort ex-
erted and the performance of the students in the online classes was not significantly different from those of students who have taken the course in traditional classroom settings in prior semesters. On the whole, the vast majority of the students handled the technology very smoothly, and the feedback they provided suggested that they liked the control they exerted over the timing of when to study and the learning environment they wanted to study in. Our students especially liked the ability to view any of the online educational resources whenever and as often as they wanted. In fact, we believe these factors combined to actually result in many of the students actually exerting more effort than they would have in a traditional in-class setting.

In conclusion we have to say that like most educators who have been around a while, we do not believe the substitution of online educational resources in lieu of traditional in-class meetings is appropriate for every course. However, our experience has shown us that online educational resources can definitely be an effective and economical educational option most departments may wish to work into their portfolio of course offerings.

Endnotes
1. The course’s focus was on financial institutions and financial markets.
2. In addition to traditional hardbound text, publishers are now providing e-text options of most of their offerings. However, that was not available for the text used in the course at the time of our investigation.
3. Publisher provided resources of this type were not available for this specific course at the time of this investigation. However, during the past few years the major publishers have started to produce some excellent educational resources for a wider variety of courses. This is especially true for courses that are widely taught and high student traffic.
4. We do not have any reasons to believe that the results of our data analysis would be different if the exams were to have been given online instead of in the classroom. We are currently collecting data that we plan to use to examine that proposition in the near future.
5. Publishers are now adding tracking and diagnostic features to their online educational resources.
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FROM THE REGIONS

Sixth Annual Indian Subcontinent DSI Conference

In today’s global environment and intense competition it is evident that the businesses and non-business organizations around the world must conduct their operations with utmost efficiency to achieve performance excellence in order to survive, let alone thrive. Hence, decision making, in all functional areas and at all levels of management, play a crucial role in achieving the desired excellence by making the best use of the available resources. There is a need for the decision makers to appreciate the various technical, cultural, behavioral, social, and environmental interdependencies they have to deal with while making decisions and adapt and utilize various decision sciences tools and techniques for efficient and effective decisions.

In this context, the 6th ISDSI International Conference on “Decision Sciences for Performance Excellence” offers a platform to promote interdisciplinary research at a global level.

The Indian Subcontinent Region Decision Sciences Institute (ISDSI) and IBS Hyderabad are organizing the 6th annual conference of ISDSI at Hyderabad, India from December 27-29, 2012. We invite all academicians, practitioners from business and industry, and research scholars to this international conference to share, discuss and deliberate on a variety of research agendas, ideas, and findings in all disciplines relevant to decision making, decision processes, and their impact on performance excellence.

Selected papers will be published as refereed conference proceedings. Further, authors of these papers will be encouraged to submit their papers to the Decision Sciences Journal, The Journal of Accounting Ethics & Public Policy, International Journal of Emerging Markets, and other suitable international journals.

For more information on the conference in Hyderabad, India, please visit the conference website: www.ibshyderabad.org/conference/ISDSI-IBS ■
Millenials Report Their Preferred Learning Environment
by Rhonda Rhodes, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

The millennial generation has its own nuances that require new teaching strategies (Merlino & Rhodes, 2010). The aging professoriate, consisting of mostly baby boomers, tend to conduct their classes as their professors did. The research states that university students in the millennial generation are bored and uninspired in many of today’s business university classrooms (Brown, Armstrong, & Thompson, 1998). Researchers are starting to investigate the unique needs of the millennial generation in higher education classrooms and online courses.

A current conflict exists between students’ preferences about how to learn and professors’ preferences about how to teach (Graubard, 2001; Proserpio & Gioia, 2007). Proserpio and Gioia (2007) report that the lack of compatibility between today’s business college students’ learning styles and their professors’ teaching styles suggests it is “less than it could be or should be, and that we need to act to avoid a disconnect” (p. 70).

A thorough review of the relevant literature shows the need for additional research about the preferred learning environment for the millennial generation as reported by millennials surveyed in university business courses. Data included preferred learning environment, characteristics, and demographics. The objectives included the following:

- Identify the preferred learning environment for millennial generation students in university business courses.
- Rank, by importance, the preferred learning environment for millennial generation students in university business courses.
- Compare the preferred learning environment identified by male and female millennial generation students.
- Compare the preferred learning environment identified by various ethnic groups of millennial generation students.
- Compare the preferred learning environment identified by various majors of millennial generation students.
- Compare the self-reported characteristics of millennials from different family educational levels.

Review of Relevant Literature

Proserpio and Gioia (2007) describe the millennial generation university student in these terms: “In general, then, we would characterize our new generation of students as learning in a somewhat different way than the previous verbal or visual generations” (p. 73). “The millennials do seem unique; they are somehow different than the students who were attending university in the

The literature identifies specific traits of the millennial generation (see Figure 1). Millennials differ from other generations concerning their expectations of colleges and universities. These students have high expectations, along with expectations of much involvement on campus and the same good grades they received in high school. Not only are the expectations different for millennials, the college and university environment is different today (see Figure 2). Howe and Strauss (2000) find that more research is required in tracking the millennial generation as they enter the universities. Merlino (2009) conducted a qualitative study, by interviewing faculty, which expanded the understanding of pedagogies specific to the millennial generation.

A summary of teaching techniques for millennials (Merlino, 2009) is shown in Figure 3. Many of these techniques are the same as those for any generation. However, shifting from a verbal to visual to a VIRTUAL generation requires different strategies.

These studies indicate research is needed that explores the unique pedagogical classroom and online course needs of millennial generation university students. While millennial generation university students require different pedagogical techniques, the literature remains sparse for key pedagogical strategies. “Millennials Report Their Preferred Learning Environment” will add to the body of knowledge concerning pedagogy for the millennial generation.

**Methodology**

A survey was administered to students in 10 sections of the capstone course of the College of Business Administration at

---

**Figure 1. Traits of the Millennial Generation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Main Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traits of the Millenial Generation</td>
<td>The millenial generation was born between 1982 and 2005 (Strauss, 2005.)</td>
<td>Butterfield &amp; Fox (2007); Coomes &amp; DeBard (2004); Howe &amp; Strauss (2000, 2007); Lancaster &amp; Stillman (2002); McGlynn (2006); Obilengen (2003); Proserpio &amp; Gioia (2007); Strauss (2005); Merlino &amp; Rhodes (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millennials are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHELTERED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACHIEVING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRESSURED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEAM-ORIENTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THE MOST ETHNICALLY DIVERSE, AND BORED IN MANY OF TODAY’S COLLEGE CLASSROOMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Key Pedagogical Strategies for Millenial Generation Students in University Business Courses, by N. Merlino, 2009, Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC, p. 88.*

---

**Figure 2. The College and University Environment for Millennials.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Main Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Universities Environment for the Millennial Generation</td>
<td>Student fees have increased substantially. Some universities have doubled or tripled their fees.</td>
<td>Atkinson (2004); Coomes &amp; DeBard (2004); Howe (2005); Howe &amp; Strauss (2000, 2007); Jennings (2007); New Strategists (2001); Wilson (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professors have changed from the familiar teacher role (as a conveyer of knowledge) to the role of the facilitator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The college ratio of men to women has changed drastically, with 57% of bachelor degrees conferred to women in 2004-2005 (Snyder et al., 2007).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial aid has changed from need to merit and from grants to loans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sixty-five percent of students are employed while attending college.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More students are working off-campus, resulting in less study time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from Key Pedagogical Strategies for Millenial Generation Students in University Business Courses, by N. Merlino, 2009, Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC, p. 88.*
Figure 3. Teaching Techniques for Millennials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Main Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Techniques for Millennials</td>
<td>Teaching techniques are usually obtained by mimicking what was experienced in the faculty’s own education.</td>
<td>Beegle &amp; Coffee (1991); Brookfield (1990, 1995); Chickering &amp; Ehrmann (1996); Ericksen (1974); Katz (1988); Kolitch &amp; Dean (1999); Miller (1988); Proserpio &amp; Gioia (2007); Van Eekelen et al. (2006); Willcoxson (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture has been the most used teaching strategy in university classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progressiveness has shifted from a verbal to visual to virtual generation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective teaching techniques are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEING ALERT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SETTING NORMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSING QUESTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEING ENTHUSIASTIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAKING CONNECTIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USING LEARNING GROUPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROVIDE PREPRINTED NOTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CULTIVATING A CARING CLASSROOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DELIVERING APPROPRIATE LECTURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACILITATING RELEVANT DISCUSSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Key Pedagogical Strategies for Millenial Generation Students in University Business Courses, by N. Merlino, 2009, Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC, p. 89.

Figure 4. Online Teaching in Colleges and Universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Main Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Teaching in Colleges and Universities</td>
<td>Changing from “sage on the stage” (Markel, 1999, p. 212) to “guide on the side” (Markel, 1999, p. 214; Williams &amp; Goldberg, 2005, p. 728).</td>
<td>Chin &amp; Williams (2006); Irvine (2004); Markel (1999); Mossavar-Rahmani &amp; Larson-Daugher (2007); Nichols (2003); Proserpio &amp; Gioia (2007); Williams &amp; Goldberg (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-learning is still in its infancy as a body of knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online enrollment is increasing yearly, with 89% of public universities offering online courses in 2000-2001 (Snyder, et al., 2003).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reward system for faculty fails to consider the added time for online class preparation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Key Pedagogical Strategies for Millenial Generation Students in University Business Courses, by N. Merlino, 2009, Ann Arbor: ProQuest LLC, p. 88.

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona. The survey was completed during a regular class meeting of the capstone course during the fall quarter of 2011 and winter quarter of 2012. An “anonymous” study design, one in which it is impossible to trace data or information back to the research subject from whom it was obtained, was used. Every precaution was taken to ensure anonymity of the participants. The survey was administered in the class session immediately following the project approval.

After collection, all data was entered into an Excel spreadsheet. T-tests were run on all hypotheses at the .95 confidence level. Preferred learning environments were identified and ranked. Outcomes included:

- Identify the preferred learning environment for millennial generation students in university business courses as ranked by Millennials.
- Rank, by effectiveness, the preferred learning environment for millennial generation students in university business courses.
- Compare the preferred learning environment identified by male and female millennial generation students.
- Compare the preferred learning environment identified by various ethnic groups of millennial generation students.
- Compare the preferred learning environment identified by various majors of millennial generation students.
- Compare the self-reported characteristics of millennials to the characteristics of millennials as reported in the literature.
- Compare the self-reported characteristics of millennials from different family educational levels.

Findings

The preferred learning environment of millennial generation students in university business classes was identified; in addition, published characteristics
were compared to self-reported characteristics of the millennial generation. Demographic data included: gender, major, age, ethnicity, and college education of parents.

The gender of the participants in the capstone course in the College of Business Administration was 60% male and 40% female. Majors in the study included the following:

- 24% Accounting
- 19% Computer Information Systems
- 8% Finance, Real Estate, and Law
- 18% Management & Human Resources
- 23% International Business & Marketing
- 8% Technology, Operations, eBusiness

Fifty-three percent of the participants have one or both parents with college degrees, while 47% of the participants’ parents do not have college degrees.

**Learning/Teaching Strategies**

The learning/teaching strategies were identified by the millennials as absolutely important, important, nice to have, not important, and absolutely insignificant. Figure 5 displays the most important learning/teaching strategies for millennial generation students as ranked by the millennial generation respondents.

The 44 various learning/teaching strategies were divided into subsections before the data was analyzed. The subsections were: use of online strategies, course structure, learning methods, assignments, assessment, and instructor. The percentages shown are the sum of “Absolutely Important” and “Important,” and are listed from most important to least important.

**Use of online strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Blackboard/course management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Powerpoints posted online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Lecture notes posted online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Interactive media online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Videoconferencing tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Podcasts and webcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Skype-teleconferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Blogs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>Traditional lecture courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Hybrid courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Online courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Active learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Trial-and-error learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Cooperative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>In-class activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Traditional lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>Inquiry-based approaches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>Discovery-based approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Out-of-class activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>Case-based approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Fewer lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Digital storytelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Prompt feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Frequent feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>Opportunities for second chances/make-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Chance to ask for a better grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Little penalty for trial and error learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>Allowing students to self-test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>Teacher publishing the criteria for earning letter grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Seeing faculty during their office hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Instructor knows your name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Instructor helps you manage stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Teacher uses text messaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 displays the learning/teaching strategies ranked least important for a successful learning environment for millennial generation students as ranked by the millennial generation respondents.

The ranking of published millennial characteristics by the respondents are shown in Figure 7. The only published characteristic that the respondents did not agree with was Sheltered. The millennial respondents do not feel that they are sheltered today.

T-tests were run on all hypotheses at the .95 confidence level. Three hypotheses were accepted and two were rejected.
Accept H1—There is no significant difference between the preferred learning environment of male millennial generation students and female millennial generation students.

Accept H2—There is no significant difference between the preferred learning environment of ethnic groups of millennial generation students.

Accept H3—There is no significant difference between the preferred learning environment of millennial generation students in different majors in university business courses.

Reject H4—There is no significant difference the characteristics of millennials as reported by the literature and as reported by millennials.

Reject H5—There is no significant difference between the self-reported characteristics of millennials from different family educational levels.

Conclusions

Millennial generation students have very distinct ideas about what learning/teaching strategies create their successful learning environment. The desired learning/teaching strategies that involve technology are predictable. This generation has been raised with technology. However, the respondents desire for traditional lecture courses over hybrid or online courses doesn’t fit the expected pattern. Especially since 87% feel active learning is important, 82% rank trial-and-error learning important, 75% rank cooperative learning important, and 71% rank in-class activities important. These items seem to be the opposite of traditional lectures. Some strategies such as prompt and frequent feedback are important for any generation.

Most millennial students, regardless of age, gender, major, ethnicity, or parents college education, will benefit from the same preferred learning environment in a classroom, hybrid, or online course.

Millennial generation students whose parents have more college education seem to fit the published characteristics more closely than millennial generation students whose parents have little to no college education.

Some of the strategies listed may not have been used by the students. Video conferencing is not commonly used in the classroom. Therefore, they have no way to know if they prefer those strategies. We tend to like what we use.

The previously published characteristics about millennials were confirmed by our sample, except for one glaring difference. The millennial students surveyed do not feel sheltered.

Recommendations

In order to create a successful learning environment for millennial generation students, the professor must recognize and appreciate the qualities of these students. Fifteen strategies for creating a successful environment include:

- Use Blackboard or another course management system
- Post PowerPoints online
- Post lecture notes online
- Vary assignments and resources
- Use group projects
- Incorporate computer simulations
- Provide prompt feedback
- Provide frequent feedback
- Provide opportunities for second chances/make-up
- Provide chances to ask for a better grade
- Publish the criteria for earning letter grades
- Be available to students by text messaging, office hours, virtual office hours, teleconferencing,
- Know your students’ names
- Help your students manage stress

Recommendations for future research are as follows:

- Many of the published studies are before the recession. Replicate prior research.

---

**Table: Self-Reported Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes and Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Oriented</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Structure</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Experience</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Teamwork</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want Technology</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect involvement on campus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect same good grades as high school</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Compare the younger millennials preferences to the older millennials preferences concerning learning/teaching strategies.

• Compare differences between gender and ethnicities.

• Compare differences between students in various colleges.

• Compare differences between students in various geographic regions.

• Follow the survey with in-depth interviews and/or focus groups to gain more information.
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An Update on AACSB International’s Revision of Its Business Accreditation Standards

by Jerry E. Trapnell, AACSB International

Business schools and management education have experienced phenomenal success and growth since AACSB International was founded in 1916. As AACSB approaches its centennial year, it is appropriate that AACSB reflects not only on the past successes of its accredited business schools, but to focus on the future of business schools. It is in this context that AACSB is preparing to adopt revised accreditation standards next April. The key context for a revision of the standards is that business education is a global phenomenon that has exploded in the last 20-30 years. Today, there are more than 13,500 institutions globally that offer at least a bachelor’s degree in business. Recognizing the global growth in management education, AACSB now accredits 655 institutions in 44 countries and territories. Though the absolute number of AACSB accredited institutions seems large, it still remains less than five percent of the global participants delivering management education. This success is quite current. In 2000, AACSB’s global activities were largely limited to Canada and a few Western European schools. In the last 12 years, student and faculty mobility on a global scale continues to increase and business schools that do not have significant international activities, partnerships, joint programs, etc. are the exception. So, it is natural that AACSB has expanded its global reach across its full range of activities which have also expanded significantly since 2000.

Despite the substantial success of business schools and management education globally, the demands for increasing globalization of management education, the increasing role of technology as a key component and facilitator of delivery of management education, increasing demands for accountability for success of graduates and return on investment for governmental, tuition and philanthropic funding place more demands on business schools than ever before. These demands are exasperated by declining financial support and expectations to “do more with less.” It is in this context that AACSB embarked on a process to update its business and accounting accreditation standards. This process began early 2011 and will continue into 2013 with the goal of an AACSB Accreditation Council vote on revised business and accounting standards at the April 2013 AACSB International Conference and Annual Meeting in accordance with AACSB By-Laws. The remainder of this paper summarizes major concepts that are currently incorporated into an exposure draft of revised AACSB business accreditation standards.

Based on the work of the AACSB’s Blue Ribbon Committee on Accreditation Quality (BRC) to date, it is clear that AACSB accreditation will continue to focus on recognition of business schools that demonstrate overall high quality and continuous improvement in the context of each business school’s mission. That is, mission-driven accreditation based on self-assessment and peer review will remain the cornerstones of AACSB accreditation. However, the BRC has recognized that more must be expected of business schools, and new revised standards must embrace an ever increasing focus on documentation of
success and outcomes to meet increasing demands for accountability for student success and of business school impact. It is no longer acceptable for business schools to just produce significant numbers of graduates or to conduct research for research sake. In this era of increasing accountability and given the rate change as an environmental context for business schools driven by globalization of business and business education, the increasing importance of technology in the conduct of business and business education, the status quo is not acceptable. It is in this spirit that the BRC’s proposed standards will continue to focus on AACSB’s original themes of mission-driven accreditation recognizing overall high quality and continuous improvement but enhance these important dimensions by expecting business schools demonstrate a commitment to innovation, impact, and engagement.

Also key to the standards revision process was that BRC members recognized that any revision process must result in accreditation standards and processes that maintain AACSB’s leadership position among business schools globally. That leadership position demands that AACSB accreditation must do more. AACSB accreditation must not constrain business schools from developing innovative approaches to support their mission. This is not the historical context for most accreditation organizations, but it must be as we move forward. In support of innovation, BRC agreed that the revised standards must demand business schools demonstrate they are making a difference, that is, they have impact. Impact is a broad concept across many dimensions, and business schools have many opportunities to demonstrate impactful outcomes. However, this has not been a broad focus, but must become one in this highly competitive environment of global business education and business activity. Finally, BRC has recognized that for an innovative business school to have positive and substantive impact, it must be broadly engaged with the academic and business communities, bringing together the latest and best of business practice and theory in support of the educational experience delivered to students, scholarship, and other activities carried out by business schools. Therefore, it is in the context of recognizing continuous improvement and overall high quality that BRC concluded future standards must expect business schools to document and demonstrate their commitment to innovation, impact, and engagement in the context of their stated mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies.

In September, BRC issued an exposure draft of the standards which are available to all AACSB member institutions representatives through the AACSB Exchange (see www.aacsb.edu for AACSB Exchange login information). Through the AACSB Exchange, BRC is soliciting feedback on the exposure draft consistent with its broad engagement strategy since inception of the review and revision process. The current exposure draft retains the following fundamentals of AACSB accreditation (AACSB, 2012):

- A continued commitment to mission focus, peer review and professional judgment, and scholarship.
- Reducing the number of standards from 21 to 15, with a resulting document that is more focused, offers increased flexibility, and enhances relevance for business schools now and in the future.
- Supports business schools and business in an environment that is increasingly international, competitive, and dynamic.

Following a section that articulates six eligibility criteria, the exposure draft presents accreditation standards in four major categories as follows:

- Strategic Management and Innovation
- Participants-Students, Faculty and Professional Staff
- Teaching and Learning
- Academic and Professional Engagement

The eligibility criteria include three general requirements and three statements of AACSB core values for which schools must demonstrate alignment. Two major revisions here include a broader, more flexible approach, under certain conditions, to establishing scope of accreditation recognizing the diversity of organizational structures globally offering business degree programs. The eligibility criteria incorporate a focus on demonstrating a functioning, collegiate business school and expands the ethical behavior expectations to address environmental sustainability.

The Strategic Management and Innovation standards continue AACSB’s focus on mission-driven accreditation processes and outcomes. The revised standards do raise expectations for business schools to incorporate a focus on innovation in support of mission achievement. The articulated mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies should describe the business school’s distinctive focus areas and how the business school expects to have an impact as it creates opportunities for innovation. This section of the standards continues AACSB’s expectation that scholarship and intellectual contribution outcomes must be a component of all accredited business school strategies. The revised standards raise expectations that business schools articulate the impact of its scholarship outcomes that move beyond a simple counting of intellectual contributions. The standard is supported by an articulation of possible examples of impact that are flexible and allow business schools to indicate how they are “making a difference.” The standards demand a clear articulation of appropriate financial strategies and other key resources (human, physical, infrastructure, etc.) that provide context and support for mission achievement and success.

The participant standards provide continued focus on business schools attracting and supporting appropriately qualified students throughout their academic program. Faculty sufficiency as currently articulated in the existing standards continues to be an important
expectation as well as the importance of appropriate faculty management policies and strategies supporting faculty development and deployment. New standards are added to address the importance of quality student-to-student and student-to-faculty interactions along with faculty-to-faculty interactions in support of high quality learning experiences. Recognizing the increasing importance of professional staff in support of mission achievement, a standard is added to address the deployment of appropriate and sufficient professional staff in key areas of business school activities to include technology and instructional program support.

The Teaching and Learning standards address curricula management and assessment and provide broad guidelines for curricula content for undergraduate through research doctoral degree programs. New standards are introduced relating expectations for the assessment, and development of high quality classroom teaching and program structure expectations are articulated. This set of standards recognizes the increasing importance of technology-enhanced instruction including fully distance-delivered modes and applies the standards to all delivery modes deployed by business schools articulating quality expectations in all such cases. Direct assessment of student learning is retained but placed in the context of overall curricula management strategies recognizing that curricula change and development may be influenced by a variety of external and internal factors including assessment of student learning. The standards also recognize that many business schools function within a prescribed program assessment environment. In such cases, the standards allow such assessments to be used to support continuous improvement if documented to be equivalent to the spirit and intent of the standards.

The Academic and Professional Engagement Standards incorporate the current focus on the importance of the deployment of qualified faculty in support of the business school mission. However, the revised standards reframe the faculty development expectations in terms of academic and/or professional engagement to support and document the currency and relevancy of the intellectual capital of the faculty in support of their teaching role and in support of the broader business school mission. The foundation of this group of standards is the expectation that high quality business schools are engaged with the academic and professional communities to ensure that business programs, research, and other activities reflect the latest in business theory and practice. Student engagement is addressed outlining expectations for students to be involved in active, engaged, experiential learning activities that can include curricular, co-curricular, and/or extracurricular experiences. Such experiences as field research, consulting projects, internships, study-abroad experiences, etc. are examples of various student engagement activities that may be used to support student engagement. Finally, a new standard is added for business schools that are involved in engagement activities through executive education programs that do not lead to a business degree. Though not mandated, if a business school conducts non-degree executive education, this is envisioned as an excellent form of professional engagement for faculty. The standard outlines expectations for quality assessment and improvement based on customer satisfaction as well as articulation of how executive education activities are resourced and supported. Faculty qualifications continue to be a key focus and the revised standards expand on the current focus on documenting “academically and professionally qualified” faculty by providing additional categories of qualified faculty. These categories recognize a variety of avenues for development activities supporting intellectual capital maintenance including examples of a variety of academic and/or professional engagement activities that are intended but not clearly articulated in the current standards.

As noted earlier, BRC’s goal is to place revised standards before the Accreditation Council for a vote next April. It should be noted that parallel processes are underway to revise accreditation forms, templates, etc. that support the accreditation process adapting these to the revised standards. Also, extensive educational programming is being planned and developed for business school leaders and faculty. A key question focuses on the transition plan for schools to adopt and apply the new standards. Currently, the transition plan calls for schools having accreditation reviews in 2013-14 to remain on the current standard unless they chose to adopt the new standards. For schools with reviews in 2014-15, the same option will be available. For reviews scheduled for 2015-16, all schools are expected to be on the new standards.

Finally, feedback and input are keys to the successful standards revision process. Business school leaders and faculty of AACSB member institutions are encouraged to review the exposure draft, participate in other opportunities to learn about the proposed standards and provide input and recommendations for improvement. A high level of engagement will ensure that the standards that are submitted to the AACSB Accreditation Council reflect our best thinking and continue to support AACSB accreditation as the global leader in business school quality assurance bringing value and critical recognition to those institutions that hold AACSB Accreditation.

Endnotes
1. The opinions and interpretations expressed in this paper are solely those of the author.
2. The AACSB Accreditation Council is comprised of all institutions that hold AACSB Accreditation.
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The digital format allows readers to easily page through the magazine, preview an entire issue at once, and zoom in on any page at will. This versatile option also allows readers to email individual pages, both editorial and advertisements and share information with colleagues or contact vendors as well as click on internet links to gather more information.

Analytics is published by INFORMS the Institute for Operations Research and the Management Sciences. INFORMS is the world’s largest membership society dedicated to the analytics profession. The society publishes 12 scholarly journals and a membership magazine, organizes national and international conferences, bestows awards and prizes, and arranges for efficient communication and networking among analytics professionals.
Decision Sciences Journal: An Update

by Asoo J. Vakharia, Editor, University of Florida

It has been another outstanding year for the Decision Sciences Journal (DSJ). As in the past, the journal has received extensive support from the Board of Directors of the Decision Sciences Institute, the publisher Wiley-Blackwell, and the Warrington College of Business Administration at the University of Florida. In addition, with the dedicated service of the Senior and Associate Editors, and an outstanding set of reviewers, we have been able to continue to build and maintain the journal as an outlet of choice for active researchers in operations and supply chain management (O&SCM) and information systems and technology (IS&T). Beginning with our February 2012 issue, the journal is now published six times each year (previously we were publishing quarterly). Hence, we will now be able to disseminate research articles at a quicker pace.

Editorial Team

For 2011–2012, we operated with a team of six Senior Editors: Professor Kurt Bretthauer (Indiana University); Professor Paulo Goes (University of Arizona); Professor Manoj Malhotra (University of South Carolina), Professor K.K. Sinha (University of Minnesota); Professor Cheri Speier-Pero (Michigan State University) and Professor Nallan C. Suresh (University at Buffalo). In addition to these individuals, we expanded the team of Associate Editors to include other eminent researchers (Table 1 lists each AE who served in 2011–2012 and their affiliation). It is only through the support and dedication of these individuals that we have been able to maintain and enhance the quality of the review process for the journal while providing detailed and constructive feedback for each paper reviewed by the editorial team. Finally, the service of reviewers to the journal has been outstanding and will be recognized in the last issue of each calendar year (i.e., all reviewers for all papers reviewed between July 1, 2011, and June 30, 2012, will be recognized in Vol. 43, No. 6, of the DSJ, to be published in December, 2012).

Journal Submissions and Outcomes

There have been a total of 651 submissions (548 original submissions and 103 revised submissions) to the journal since we launched our online system in January 2011. As of August 13, 2012, the statistics of relevance related to these submissions are as follows:

- Accepted (or conditionally accepted) for publication: 48 articles (7.4%);
- Revisions Invited (in process with authors): 110 articles (16.9%);
- Rejected: 419 articles (64.4%); and
- Currently in the review process: 74 articles (11.4%).

Review Process and Cycle Time

For the original submissions which have reached decisions (489 of 548, as of August 13, 2012), the cycle time for first round feedback is as follows:

- Average cycle time: 91 days;
- Percentage of papers processed within 75 days: 34%; and
- Percentage of papers processed within 105 days: 70%.

Focused Issues of DSJ

At this point in time, we are planning to publish two focused issues of the journal in 2014:
• Responsible Purchasing and Supply Practices (Co-Senior Editors: Christopher Seow, Joseph Sarkis, Martin Lockström, and Thomas Callarman): We hope to make final decisions on these manuscripts by June 30, 2013. Papers that are accepted for publication for this focused issue will be published during 2014.

• Management of Innovation Within and Across Borders (Co-Senior Editors: Janice Carrillo, Cheryl Druehl, and Juliana Hsuan): We hope to make final decisions on these manuscripts by December 1, 2013. Papers that are accepted for publication for this focused issue will be published during 2014.

Due to the substantial increase in the number of focused issue proposals, we have developed a process for evaluating these on an annual basis (focused issue proposal form is available at http://warrington.ufl.edu/departments/isom/dsj/focused.asp).

Annual Recognition

At the 2011 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute (held in Boston, MA), the following Associate Editors and Reviewers were recognized for their service to the journal:

- Apurva Jain, Ray Patterson, and Johnny Rungtusanatham were recognized as Outstanding Associate Editors for 2010–2011.
- Greg Heim, Christopher Craighead, and Jennifer Blackhurst were recognized as Outstanding Reviewers for 2010–2011.

In addition, the paper by Khawaja A. Saeed, Manoj K. Malhotra, and Varun Grover for their article “Interorganizational System Characteristics and Supply Chain Integration: An Empirical Assessment” (Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 7–42) was selected as the best paper published in DSJ in 2010-2011.

Impact Factors and Journal Quality

One of the many factors which can be used to validate the quality and/or impact of a journal is the impact factor (IF) determined by the ISI Web of Knowledge based on the journal citation reports (JCR). Although we all recognize that measures of quality based on citations are subject to debate, this IF is frequently used by external constituencies. The annual IF for leading O&SCM and IS&T journals for 2009-2011 are given in Table 1.

There is no question of the significant drop in the IF for DSJ in 2011 as compared to 2010. On the other hand, it is also obvious that the annual IF for all journals was substantially lower in 2011 as compared to 2010. In order to investigate these significant changes in the 2011 IF, we obtained a detailed report from the publisher. Our analysis of this report led to the following conclusions:

- First, an analysis of the annual impact factor is reflective of a myopic focus since it could be the result of a one-time occurrence such as the publication of a single paper which might be extensively cited.
- Second, the IF has primarily been used to develop rankings and it has been noted that by using the annual IF, rankings change substantially from year to year.
- Finally, there was an observed trend (discussed widely among journal editors) where by following unethical practices, certain journals were able to increase their IF. In response to this, a group of editors initiated the development of a voluntary code of conduct (http://editorethics.unc.edu/Index.aspx) which has been affirmed by a significant number of journal editors.

Informal discussions with several editors of other respected journals and with several Senior and Associate Editors of DSJ were also initiated regarding the best use of IF as a proxy for journal quality and/or impact. The overwhelming consensus was that in addition to the annual IF, we should also consider and track the 5-year IF shown in Table 2.

This table reflects the remarkable consistency in the ranking of DSJ among the set of peer journals. It is worth noting that we are well positioned relative to Management Science (especially in 2010 and 2011); in O&SCM, we are consistently ranked second, while in IS&T, we are since consistently ranked third. Finally, among the set of all management journals included in the ISI list, DSJ is ranked 21st (2009); 23rd (2010); and 29th (2011).

### Table 1. Impact factors and journal quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONS/SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>2011 IF</th>
<th>2010 IF</th>
<th>2009 IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Operations Management (JOM)</td>
<td>4.382</td>
<td>5.093</td>
<td>3.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing &amp; Service Operations Mgt (M&amp;8OM)</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>2.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production &amp; Operations Management Journal (POMS)</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>1.851</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION SYSTEMS/TECHNOLOGY</th>
<th>2011 IF</th>
<th>2010 IF</th>
<th>2009 IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIS Quarterly (MISO)</td>
<td>4.447</td>
<td>5.041</td>
<td>4.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Research (ISR)</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>1.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Information Systems (JMIS)</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>2.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROSS DISCIPLINARY</th>
<th>2011 IF</th>
<th>2010 IF</th>
<th>2009 IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Science (MS)</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>2.221</td>
<td>2.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Sciences (DSJ)</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>2.233</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Impact factors and journal quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 IF</th>
<th>2010 IF</th>
<th>2009 IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATIONS/SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Operations Management (JOM)</td>
<td>6.012</td>
<td>6.029</td>
<td>4.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing &amp; Service Operations Mgt (M&amp; SOM)</td>
<td>2.356</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production &amp; Operations Management Journal (POMS)</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>3.147</td>
<td>2.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION SYSTEMS/TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS Quarterly (MISQ)</td>
<td>7.497</td>
<td>9.821</td>
<td>9.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Research (ISR)</td>
<td>4.131</td>
<td>5.458</td>
<td>4.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Management Information Systems (JMIS)</td>
<td>2.945</td>
<td>4.054</td>
<td>3.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROSS DISCIPLINARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Science (MS)</td>
<td>3.304</td>
<td>3.966</td>
<td>4.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Sciences (DSJ)</td>
<td><strong>3.146</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.937</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.276</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concluding Thoughts

The focus of the *DSJ* will continue to be the publication of exemplary and rigorous research addressing business decisions primarily in the areas of O&SCM and IS&T. At this point in time, we do not plan to implement major editorial changes for the journal. Of course, there have been minor changes in the group of Associate Editors since a few did make the decision to take a break from their duties to *DSJ*. We were able to recruit additional AE’s to replace these individuals effective July 1 and the revised list of AE’s is available at [http://warrington.ufl.edu/departments/isom/dsj/team.asp](http://warrington.ufl.edu/departments/isom/dsj/team.asp).

Another priority of the journal is to continue to expand the reach of *DSJ* internationally. As editor, I represented the journal at the 3rd Annual Meeting of the European Decision Sciences Institute in Istanbul, Turkey held in June 2012 and also participated in journal-related panel discussions at other international conferences. Relevant information for the journal was disseminated at both international meetings and we have been successful in recruiting international scholars to serve as Associate Editors for the journal. I will continue with these initiatives and will share the outcomes in my journal update next year.

I look forward to sharing more information on the journal with the DSI community at the upcoming Annual Meeting in San Francisco. I do hope you will continue to provide the strong support to the journal not only by submitting your best work but also by helping to referee submitted manuscripts. *DSJ* continues to be an excellent outlet for disseminating both theoretical and practical research and I hope that we can work together to maintain and enhance its reputation within our community.

Join us at the San Francisco Marriott Marquis for DSI’s 2012 annual meeting!
Focused Issue on “Responsible Purchasing and Supply Practices”

New Extended Deadline: October 31, 2012

Focused Issue Co-Senior Editors:
Christopher Seow (Royal Docks Business School, University of East London and Cass Business School, City University, UK)
Joseph Sarkis (Clark University, USA)
Martin Lockström (China Europe International Business School, Shanghai, China).

Motivation

There is a growing consensus that organizations should not only be managed efficiently, but also behave responsibly. The adoption of the general notion of corporate social and environmental responsibility has become well established within the global business community over the past decade. Environmental responsibility can be defined as actions that seek to limit, ameliorate, or prevent damage to the existing natural environment caused from a company’s activities. It may also include efforts to improve the quality or quantity of environmental resources. The wider issue of corporate social responsibility includes a diverse range of areas, including compliance, governance, and impacts on developing markets.

A fundamental, yet less explored aspect of responsibility is responsible purchasing and supply. This deals broadly with business-supplier relationships and is integral to innovation and success—but it through market efficiencies, responses to change or innovation, or the introduction of technological, social and institutional processes, including new business models.

While the rhetoric around responsible purchasing and supply for sustainable development may be well developed, research into this aspect is, at best, at an exploratory stage. Investigation into this area requires new knowledge—and possibly departures from existing assumptions—and its integration into established business models, processes and routines. At the extreme, it may involve the reconfiguration of established business thinking and development of new business models that redraw businesses’ traditional supplier and sourcing relationships.

In line with the policy of DSJ, we welcome submissions which analyze the problem of interest using any appropriate methodological research tool(s). In addition, papers that focus on developed or emergent economies and new or established industries are also of interest. Suggested themes for contributed papers are:

- Sustainable Procurement
- Supply-Chain Related Agency Problems
- Stakeholder Roles and Relationships in Responsible Sourcing
- Social Considerations in Ethical Business
- Roles of Ethics in Developing Customer/Stakeholder Loyalty
- Responsible Purchasing and Supply for Increased Competitiveness
- Monitoring and Safeguarding Compliance
- Issues of Governance in Sustainable Procurement
- Impact of Developing and Emerging Markets on Sustainability
- Buyer-Supplier Relationships
- Behavioral and Corporate Citizenship

This list is obviously non-exhaustive and hence, we also welcome other research related to the theme of the focused issue.

Review Process and Deadlines

Manuscripts for the focused issue should be submitted by carefully reviewing the guidelines available at decisionsciencesjournal.org/authors.asp. All authors submitting a manuscript (all submissions must be through mc.manuscriptcentral.com/dsj) should indicate that it is for a focused issue on “Responsible Purchasing and Supply Practices.”

The deadlines for this focused issue are:

- October 31, 2012
  Submission deadline for initial submissions
- December 15, 2012
  First-round decisions on all submitted manuscripts
- March 1, 2013
  Submission deadline for invited revisions
- June 30, 2013
  Final decisions
Focused Issue on “Management of Innovation Within and Across Borders”

Submission Deadline: January 31, 2013

Focused Issue Co-Senior Editors:
Janice Carrillo (University of Florida, USA)
Cheryl Druehl (George Mason University, USA)
Juliana Hsuan (Copenhagen Business School, Denmark)

Innovation is an integral part of every firm’s ongoing operations. While new product and service creation is an essential task to ensure a firm’s immediate success in the marketplace, process and supply chain innovations can also create a unique source of competitive advantage for the future. Encouraging innovative thinking, developing new innovations, and managing the processes by which those innovations are developed are critical aspects of today’s firm. Consequently, research which aids in the creation and maintenance of innovative firms is an important topic of inquiry for the operations management (OM) and information systems (IS) communities.

The objective of this focused issue is to encourage rigorous and relevant research on the management of innovation. We invite authors to submit papers that address the topic of innovation within and across borders. Recognizing and celebrating the complex nature of innovation processes, the term “borders” in this context can denote a firm’s (i) value chains, (ii) functional boundaries, (iii) corporate boundaries, and (iv) geographic borders.

We seek papers that address contemporary topics and have the potential to create a new foundation for the management of innovation in the future. We are particularly interested in the processes which underlie innovation. The papers may draw from one or more methodologies, including analytical, empirical, and conceptual approaches. Multi-disciplinary papers are encouraged, as long as they adhere to the editorial guidelines established for DSJ.

Suggestions for potential topics include, but are not limited to, the following:

Innovation Within a Value Chain:
- Process innovation
- Business model innovation
- New product development
- New service design
- Innovation in performance management
- Behavioral practices innovation
- Innovations in social responsibility
- R&D management
- Information technology systems

Innovation Across Functions:
- Entrepreneurship
- Finance
- Information systems
- Operations management
- Marketing
- Strategy
- Organizational behavior

Innovation Across Company and Geographic Borders:
- Supply chain innovation
- Dispersed innovation
- Cross-cultural views of innovation
- Innovation and globalization
- Development of tools to facilitate inter-company innovation

The anticipated deadlines for this focused issue are:
- January 31, 2013
  Submission deadline for initial submissions
- April 30, 2013
  First-round decision deadline on all submitted manuscripts
- July 31, 2013
  Submission deadline for invited revisions
- December 1, 2013
  Final decisions

decisionsciencesjournal.org/
Institute Meetings

■ The 43rd Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 17-20, 2012, at the San Francisco Marriott Marquis in San Francisco, CA. Submission deadlines have passed. For more information, contact Program Chair Thomas Choi at thomas.choi@asu.edu.

www.decisionsciences.org

■ The 44th Annual Meeting of the Institute will be held November 16-19, 2013, at the Marriott Baltimore Waterfront in Baltimore, Maryland. For more information, contact Program Chair Funda Sahin at fsahin@uh.edu.

■ The 12th Annual International DSI and 18th Annual Asia-Pacific DSI Region will hold a joint annual meeting at the Courtyard Marriott, Nusa Dua, Bali, Indonesia, July 9-13.

idsi13.org

■ The European Region will hold its 4th annual conference June 16-19, 2013, in Budapest, Hungary, at the Hotel Sofitel Budapest Chain Bridge. Submission deadline is March 4, 2013.

www.edsi2013.org

■ The 7th Annual Meeting of the Indian Subcontinent will be held in Hyderabad, India, December 27-29, 2012, at IBS. Submission deadline has passed.

www.ibshyderabad.org/conference/ISDSI-IBS

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

■ The Midwest Region will hold its 2013 Annual Meeting on April 18-20, at the Kent State Regional Center. Program Chair is Joseph Muscatoello: jmuscate@kent.edu

■ The Northeast Region will hold its 2013 Annual Meeting on April 5-7, at the New York Marriott at the Brooklyn Bridge in New York City. Submission deadline has passed.

www.nedsi.org

■ The Southeast Region will hold its 2013 Annual Meeting on February 20-22, at the DoubleTree in the historic district of Charleston, SC. Paper submission deadline has passed. Submission deadline for students is November 2.

www.sedsi.org

■ The Southwest Region will hold its 2013 Annual Meeting on March 12-16, at the Albuquerque Convention Center in Albuquerque, NM. Submission deadline has passed.

www.nedsi.org

■ The Western Region will hold its 2013 Annual Meeting on March 26-29, at the Long Beach Renaissance Hotel, Long Beach, CA. Submission deadline has passed.

www.wdsinet.org

Call for Papers

Conferences

■ International Masaryk Conference organized by MAGNANIMITAS Association will be held in The Czech Republic on December 27-29, 2012. The conference is intended to gain academics and Ph.D. students representing universities from European countries as well as representatives of academic institutions and companies. Applications are due December 3, 2012; paper deadline is December 4, 2012.


■ The 3rd International Workshop on Model-driven Approaches for Simulation Engineering (part of the Symposium on Theory of Modeling and Simulation) will be in San Diego, CA. Submission deadline is November 1, 2012.

www.sel.uniroma2.it/Mod4Sim13

■ The 30th Anniversary Pan-Pacific Conference will be held June 3 - 6, 2013, in Johannesburg, South Africa, in collaboration with the University of Johannesburg. The theme of the Conference is “Forging the Legacies of Emerging Economies.” Submission deadline for Papers/Proposals is February 15, 2013.

www.panpacificbusiness.org

■ The 15th International Conference on Electronic Commerce will be held in Turku, Finland. A special attention will be paid to the theme of Effective, Agile and Trusted co-created eServices. Submission deadline is March 16, 2013.

www.icec.net

Publications

■ Decision Sciences Journal is publishing a focused issue on “Responsible Purchasing and Supply Practices.” Initial submission deadline has been extended to October 31, 2012. See page 22 of this newsletter for more information.

■ Decision Sciences Journal is publishing a focused issue on “Management of Innovation Within and Across Borders.” Submission deadline is January 13, 2013. See page 23 of this newsletter for more information.

■ The Journal of Business Logistics will publish a special topic forum on strategic sourcing and performance. Submission window is November 15 - December 31, 2012. Email guest editors: cwc13@psu.edu, ketchda@auburn.edu, or tcrook@utk.edu.

■ The Journal of Operations Management will publish a special issue on “Service Triads.” relationships between buying organization, service provider, and the buying organization’s customer can be viewed as a “service triad.” Submission deadline is April 1, 2013.

wpcarey.asu.edu/JOM/upload/BehOpsSpecialIssue2010.pdf

More conferences and calls for papers are listed on our website: www.decisionsciences.org/conferences/default.asp
2012 Program Chair’s Message

THOMAS Y. CHOI, Arizona State University

Globalization—Working Together and Celebrating Our Differences

We want to give you a heads-up for a new initiative we are trying out this year. That is the “Track Caucuses.” This initiative is largely designed to provide some continuity from this year to next year. You will meet like-minded scholars there that share common research interests. Please keep your eyes open for this event. The track chairs of this year and next year have been asked to come and lead the caucus. We intend to provide food.

In addition, the 2012 DSI Annual Meeting will feature exciting plenary talks by leading professionals and academics. Stuart Kauffman, whose talk is “Beyond Entailing Laws: The Illusion in our Habit of Control and the Promise of a Habit of Enablement,” is an American theoretical biologist and complex systems researcher concerning the origin of life on Earth. Jeffrey K. Liker’s talk is entitled “The Myth of Top Down Decision Making: Distributed Problem Solving at Toyota.” He is professor of industrial and operations engineering at the University of Michigan and is the author of The Toyota Way, an international best seller. Jack Meredith will speak on “OM Journal Research vis-à-vis Managerial Decisions: Where Are We?” He is a professor and distinguished scholar at Wake Forest University, and a former editor of Journal of Operations Management.

In addition, this year we will have Theme-Based Showcase Sessions from five different continents. The session on Africa will highlight research challenges and opportunities in the African continent. Australia’s session will present challenges and opportunities faced in Australia. North America’s session is about the return of manufacturing previously sourced to other continents. Asia’s session will address emerging trends and managerial challenges on that continent. And South America’s session will address sustainable supply chains particularly in agro-industry, a cornerstone in many South American economies.

For more details, see the conference website at www.decisionsciences.org/Annualmeeting.
DSI 2012 Annual Meeting Keynote Presentations

The 2012 DSI Annual Meeting will feature these exciting plenary talks by leading professionals and academics in the decision sciences.

Stuart Kauffman on “Beyond Entailing Laws”: The Illusion in Our Habit of Control and the Promise of a Habit of Enablement”

Jeffrey K. Liker on “The Myth of Top Down Decision Making: Distributed Problem Solving at Toyota”

Jack Meredith on “OM Journal Research vis-à-vis Managerial Decisions: Where Are We?”

Critically, no one can prestate the emergence of the Turing Machine, Google, or the Arab Spring. Thus, not only do we not know what WILL happen, we often do not know even what CAN happen. In this context, the 1950’s style General Motor top down management fails, for we do not know the ever new variables that become relevant, thus cannot optimize over a strategy space we cannot prestate. In its place we need to explore the promise of a habit of enablement.

Stuart Alan Kauffman is an American theoretical biologist and complex systems researcher concerning the origin of life on Earth. In 2010, he joined the University of Vermont faculty.

The stereotype of corporate decision making features the lone CEO making decisions executed by the corporation as if organizations are computers and executives need only pick the right software and program it. In reality organizations are complex social systems, and decisions at the top are only loosely related to organizational processes and their outputs. This presentation will use Toyota as an example.

Jeffrey K. Liker is Professor of Industrial and Operations Engineering at the University of Michigan. He is author of The Toyota Way, which speaks to the underlying philosophy that drives Toyota’s quality and efficiency-obsessed culture.

Beginning with a review of the research history of our field and the role of various journals in our research evolution, the focus will then shift to managerial decision making, including where we’ve been and where we are today. From there, we will explore some possible futures for research and its impact on managerial decisions, with a brief final “plug” for more case and field research.

Jack Meredith is a professor at Wake Forest University. He was the editor-in-chief of the Journal of Operations Management from 1994-2002 and more recently was the founding and co-editor-in-chief of the journal Operations Management Research from 2005-2011.

Theme-Based Showcase Session—Africa

by Adegoke Oke, Arizona State University

DSI’s theme-based session on Africa at the DSI 2012 meeting is an interactive panel-led discussion that will be focused on highlighting the research challenges and opportunities in the African continent. Despite the stagnant growth in Western economies, Africa continues to enjoy robust growth. Yet, academics and practitioners in the West, especially in the U.S., know little about Africa, and have a lot of misconceptions about operating there. In line with the theme of the 2012 conference “Globalization: Working Together and Celebrating our Differences,” this session will bring together academics and practitioners from different cultures and with diverse experience in operating and doing research in Africa.

Specifically, some of the issues that this interactive panel-based session will address include the following:

1. What are the challenges and opportunities for decision sciences researchers in Africa?
2. Doing research in Africa
   - Learning by doing—what can we learn from the China experience in terms of doing research in an emerging market?
   - What are potential research issues and topics?

- Opportunities and challenges?
- Data availability and access issues
- Potential partners/collaborations
- How to go about it

3. Africa—“the dark continent?” Or the next location for low-cost manufacturing/commodity manufacturing operations?

For more information, contact Africa Theme-based Session Coordinator:
Adegoke Oke
Dept of Supply Chain Management
W.P. Carey School of Business
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-4706
480-965-3105
adeloke@asu.edu
Reshoring and the Competitiveness of North American Manufacturing Supply Networks. Reshoring is a topical movement in both the United States and Canada with an evolving role for Mexico in the North American Free Trade zone. The impetus for North American firms to source from emerging economies on other continents is eroding. Aside from macroeconomic forces, four trends are transforming the competitive landscape for individual firms. First changes in the price and availability of labour, energy and materials require changes in sourcing strategies in order to achieve profit and grow targets. Second, product and process technology continues to evolve in many industries to a “third generation” of manufacturing - an evolution that favors workforces that are able to understand and implement new sophisticated technologies. Third, firms are rediscovering the importance of flexible and resilient supply networks to better serve their customers. Finally, softwares are emerging to help firms aggregate the impact of all of these factors and make holistic decisions. In this session we focus on understanding the drivers of change, the implications for management, and the establishment of a research agenda focused on manufacturing and supply network strategy.

Our panelists include:
- Paul Ciani, VP Operations, Stoke Ltd., a Silicon Valley start-up. www.stoke.com
- Kevin O’Brien, CEO and President of Energy Commercialization, LLC www.energycommercialization.com

For further information, please contact:
Dr. David A. Johnston
Shulich School of Business
York University, Toronto, Canada
johnston@rogers.com
Theme-Based Showcase Session—South America

by Edgar Blanco, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Ely Paive, Fundacao Getulio Vargas, Sao Paulo

In this panel we will learn about sustainable supply chains in the region. Agroindustry is a cornerstone of several economies in South America. The panelists will describe the operations, strategies and "performance" of global competitive supply chains in South America. The discussion will include the panelists’ perspectives on the long-term sustainability of these industries.

Initially, we will present the topic broadly. Afterwards, two invited speakers will briefly summarize their positions (15 minutes). The questions that we plan to discuss:

- What are the current constraints and achievements in the cases presented?
- How is the triple bottom sustainability present in the cases presented?
- What are the future challenges for sustainable supply chains in the region from a global competition perspective?

For more information on this session, contact the co-chairs:

Edgar Blanco, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, eblanco@mit.edu.

Ely Paive, Fundacao Getulio Vargas, Sao Paulo, ely.paiva@fgv.br.
2012 DSI Annual Meeting Awards

DENNIS E. GRAWOIG DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD
TBA

2012 FELLOWS
Soumen Ghosh, Georgia Institute of Technology
Timothy L. Smunt, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

BEST APPLICATION AWARD
Winner:
The Relationship between Lean Supply Chain Strategy and Supplier Integration and Competitive Capabilities in Thailand’s Automotive Suppliers?
Suntichai Kotcharin, Manchester Business School
Steve Eldridge, Manchester Business School
James Freeman, Manchester Business School

Honorable Mention:
Facility Layout at McNeil Warehouse Goodwill Industries
Clara Novoa, Texas State University
Nhi Mai, Texas State University

BEST INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH PAPER
Winner:
Cloud Computing: Supply Chain Applications and Implementation Issues—An Agent-Based Simulation Approach
Yang Yu, Texas Tech University
Dara Gale Schniederjans, Texas Tech University
Qing Cao, Tech University

Honorable Mention:
Role of Goals on Six Sigma Project Performance Through Knowledge Creation: A Moderator Mediation Analysis
Arunugam Velaayudan, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK
Jiju Antony, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

BEST THEORETICAL/EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AWARD
Winner:
Co-Production and Co-Creation of Value: A Differential Games Approach
Emre M. Demirezen, Texas A&M University
Subodha Kumar, Texas A&M University
Bala Shetty, Texas A&M University

Honorable Mention:
Role of Goals on Six Sigma Project Performance Through Knowledge Creation: A Moderator Mediation Analysis
Arunugam Velaayudan, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK
Jiju Antony, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

BEST STUDENT PAPER
Winner:
Product Innovative Supply Chains: The Role of Strategy and Buyer-Supplier Interface
Shakeel Sadiq Jajja, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan
Shaukat Ali Brah, Karachi School for Business & Leadership, Pakistan
Syed Zahoor Hassan, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan

ELWOOD S. BUFFA DOCTORAL DISSERTATION AWARD WINNERS
(Con-sponsored by Hercher Publishing, Inc. and Decision Sciences Institute)
Winner:
Alan Mackelprang, Georgia Southern University
Beyond Firm Boundaries: Exploring the Interdependence Between Supply Chain Partners
Advisor and Degree-granting Institution: Manoj Malhotra, University of South Carolina

Honorable Mentions:
Michael Dixon, Naval Postgraduate School
Membership-Based Loyalty Programs in Services: Operational and Marketing Implications
Advisor and Degree-granting Institution: Rohit Verma, School of Hotel Administration, Cornell University
Gang Li, Bentley University
A Decision Model for Designing and Integrating Back-Office and Front-Office Service Operations
Advisor and Degree-granting Institution: Anant Balakrishnan, University of Texas - Austin
Xiaoqing (Kristine) Xie, Shanghai University of Finance & Economic Selling and Pricing on Online Opaque Channels
Advisor and Degree-granting Institution: Chris Anderson, School of Hotel Administration, Cornell University

INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION AWARD COMPETITION
(Con-sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta (the national honorary in the decision sciences), Prentice Hall, and Decision Sciences Institute)
Finalists:
A Cross-Functional Systems Project in an IS Capstone Course
Michael Maloni, Kennesaw State University
Pamila Dembla, Kennesaw State University
Tony Swaim, Kennesaw State University
Cultivating Student Global Competence: A Pilot Experimental Study
Yulong Li, Roger Williams University
Distant yet Near: Interdisciplinary Collaboration and Learning between Engineering and Business Students through Socially Responsible Projects
Monica Adya, Marquette University
Bryan Temple, Glasgow Caledonian University
Donald Hepburn, Glasgow Caledonian University
Operations Reality Show: An Experiential Service Learning and Storytelling Project
Xin Ding, University of Houston

See AWARDS, next page
BEST CASE COMPETITION
Finalists:
Deploying Sustainability at Solea
  Sinan Erzurumlu, Babson College
Salvation Army—Dallas ARC
  Arunachalam Narayanan (University of Houston)
Shanghai Baolong Automotive Corporation
  H Brian Hwarng, Business School, National University of Singapore
  Xuexuan Yuan, National University of Singapore

DISTINGUISHED TRACK PAPERS
Accounting and Finance
  Payout Policy, Ownership Structure, Taxation, and Corporate Value: Evidence from Brazil
  Jefferston Colombo, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul

Decision Making and Problem Solving (MS/OR/Statistics)
  Classification of Customer Complaints Using Latent Dirichlet Allocation
  Leticia H. Anaya, University of North Texas
  Nicholas Evangelopoulos, University of North Texas

Healthcare Management
  Linking Innovation Orientation, Supply Chain Management, and Customer-Centered Outcomes: A Study of USA Hospitals
  David D. Dobrzykowski, University of Toledo
  Stephen K. Callaway, University of Toledo
  Mark A Vonderembse, The University of Toledo

Innovative Education
  Norming of Student Evaluations of Instruction: Impact of Non-Instructional Factors
  Satish Nargundkar, Georgia State University
  Milind Shrikhande, Georgia State University

Information Technology
  Using Cloud Computing Service: A Perspective from Users’ Information Security, Privacy Concern and Trust
  Andree Emmanuel Widjaja, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
  Jengchung Victor Chen, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan

Logistics and Distribution
  The Transmission of Disruptions in Supply Chains: Is There a Snowball Effect?
  Artur Swierczek, University of Economics

Management Strategies and Organization Behavior and Theories
  The Impact of IT-enabled Business Flexibility and Its Integration on the Acquirer’s Post-M&A Performance
  Jose Benitez-Amado, University of Granada
  Gautam Ray, University of Minnesota

Manufacturing Operations Management
  A Model for Supply Chain Risk Resiliency Measurement and Planning
  Kanchan Das, East Carolina University
  R.S. Lashkari, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada

Marketing and Cross-Functional Interface
  Is Trust a Cardinal Virtue?
  Ram Kesavan, University of Detroit Mercy
  Michael Bernacchi of University of Detroit Mercy

Product/Process Innovation and Project Management
  Product Design Effectiveness and the Market Value of the Firm: An Empirical Assessment
  Yusen Xia, Georgia State University
  G. Peter Zhang, Georgia State University

Quality Management and Lean Operations
  Modeling Management in Lean Production Environments:
    A Study of Italian SMEs
    Arnoaldo Camuñfo, Bocconi University
    Fabrizio Gerli, Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia

Service Operations Management
  U.S. Touristic Clusters: The Impact of the Geographic Effect on Hotel’s Economic Performance
  Angel Peiro-Signes, Universitat Politecnica de Valencia
  Maria-del-Val Segarra-Ona, Universitat Politecnica de Valencia
  Rohit Verma, Cornell University, School of Hotel Administration

Supply Management
  Developing the Commercial Capital of Buyer Firms for Supplier Innovation: A Conceptual Maturity Model of Supply Management’s Roles
  Yang Yang, Arizona State University
  Phillip Carter, Arizona State University

Sustainable Operations
  Supply Chain Sustainability at the Bottom of the Pyramid
  Kristie Kay Seawright, Brigham Young University
  Simon Greathed, Brigham Young University
  Casey Green, Brigham Young University
  Richard Christian Westbrook, Brigham Young University
  Christian Mealey, Brigham Young University
  Ikaika Bullock, Brigham Young University

New Talent Showcase—Student Presentations
  Co-Production and Co-Creation of Value: A Differential Games Approach
  Emre M. Demirezen, Texas A&M University
  Subodha Kumar, Texas A&M University
  Bala Shetty, Texas A&M University
2012 New Faculty Development Consortium

Covering teaching, research, publishing, and other professional development issues

The New Faculty Development Consortium (NFDC) is a program for faculty who are in the initial stages of their academic careers and who would like to gain insights about teaching, research, publishing and professional development. Faculty members who have earned their doctoral degrees and are in the first three years of their academic careers are eligible to apply.

The consortium will be held on Saturday, November 17, 2012, as part of the DSI conference. The day-long agenda for the consortium will consist of interactive presentations and panel discussions led by business faculty at varying stages of their careers. The program will also provide opportunities for interaction and networking with experienced faculty as well as with co-participants in the Consortium.

The program will include sessions on a variety of topics such as:

- Tenure and promotion
- Building a successful research program
- Excellence in teaching
- Institutional citizenship—Service toward your institution and toward the academic community

To participate in the Consortium, please send an e-mail providing the information listed on the DSI annual meeting website under NFDC along with your current vita to the coordinator listed below. To be eligible for participation, your application must be received by the end of the day on November 5, 2012. Early applications will be appreciated. The first 50 qualified applicants will be selected for participation. Although each NFDC participant will be required to register for the DSI 2012 Annual Meeting, there will be no additional fees for participating in this consortium.

Application for 2012 New Faculty Development Consortium
November 17, 2012 • San Francisco, California

Send in this form and a current copy of your vita to Janet Hartley (see below).

Application deadline: November 5, 2012.

Name:

Current institution and year of appointment:

Mailing address:

Year doctorate earned & Doctoral institution:

Phone | Fax | E-mail:

Research interests:

Teaching interests:

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

Have you attended a previous DSI Doctoral Student Consortium? yes no

If so, when?

New Faculty Development Consortium Coordinators:

Janet Hartley
College of Business
Bowling Green State Univ
419-372-8645
jhartle@bgsu.edu

Jay Kim
School of Management
Boston University
617-353-9749
jkimjr@bu.edu
New Faculty Development Consortium

Co-sponsored by Bowling Green State University

The New Faculty Development Consortium (NFDC) is a program for faculty who are in the initial stages of their academic careers and who would like to gain insights about teaching, research, publishing and professional development. Faculty members who have earned their doctoral degrees and are in the first three years of their academic careers are eligible to apply. The consortium will be held on Saturday, November 17, 2012, as part of the DSI conference. The day-long agenda for the consortium will consist of interactive presentations and panel discussions led by business faculty at varying stages of their careers. The program will also provide opportunities for interaction and networking with experienced faculty as well as with co-participants in the Consortium.

New Faculty Development Consortium Coordinator
Janet Hartley, Bowling Green State University
Jay Kim, Boston University

- Continental Breakfast and Registration
  7:45 - 8:00 am
- Welcome and Introductions
  8:00 - 8:30 am
- Building a Successful Academic Career: Insights for Promotion and Tenure
  8:30 - 9:30 am
  Morgan Swink, Texas Christian University
  Rebecca Durray, University of Colorado-Colorado Springs
- Successful and Rewarding Teaching: Proven Approaches
  9:30 - 10:30 am
  Nada Sanders, Lehigh University
  Robert Stroufe, Duquesne University
- Coffee Break
  10:30 - 10:45 am
- Joint Deans Panel (with Doctoral Student Consortium)
  10:45 am - 12:00 pm
  Moderators: Xenophon Koufteros and Shawnee Vickery

Panelists:
Associate Dean Sanjay Gupta, Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University
Dean Robert Mittelstaedt, W. P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University
Dean Jerry R. Strawser, Mays Business School, Texas A&M University
Dean Hildy Teegen, The Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina
- Joint Luncheon (with Doctoral Student Consortium)
  12:00 - 1:20 pm
- Greetings and Introduction
  Powell Robinson, President DSI, Professor, University of Houston
  Thomas Y. Choi, 2012 DSI Annual Meeting Program Chair, Professor, Arizona State University
  David Olson, President, Alpha Iota Delta
  Gregory Ulferts, Executive Director, Alpha Iota Delta
  James Viehland, President, Beta Gamma Sigma
- Joint Editors Panel (with Doctoral Student Consortium)
  1:20 - 2:45 pm
  Moderators: Xenophon Koufteros and Shawnee Vickery
  Panelists:
  Craig Carter, Co-Editor, Journal of Supply Chain Management, Arizona State University
  Thomas Choi, Co-Editor in Chief, Journal of Operations Management, Arizona State University
  Vijay Kannan, Editor, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education
  Kay Lemon, Editor, Journal of Service Research, Boston College
  Chetan Sankar, Former Editor, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, Auburn University
  Asoo Vakharia, Editor, Decision Science Journal, University of Florida
  Matthew Waller, Co-Editor, Journal of Business Logistics, University of Arkansas
- Coffee Break
  2:45-3:00 pm
- Developing an Exciting Stream of Publishable Research
  3:00-4:00 pm
  Wendy Tate, University of Tennessee
  Xiande Zhao, Chinese University of Hong Kong
  Rachna Shaw, University of Minnesota
  Sarv Devaraj, Notre Dame
- Enjoying Life as an Academic
  4:00 - 5:00 pm
  Constantin Blome, Université Catholique Louvain
  Anthony Ross, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
  Barb Flynn, Indiana University
  Daesik Hur, Yonsei University
- Closing Remarks: Janet Hartley and Jay Kim
  5:00-5:15 pm
- Joint Reception (with Doctoral Student Consortium)
  Sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta and Beta Gamma Sigma
  5:15 – 6:00 pm
DSI’s 30th annual Doctoral Student Consortium is an engaging, interactive professional experience designed to help participants successfully launch their academic careers. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 17, 2012, at the 2012 DSI Annual Meeting in San Francisco, California.

Who Should Attend?
The Doctoral Consortium is offered to individuals who are well into their doctoral studies. The Consortium welcomes students from all subject areas within the decision sciences. A variety of students with backgrounds in operations and supply chain management, management information systems, management science, strategy, organizational behavior, marketing, accounting, and other areas will increase the vitality of the sessions. The program will focus on career goals, research strategies, teaching effectiveness, job search issues, placement services, manuscript reviewing, and professional experience designed to help you develop an effective strategy for moving from your dissertation to a planned research program. The Consortium’s Research Collaborative provides a forum for discussing your research ideas with leading researchers and peers who will provide you with valuable feedback and insights.

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

1. Networking. Getting a job, finding collaborators, and gaining advantages in the career you are about to enter are all related to “who you know.” The consortium provides an opportunity for you to meet and get to know some of the leading researchers and educators in the field.

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

3. Effective Research Strategies. Advice and counsel from accomplished researchers in your field can help you develop an effective strategy for moving from your dissertation to a planned research program. The Consortium’s Research Collaborative provides a forum for discussing your research ideas with leading researchers and peers who will provide you with valuable feedback and insights.

4. Learn About DSI. Take advantage of this unique opportunity to “test-drive” DSI, learn about its people, its processes (such as placement services), and everything it has to offer you.

5. Fun! Come socialize with your current and future colleagues in a city that offers an exciting blend of cultural attractions and landmarks and just happens to be one of the top travel destinations in the world.

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

- Teaching Effectiveness. Harvey Brightman will return to the Doctoral Consortium for another post-retirement workshop in 2012. His sessions are simply not to be missed—even experienced faculty members sit in on these dynamic and inspiring sessions.

- Research Collaboration. This open and interactive forum will feature guidance from tenured faculty mentors to help you develop a strategic research plan to advance your career and tenure goals. Working in small breakout groups and with the advice and guidance of the accomplished faculty mentors, you will identify your areas of expertise, target appropriate journals, find suitable co-authors, and plan a mix of publications.

- Meet the Editors and Academic Reviewing. Editors from journals in the decision sciences and related fields will describe the missions of their publications and will discuss how to craft strong manuscript submissions, how to improve the chances of getting a journal article accepted, and how to respond to reviews. You will also learn about how to constructively review manuscripts.

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

- The Changing Nature of Academia—Dean’s Panel. Deans play a significant role in setting the direction for their respective colleges and have the latitude to allocate financial and other resources to support research, teaching, and service. Deans, however, face significant challenges as state funding and associated university budgets are shrinking in the face of global economic pressures. How do these challenges affect incoming junior faculty? What are the deans looking for in new hires? Are the criteria for selection and faculty retention shifting? What does it
take to make promotion and tenure? Is the ability to obtain funding for your research becoming increasingly important? What are the evaluation criteria, especially in light of demands by accreditation bodies? How do research, teaching, and service get rewarded?

Join Us

The Doctoral Consortium does more than prepare individual students; it creates a community of colleagues you’ll know throughout your career. Please plan to attend the Consortium and also encourage your student colleagues to participate in this important program. Although many participants will be entering the job market for 2012-2013, others will appreciate the opportunity to get a better understanding of an academic career and how to approach the job market the following year.

Application Process

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

1. A current curriculum vita, including contact information (e-mail in particular), your major field (operations management, supply chain management, MIS, management science, strategy, and so on), the title of your dissertation proposal or the title of a current research paper.
2. Interested students are encouraged to apply early if they wish to ensure themselves space in the Consortium. Materials should be emailed to Xenophon Koufteros or Shawnee K. Vickery, Doctoral Consortium Co-coordinators at XKoufteros@mays.tamu.edu or vickery@msu.edu by July 27, 2012. Those who apply by this date and meet the criteria listed above will be accepted for participation. Applications received after July 27th will receive consideration on a space-available basis.

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

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

Doctoral Consortium Coordinators:

Xenophon Koufteros
Associate Professor
Mays Business School
320J Wehner Building
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
77843-4217
xkoufteros@mays.tamu.edu
979-845-2254

Shawnee K. Vickery
Professor of Operations and Supply Chain Management
Demmer Legacy Fellow
The Eli Broad College of Business
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
vickery@msu.edu
517-432-6441

DOCTORAL STUDENT PARTICIPANTS:

Ahmed, Muhammed Usman
York University

Anekal, Prashanth
University of Toledo

Arora, Amit
Georgia Southern University

Asamoah, Daniel
Oklahoma State University

Ates, Melek
RSM Erasmus University

Bakar, Siti
Southern Illinois University

Babik, Dmytro
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Brown, James
Kent State University

Bushuev, Maxim
Kent State University

Cao, Qingning
University of Texas, Dallas

Chen, Sze-Ting
National Sun Yat-sen University

Chuang, Hao-Chun
Texas A&M University

Decampos, Hugo
Michigan State University

Demirezen, Emre
Texas A&M University

Dreyfus, David
Michigan State University

Eckstein, Dominik
EBS University of Business & Law

Fontem, Belleh
University of Alabama

Jackson, Jonathan
Washington State University

Jajja, Shakeel
Lahore University of Management, Lucknow

Johnson, Nathan
Washington State University

Jung, Kyung Sung
University of Texas, Dallas

Kang, Taeuk
University of Texas, Arlington

Kaufman, Sophie
Pace University

Kazan, Osman
University of Texas, Dallas

Kim, Myung Kyo
Michigan State University

King, Michael
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ

See DOCTORAL STUDENTS, next page
Doctoral Student Consortium Schedule


DSI’s 30th annual Doctoral Student Consortium is an engaging, interactive professional experience designed to help participants successfully launch their academic careers. The Consortium will take place on Saturday, November 17.

- Continental Breakfast and Registration 8:00 - 8:30 am
- Welcome and Introductions 8:30 - 9:00 am
- Best Teaching Practices from the Master 9:00 - 10:30 am
- Harvey J. Brightman, Emeritus Professor, Georgia State University
- Networking Break 10:30 - 10:45 am
- Joint Deans Panel with New Faculty Development Consortium 10:45 am -12 pm
- Moderators: Xenophon Koufteros and Shawnee Vickery
- Panelists:
  - Associate Dean Sanjay Gupta, The Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University
  - Dean Robert Mittelstaedt, The W. P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University
  - Dean Jerry R. Strawser, Mays Business School, Texas A&M University
  - Dean Hildy Teegen, The Darla Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina
- Joint Luncheon with New Faculty Development Consortium 12:15 - 1:15 pm
- Greetings and Introduction Powell Robinson, President DSI, Professor, University of Houston
- Thomas Y. Choi, 2012 DSI Annual Meeting Program Chair, Arizona State University
- David Olson, President, Alpha Iota Delta
- Gregory Ulberts, Executive Director, Alpha Iota Delta
- James Viehland, President, Beta Gamma Sigma
- Joint Editors Panel with New Faculty Development Consortium 1:20 - 2:45 pm
- Moderators: Xenophon Koufteros and Shawnee Vickery
- Panelists:
  - Craig Carter, Co-Editor, Journal of Supply Chain Management, Arizona State University
  - Thomas Choi, Co-Editor in Chief, Journal of Operations Management, Arizona State University
  - Vijay Kannan, Editor, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education
  - Kay Lemon, Editor, Journal of Service Research, Boston College
- Closing Remarks 4:30 - 4:45 pm
- Joint Reception with New Faculty Development Consortium (Sponsored by Alpha Iota Delta and Beta Gamma Sigma) 5:15 – 6:00 pm

Coordinators
Xenophon Koufteros, Texas A&M
Shawnee K. Vickery, Michigan State University

DOCTORAL STUDENTS, from page 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kong, Guangwen</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotcharin, Sumit</td>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwabena, Boakye</td>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulangara, Nisha</td>
<td>University of Texas, Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwark, Young</td>
<td>University of Texas, Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Meng</td>
<td>University of Texas, Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Shengli</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Yibai</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Owen</td>
<td>University of Texas, Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merhi, Mohammad</td>
<td>University of Texas, Pan American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min, Yong-Taek</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishra, Rajat</td>
<td>University of Texas, Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasr, Eman</td>
<td>Wilfried Lauriel University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngafeseon, Madison</td>
<td>University of Texas, Pan American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh, Jae-Young</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osiyevskyy, Oleksiy</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protzner, Stefanie</td>
<td>Erasmus University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley, Jason</td>
<td>Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sangasoongsong, Akkarapol</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shang, Guangzi</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, Sharvani</td>
<td>York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southin, Nancy</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundar, Subhashree</td>
<td>University of Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaim, James</td>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swain, Ajay</td>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tao, Zhi</td>
<td>Kent State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varzgani, Nilofar</td>
<td>Rutgers Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venkataraman, Sriram</td>
<td>Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verghese, John</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang, Zuozheng</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu, Wei</td>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Zhiguo</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan, Xuchuan</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012 Technology in the Classroom Miniconference

Sponsorship from McGraw-Hill

The Technology in the Classroom Miniconference is a forum for participants to share novel or innovative applications of technology in the classroom that enhance students’ learning experience.

TC-1: Taking Stock of Technology in the Classroom
Saturday, Nov. 17th, 2012, 8:00-9:30 am
Session Chair: Natalie Simpson (University at Buffalo, SUNY)

• How Should We Define Technology in Classrooms?
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Derek J. Sedlack (South University)

• The Changing Landscape in Educational Technology
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Anshu Saxena Arora (Savannah State University)

• Benefits and Challenges of a Blended-Format Program
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  James Hamister (Wright State University)

TC-2: Instructional Software to Enhance Learning—Brief Overviews
Saturday, Nov. 17th, 2012, 1:00-2:30 pm
Session Chair: Danielle Morin (Concordia University)

• Does the use of Clickers enhance classroom dynamics?
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Patti C Miles (University of Maine)

• Audience Response in the Classroom: Novelty or Sound Pedagogy?
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Eric Tucker (United States Air Force Academy)

• Plan Ahead for Students Sharing Ideas with Laptops
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Pei-Hsuan Hsieh (Institute of Information Management, National Cheng Kung University)

TC-3: Technology and Business Statistics
Saturday, Nov. 17th, 2012, 3:00-4:30 pm
Session Chair: Jesus Alvaro Cardenas (UTEP)

• Teaching Introductory Business Statistics online or in class?
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Danielle Morin (Concordia University), Samie Li Shang Ly (Concordia University), Fassil Nebebe (Concordia University), Jennifer D.E. Thomas (Pace University)

• Mastering Statistics, Making a Difference
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Anthony Belen (Hawkes Learning Systems)

• With or Without You: Teaching Statistics in a Technology Mediated Environment
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Dianna Cichocki (University at Buffalo (SUNY))

TC-4: The Role of Software in Teaching and Learning
Saturday, Nov. 17th, 2012, 3:00-4:30 pm
Session Facilitator: Albert Kagan (Arizona State University)

• Exploiting Web Resources For Maximum Teaching and Learning Impact With Integrative Competitive Simulations
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Randall G Chapman (LINKS Simulations)

• Illustrating Process Enabling Information Technologies with Microsoft Dynamics
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  Todd Schultz (Augusta State University)

• Enhancing Business Intelligence Courses with Tableau Software
  Non-Refereed Research Abstract
  S. Srinivasan (Texas A&M International University)

Coordinator
Natalie Simpson, University at Buffalo School of Management
2012 Making Statistics More Effective in Schools and Business

The mission of Making Statistics More Effective in Schools and Business (MSMESB) 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.

- **SE-1: Improve Your Class by Getting Out of the Box**  
  **Saturday, Nov. 18th, 8:00-9:30 am**  
  **Session Organizer:** Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)  
  **Participants:** David Stephan (davidlevinestatistics.com), Joseph G. Van Matre (UAB), Stephen W Custer (Virginia Commonwealth University), Barry A Wray (University of North Carolina Wilmington), Ravij Badarinathi (University of North Carolina Wilmington), Hope M. Baker (Kennesaw State University), Amy Luginbuhl Phelps (Duquesne University)

- **SE-2: Analysis and Instructional Implications of Big Data**  
  **Sunday, Nov. 18th, 1:00-2:30 pm**  
  **Session Organizer:** Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)  
  **Participant:** Richard De Veaux (Williams College)

- **SE-3: Data Visualization**  
  **Sunday, Nov. 18th, 3:00-4:30 pm**  
  **Session Organizer:** Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)  
  **Participants:** Aric LaBarr (Institute for Advanced Analytics at North Carolina State), Kellie B Keeling (University of Denver), Webster West (Integrated Analytics LLC/North Carolina State University)

- **SE-4: Improve Your Class through Effective Interaction with Students**  
  **Sunday, Nov. 18th, 5:00-6:30 pm**  
  **Session Organizer:** Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)  
  **Participants:** John McKenzie (Babson College), William Rybolt (Babson College), Barbara Azalos Price (Georgia Southern University), Joan M Donohue (University of South Carolina)

- **SE-5: Focus on Analytic and Quantitative Skill Development**  
  **Monday, Nov. 19th, 8:00-9:30 am**  
  **Session Facilitator:** Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University)  
  **Participants:** Wilma Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University), Stephen W Custer (Virginia Commonwealth University), Weiyoung Zhang (Old Dominion University), Allen S Lee (Virginia Commonwealth University), Thomas W. Jones (Univ of Arkansas)

- **SE-6: The Analytics Curriculum: Is it Reengineering or Merely Rebranding of Existing Offerings?**  
  **Monday, Nov. 19th, 1:00-2:30 pm**  
  **Session Organizer:** Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University), Vijay Mehrotra (University of San Francisco), Curt Hinrichs (JMP Academic Group, SAS Institute, Inc.)  
  **Participants:** Aric LaBarr (Institute for Advanced Analytics at North Carolina State), Jeff Camm (University of Cincinnati), Helmut Schneider (Louisiana State University)

- **SE-7: Integrating Business Analytics Into the Introductory Business Statistics Course**  
  **Monday, Nov. 19th, 3:00-4:30 pm**  
  **Session Organizer:** David M. Levine (Baruch College, CUNY)  
  **Participants:** Kathryn Szabat (LaSalle University), Robert L. Andrews (Virginia Commonwealth University), David Stephan (davidlevinestatistics.com)

---

2012 Project Management Teaching and Research Miniconference

- **PM-1: Research in Project Management—Links with Decision Sciences**  
  **Saturday, Nov. 17th, 8:00-9:30 am**  
  **Session Organizer:** Carla Messikomer (Project Management Institute)  
  **Participants:** Terry Williams (Hull University Business School), Hans Georg Gemünden (Technical University of Berlin), Brian Hobbs (University of Quebec at Montreal)

- **PM-2: Project Management Curriculum Development**  
  **Saturday, Nov. 17th, 1:00-2:30 pm**  
  **Session Organizer:** Carla Messikomer (Project Management Institute)  
  **Participants:** Brian Hobbs (University of Quebec at Montreal), Audrey Curtis (Stevens Institute of Technology), Stephen Leybourne (Metropolitan College; Boston University)
San Francisco Marriott Marquis

Rising 39 stories high in the skyline, the magnificent San Francisco Marriott Marquis exudes an essence of modern luxury and the convenience of an extraordinary downtown San Francisco hotel. Just south of Market Street, the hotel is steps away from the Yerba Buena Gardens, renowned museums and cultural attractions, world-class shopping on Union Square, and AT&T Park, home of the San Francisco Giants. Nearby visit the largest Chinatown outside of Asia and the oldest Chinatown in North America. In the hotel enjoy inspiring penthouse views and cocktails at The View Lounge or the finest contemporary cuisine at Mission Grille.

To guarantee your reservations at the Marriott Copley Place Hotel and to receive the special offered group rate, your reservations must be made by October 29, and you must supply a credit card (Visa, Master Card, American Express, Discover, or Diners Club). Note that the Decision Sciences Institute special group rate may not be available if the group room block becomes full (based on occupancy of the hotel from November 16-21, 2011), or after October 29.

For reservations, please refer to the guidelines below. Online registration is available at:

www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/sfodt

Click “Special Rates and & Awards,” then enter one of the following Group Codes:

- **Single/Double occupancy** ($187): dsidsia
- **Triple occupancy** ($207): dsidsib
- **Quadruple occupancy** ($227): dsidsic

**Hotel Room Types**
- One king-size bed in room
- Double/double bed in one room

Check-in time is 4:00 pm of the day of arrival and checkout time is 12:00 pm.

**Reservations by Phone**
If you prefer to call in your bookings, contact Marriott Reservations at 888-575-8934 and reference group code “DSI”.

Conference Registration form is available at www.decisionsciences.org/annual-meeting/documents/dsi-conf-regis12.pdf. (Online registration will be available in late summer.)
DSI’s Governing Structure

DSI is governed in hierarchical order by its constitution, bylaws, and policy and procedures. The constitution establishes the board of directors as the chief policymaking and legislative body of the Institute. The board establishes objectives, policies and procedures; staffs committees; monitors the work and activities underway or planned; and takes other actions necessary for the implementation of the Institute’s goals. Constitutionally mandated, standing and ad hoc committees assist in planning and carrying out the activities of the Institute. The home office, with direction provided by the executive director, fulfills the operating responsibilities of the Institute and facilitates the administration of services to the Institute’s members and other activities of the Institute. The board of directors and committees provide the front-end planning of the Institute, while the home office is responsible for back-end execution. Seamless integration of front-end and back-end processes is required for the Institute’s success. Responsibility for this integration rests with the board.

The Institute’s board consists of the executive director as an ex-officio member plus the elected officers, which are the president, immediate past president, president-elect, secretary, treasurer, and vice presidents, one elected by each of the regional subd-

visions and an equal number of vice presidents elected at-large. The vice presidents elected by the regions, along with regional presidents and presidents-elect, serve on the Regional Activities Committee to provide conduits of communication between the regions and board. The vice presidents elected at-large have no assigned duties other than serving on the board. Further details about the Institute’s governance structure are in the constitution and bylaws, which are available on the Institute’s website.

Limitations of the Existing Organizational Structure

During the strategic planning workshop, several board members noted that many of the problems facing DSI today had been addressed in earlier workshops along with recommendations for solving them. However, little progress had been made in implementing several of the recommendations over time. This hinders the Institute’s ability to accomplish its strategic and tactical objectives. Notable examples include establishing and executing information systems, marketing, membership services, and global development strategies that support the mission of the Institute.

While each of these problem areas is important in its own right, an overarching question is: Why does DSI repeatedly struggle with the same issues and often lag behind many of its competitors in these critical areas that are imperative for success? While it is easy to finger point at individuals, the president, the board, the home office, or others—the problem is partially rooted in DSI’s governance structure, which impedes both its strategic planning efforts and the ability to carry out strategic initiatives. Four characteristics of DSI’s governance structure compromise its performance and indicate that an overhaul of the governance model may be warranted.

First, consider that DSI board members are volunteers and that approximately 50% of the board’s officers (and knowledge base) and the president turn over each year. Under the leadership of a new president, each board may pursue distinctly different strategic objectives than the prior board. The high turnover rate and volatility of the Institute’s leadership poses numerous challenges for pursuing long-term strategic initiatives. This is illustrated by the board’s initiative to expand the Institute’s journal portfolio one year, while the following year’s board canceled the initiatives. A second example relates to the board’s inability to establish an information systems strategy. For several years the board oscillated from establishing an in-house systems development capability, to hiring an internal IT professional to manage the Institute’s IT needs, to establishing a committee to develop a ‘Member Zone’ web presence, and most recently to consider outsourcing all IT responsibilities to a technology management firm. After years of wrestling with the IT issue, none of these initiatives have been completed, and the Institute continues to struggle with an outdated and ineffective information system. These examples illustrate the difficulty of maintaining strategic direction given the high turnover rate of the board’s leadership and current governance structure.

A second characteristic of DSI’s board is the lack of assigned responsibilities for the planning and execution of key functional activities. The Institute has 18 elected vice presidents (9 elected at-large and 9 elected regionally) but not one is accountable for information systems, marketing, publications, membership services, global development, or other areas critical to the success of the organization. Instead, responsibility for core business processes is often assigned to committees which submit reports for board review. If the board accepts any action items from the reports, they are recorded in the meeting minutes and then typically ‘thrown over the wall’ for execution by the home office without a specific point of accountability among the elected officers. Hence, there is a tendency for action items requiring coordination between the home office and board, such as designing and executing a marketing strategy, to fall short of their intended goals and to get lost during the annual change in board leadership. With increasing frequency, committee chairs question why they analyze the same problems each year without seeing any
improvement. The front-end planning and back-end execution processes of the Institute are disconnected, which encumbers the ability to carry out strategic initiatives.

A third characteristic of DSI’s governance structure is the large size of the board (and committees), which has grown from 16 to 24 members in recent years. In a 2011 book by professional association management experts Harrison Coevert and Mary Byers entitled Race for Relevance: 5 Radical Changes for Associations, the authors cite changes in outdated governance structures as the most important and most difficult for revitalizing a professional association. They state:

The problem with most boards is simple: they are too large and they are not composed for performance. Large boards are not effective. They are cumbersome. They are slow. They are full of political entanglements. They are difficult to manage. And they generally continue to get larger.

The biggest consequence of a large board is ‘social loafing,’ where the larger the board gets, the less engaged the individual board member tends to be and increasingly relies on others to take the lead. Hence, individual contribution and accountability suffer. Instead of adding value, overly large boards impede decision making and responsiveness. This is particularly the case when board members don’t have assigned responsibilities.

A fourth characteristic is the uniqueness of DSI’s governance structure when compared to sister associations that have been experiencing substantial membership growth. These include the Association for Information Systems (AIS), Production and Operations Management Society (POMS), INFORMS, and the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals (CSCMP). DSI has more vice presidents than any of these organizations, but is the only association that does not have vice presidents assigned for the oversight, planning and development of critical functions. The numbers of functional (F) and Regional (R) Vice Presidents for related associations are: AIS (8-F, 3-R), POMS (8-F, 4-R), INFORMS (10-F, 0-R) and CSCMP (10-F, 0-R). The governance structures of these associations are strategically aligned on their competitive priorities. On the other hand, DSI’s organizational structure with its 18 vice presidents lacks focus. It is critically lacking specified points of responsibility for the oversight, planning, and development of the areas that are critical for the Institute’s success. Bringing functional focus and accountability to the board is imperative for enabling the Institute to establish itself as a premier society defining the decision sciences discipline.

Recommended Changes to the Governance Structure

Changing the governance structure of any professional society is not an easy endeavor. Change disrupts comfort zones and there is no guarantee that restructuring the board will alleviate all of the planning and execution issues. However, after considerable deliberations on how to better position the Institute for future success, the DSI board of directors voted by an overwhelming majority to recommend to the members a constitutional amendment to reconstitute the Board as follows:

- President
- President-Elect
- Immediate Past President
- Secretary
- Treasurer (VP of Finance)
- VP for Global Activities
- VP for Marketing
- VP for Member Services
- VP for Publications
- VP for Professional Development
- VP for Technology
- VP for the Americas Division
- VP for Asia-Pacific Division
- VP for Europe Division
- Executive Director (ex-officio)

As in the past, vice presidents will be elected to serve a two-year staggered term ensuring that each year approximately 50% of the returning vice presidents are experienced in their role. The functional vice presidents will be elected by the full membership while the divisional vice presidents will be elected by the regions making up the division. Each newly elected vice president will coordinate with the respective outgoing vice president to ensure continuity of focus and program. To further ensure integration and continuity of planning, the functional vice presidents will chair the committee related to their responsibilities as appropriate.

The DSI board of directors believes that passing this constitutional amendment is important for several reasons.

- First, it will provide a functional orientation and points of responsibility for ensuring continuity in managing strategic activities that are critical to the Institute’s success.
- Second, it will create a more efficient, effective, agile and responsive governance structure, where each board member has a defined responsibility.
- Third, it will enable stronger linkages between the board and the home office, between the board and members, and between members and the home office.
- Fourth, it will maintain strong regional representation on the board which is critical for facilitating regional development and ensuring that the diverse interests of the membership are represented.
- Finally, it will streamline and better focus the governance structure of DSI in a manner that is consistent with that of sister academic societies (e.g., INFORMS, POMS, AIS, CSCMP, AOM, etc.) which have been experiencing membership growth.

Procedural Issues for Addressing Changes in the Constitution

ARTICLE XVII-Changes in Constitution outlines the procedures for modifying DSI’s constitution. It states,

No article shall be added to this Constitution and no part shall be amended or nullled except by written ballot sent to all Members. A change in the Constitution requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Members returning said written ballots within 30 days after their mailing to the Members.

see PRESIDENT’S LETTER, page 43
### Ad hoc Committee on Conference Planning

**Chair**  
Richard L. Jenson  
Utah State University

**Members**  
Kenneth E. Boyer  
Ohio State University  
Thomas Y. Choi  
Arizona State University  
Johnny Rungtusanatham  
Ohio State University  
Fundan Sahin  
University of Houston  
Morgan L. Swink  
Texas Christian University

### Development Committee for Excellence in the Decision Sciences

**Chair**  
Peter T. Ward  
Ohio State University

**Members**  
Laura Foraker  
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth  
Xenophon Koufteros  
Texas A&M University College Station  
Antonio Maçada  
Ely Paiva  
Fundacao Getulio Vargas

### Executive Committee/Strategic Planning Committee

**Chair**  
E. Powell Robinson  
University of Houston

**Chair Designate**  
Maling Ebrahimipour  
University of Florida St Petersburg

**Members**  
T. Paul Cronan  
University of Arkansas Fayetteville  
Krishna S. Dhir  
Berry College  
Carol J. Latta  
Georgia State University  
Johnny Rungtusanatham  
Ohio State University

### Fellows Committee

**Chair**  
Manoj Malhotra  
University of South Carolina

**Chair Designate**  
Mark Davis  
Bentley University

**Members**  
F. Robert Jacobs  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Carol J. Latta  
Georgia State University  
Johnny Rungtusanatham  
Ohio State University  
Fellows Committee  
F. Robert Jacobs  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Carol J. Latta  
Georgia State University  
Ram Narasimhan  
Michigan State University  
Linda G. Sprague  
CEIBS  
Marc J. Schniederjans  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

### Alternate 1:

Soumen Ghosh  
Georgia Institute of Technology

### Alternate 2:

David L. Olson  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

### Alternate 3:

Thomas W. Jones  
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville

### Finance and Investment Advisory Committee

**Chair**  
Johnny Rungtusanatham  
Ohio State University

**Members**  
Shaw K. Chen  
University of Rhode Island  
Pooja Dodia  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Carol J. Latta  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Roderick Posey  
The University of Southern Mississippi  
Cecily Raiborn  
Texas State University-San Marcos  
Luis E. Rivera-Solis  
Dowling College

### Information Technology Committee

**Chair**  
Jon Jasperson  
Texas A&M University

**Members**  
Q. B. Chung  
Villanova University  
Pooja Dodia  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Hal Jacobs  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Carol J. Latta  
Decision Sciences Institute

---

**Ad hoc Committee on Strategic DSI Journal Portfolio**

**Chair**  
F. Robert Jacobs  
Indiana University-Bloomington

**Members**  
Kurt Brethauer  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Thomas Choi  
Arizona State University  
Vijay Kannan  
Utah State University  
Jack Meredith  
Wake Forest University  
Johnny Rungtusanatham  
The Ohio State University  
Vallabhb Sambamurthy  
Michigan State University  
Assoo Vakharia  
University of Florida

**Ad hoc Committee on World Congress**

**Chair**  
Barbara B. Flynn  
Indiana University

**Members**  
Marion G. Sobol  
Southern Methodist University  
Rajesh Srivastava  
Florida Gulf Coast University  
Mohammed H.A. Tafsi  
Hofstra University  
Gyula Vastag  
University of Pannoni  
Soumen Ghosh  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
David L. Olson  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Thomas W. Jones  
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville  
Shaw K. Chen  
University of Rhode Island  
Pooja Dodia  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Carol J. Latta  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Roderick Posey  
The University of Southern Mississippi  
Cecily Raiborn  
Texas State University-San Marcos  
Luis E. Rivera-Solis  
Dowling College  
Q. B. Chung  
Villanova University  
Pooja Dodia  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Hal Jacobs  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Carol J. Latta  
Decision Sciences Institute  
F. Robert Jacobs  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Carol J. Latta  
Georgia State University  
Ram Narasimhan  
Michigan State University  
Linda G. Sprague  
CEIBS  
Marc J. Schniederjans  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Soumen Ghosh  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
David L. Olson  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Thomas W. Jones  
University of Arkansas-Fayetteville  
Shaw K. Chen  
University of Rhode Island  
Pooja Dodia  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Carol J. Latta  
Decision Sciences Institute  
Roderick Posey  
The University of Southern Mississippi  
Cecily Raiborn  
Texas State University-San Marcos  
Luis E. Rivera-Solis  
Dowling College
Binshan Lin  
Louisiana State University  
Shreveport  
Bob McQuaid  
Pepperdine University  
Sriram Narayanan  
Michigan State University  
Robert S. Russell  
Virginia Tech  
Anjit Sengupta  
Wright State University  
Doug White  
Roger Williams University  

Member Services Committee  
Chair  
Gyula Vastag  
University of Pannonia  
Members  
John Bell  
University of Tennessee-Knoxville  
Kurt Bretthauer  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Chia-Ming Chang  
Shih Chien University  
Shaw K. Chen  
University of Rhode Island  
Thomas Y. Choi  
Arizona State University  
James Driscoll  
Strayer University  
Janet L. Hartley  
Bowling Green State University  
David L. Olson  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Robert Pavur  
University of North Texas  
Barbara A. Price  
Georgia Southern University  
Anjit Sengupta  
Wright State University  
Kaushik Sengupta  
Hofstra University  
Vivek Shah  
Texas State University, San Marcos  
Dayna Simpson  
Monash University  
Eric Stein  
Penn State Great Valley  
Matthew Swinarski  
Penn State Erie  
Morgan L. Swink  
Texas Christian University  
Rohit Verma  
Cornell University  
Doug White  
Roger Williams University  
Susan Williams  
Georgia Southern University  

Nominating Committee  
Chair  
Krishna S. Dhir  
Berry College  
Chair Designate  
E. Powell Robinson  
University of Houston  
Members  
Robert L. Andrews  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
William B. Carper  
University of West Florida  
Daesik Hur  
Yonsei University  
Vijay R. Kannan  
Utah State University  
Carol J. Latta  
Decision Sciences Institute  
G. Keong Leong  
University of Nevada-Las Vegas  
Rhonda Lummus  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Fundasahin  
University of Houston  
Majidid Tavana  
LaSalle University  

Programs and Meetings Committee  
Chair  
Morgan L. Swink  
Texas Christian University  
Chair Designate  
Minoo Tehrani  
Roger Williams University  
Members  
Jengchung ‘Victor’ Chen  
National Cheng Kung University  
Constantin Blome  
Universite catholique de Louvain  
Thomas Y. Choi  
Arizona State University  
Nevine Labib Eskaros  
Sadat Academy for Management Sciences  
Deanna M. Kennedy  
University of Washington Bothell  
Sriram Narayanan  
Michigan State University  
David L. Olson  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Johnny Rungtusanatham  
Ohio State University  
Fundasahin  
University of Houston  
John Seydel  
Arkansas State University  

Publications Committee  
Chair  
Kurt Bretthauer  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Chair Designate  
G. Keong Leong  
University of Nevada - Las Vegas  
Members  
Mahyar Amouzegar  
Cal Poly Pomona  
Parakramaweera S. Dharmapala  
Sultan Qaboos University  
Maling Ebrahimpour  
University of Florida St Petersburg  
Hal Jacobs  
Georgia State University  
Guorui Jiang  
Beijing University of Technology  
Vijay Kannan  
Utah State University  
Xenophon Koufteros  
Texas A&M University  
College Station  
Hao Lei  
Wuhan University  
Rhonda L. Lummus  
Indiana University-Bloomington  
Arunachalam Narayanan  
Texas A&M University  
College Station  
Barbara A. Price  
Georgia Southern University  
Chetan S. Sankar  
Auburn University  
Suresh Sethi  
University of Texas at Dallas  
Ramesh Sharda  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater  
Asoo Vakharia  
University of Florida  
Suhaiza Zailani  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
Weiyong Zhang  
Virginia Commonwealth University  

Regional Activities Committee  
Chair  
Maling Ebrahimpour  
University of Florida St Petersburg  
Chair Designate  
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In this column, I discussed the issues leading to the proposed constitutional amendment calling for revisions in the organizational structure of the board of directors. The proposal, if passed, will both refocus the board and reduce its size from 24 to 15 members. The next step in the process is three-fold. First, the proposal will be presented at the Annual Business Meeting of the Institute, which will be held Sunday evening, November 18, 2012. Next, a ballot will be sent to all members by e-mail. The ballot will contain the specific changes to the wording of the constitution that are necessary to implement the organizational restructure. Finally, the constitutional amendment will be accepted and implemented if a two-thirds affirmative vote of the members is received from those returning said ballots within 30 days after their mailing to the members.

The board of directors realizes that realigning the governance structure is only one possible avenue for making DSI more responsive to its members and competitive in the marketplace. Other initiatives underway include surveying the membership in order to better understand its service and value perceptions; continuous improvement of the annual meeting; requesting and evaluating proposals for implementing an integrated information system for the Institute; and conducting a five-year review of the home office’s management, operations, and general performance and, if necessary, make suggestions for improvement.

I look forward to seeing each of you at the upcoming 2012 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute in the enchanting city of San Francisco. The Program Committee under the direction of Thomas Choi has put together a remarkable program. I want to thank the members of the Program Committee and everyone participating in the annual meeting for their contributions to making it a successful meeting and their dedication to establishing the Decision Sciences Institute as a premier society in defining the decision sciences discipline.
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BALLOTS, from page 1

Regionally-Elected Vice Presidents
Indian-Subcontinent—TBD
Mexico—TBD
Southeast—TBD
Southwest:
  Lynn Heinrichs, Elon University
  Kai Koong, University of Texas-Pan American
Western:
  Mahyar Amouzegar, California State University, Pomona
  Nafisseh Heiat, Montana State University-Billings

The 2011-12 Nominating Committee, chaired by Keong Leong, University of Nevada-Las Vegas, has completed the slate of nominees for the 2013 DSI 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 emailed in January 2013. Additional nominations may be made by December 15, 2012. 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, 75 Piedmont Avenue, Suite 340, Atlanta, GA 30303, dsi@gsu.edu or clatta@gsu.edu.

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 e-mail address!

PARENT, from page 4

One may evolve to support this kind of activity while finding a home within DSI for faculty and institutions engaging students in the process of learning decision making through public service projects.

Second, our regions are important but may be blinded to innovative opportunities by embracing the annual meeting paradigm. Without abandoning our basic meeting structure, would it be possible to build a focus on an industry or a particular business function logically tied to regional meeting locations? For example, WDSI purposely did so by focusing on location and a sometimes over-the-top buffet when taking a chance on its first meeting in Hawaii (where, by the way, Marc Schniederjans served as local arrangements coordinator). In 2014 WDSI will meet in Napa, California, where a special focus on decision sciences within the wine industry will be pursued. This serves existing membership while attracting others to the Institute.

Lastly, I’d like to explore the establishment of a DSI Foundation which would enhance member benefits particularly as these would translate into opportunities for students. To this end, I would hope to leverage Alpha Iota Delta (check out their web site), perhaps the Institute’s greatest untapped resource.

I look forward to seeing you in San Francisco.

Mike Parent is professor emeritus at Utah State University. He served on the faculty there for 40 years and joined Decision Sciences when Rodger Collons was president. mike.parent@usu.edu
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OFFICERS’ NOMINATIONS

The Institute’s 2013-14 Nominating Committee invites your suggestions for nominees to be considered for the offices of President-Elect, Secretary, and Vice Presidents to serve on the Institute’s Board of Directors, beginning in 2015.

Your recommendations should include the affiliation of each nominee, the office recommended for the nominee, and a brief statement of qualifications of the nominee.

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. There are no exceptions to the October 1st deadline.

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 nominee 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. There are no exceptions to the October 1st deadline.

Decision Sciences Institute Fellows

Adam, Everett E., Jr., Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
Anderson, John C., Univ. of Minnesota
Benson, P. George, College of Charleston
Benken, William, Univ. of Georgia
Berry, William L., The Ohio State Univ.
Borini, Charles P., Stanford Univ.
Brightman, Harvey J., Georgia Institute of Technology
Buffa, Elwood S.*, Univ. of California-Los Angeles
Cangolos, Vincent*, Univ. of Southeast Louisiana
Carter, Phillip L., Arizona State Univ.
Chase, Richard B., Univ. of Southern California
Chervany, Norman L., Univ. of Minnesota
Clapper, James M., Aladdin TempRite Collins, Rodger D., Drexel Univ.
Couger, J. Daniel*, Univ. of Colorado-Colorado Springs
Cummings, Larry L.*, Univ. of Minnesota
Dardery, William R.*, Louisiana State Univ.
Davis, K. Roscoe, Univ. of Georgia
Davis, Mark M., Bentley College
Day, Ralph L.*, Indiana Univ.
Digman, Lester A., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Dock, V. Thomas, Maui, Hawaii
Ebert, Ronald J., Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
Ehramhouspour, Maling, Univ. of South Florida-St. Petersburg
Edwards, Ward, Univ. of Southern California
Evans, James R., Univ. of Cincinnati
Fetter, Robert B., Yale Univ.
Flores, Benito E., Texas A&M Univ.
Flynn, Barbara B., Indiana Univ.
Franz, Lori S., Univ. of Missouri-Columbia
Ghosh, Soumen, Georgia Tech
Glover, Fred W., Univ. of Colorado at Boulder
Gonzalez, Richard F., Michigan State Univ.
Grawoig, Dennis E.*, Boulder City, Nevada
Green, Paul E., Univ. of Pennsylvania
Groff, Gene K., Georgia State Univ.
Gupta, Jatinder N.D., Univ. of Florida-Mississippi
Heineke, Janelle, Boston Univ.
Hershbaumer, James C., Arizona State Univ.
Holsapple, Clyde W.*, Univ. of Kentucky
Honowitz, Ira, Univ. of Florida
Houck, Ernest C., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Huber, George P., Univ. of Texas-Austin
Jacobs, F. Robert, Indiana Univ.
Jones, Thomas W., Univ. of Pennsylvania-Fayetteville
Kendall, Julie E., Rutgers Univ.
Kendall, Kenneth E., Rutgers Univ.
Keeve, Arthur J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Khamovskov, Bashsheer M.*, Univ. of Houston
Kim, Kee Young, Yonsei Univ.
King, William K., Univ. of Pittsburgh
Klein, Gary, Univ. of Colorado, Colorado Springs
Koehler, Anne B., Miami Univ.
Krajewski, Lee J., Notre Dame Univ.
LaFarge, Lawrence, Clemson Univ.
Latta, Carol J., Georgia State Univ.
Lee, Sang M., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Luhans, Fred, Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Mabert, Vincent A., Indiana Univ.
Malhotra, Manoj K., Univ. of South Carolina
Malhotra, Naresh K., Georgia Institute of Technology
Markland, Robert E., Univ. of South Carolina
McMillan, Claude,*, Univ. of Colorado at Boulder
Miller, Jeffrey G., Boston Univ.
Monroe, Kent B., Univ. of Illinois
Mooney, Laurence J., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Muehlen, Herbert, Purdue Univ.
Narasimhan, Ram, Michigan State Univ.
Neter, John, Univ. of Georgia
Nutt, Paul C., The Ohio State Univ.
Olson, David L., Texas A&M Univ.
Perkins, William C., Indiana Univ.
Peters, William S., Univ. of New Mexico
Philippatos, George C., Univ. of Tennessee-Knoxville
Ragsdale, Cliff T., Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State Univ.
Raiffa, Howard, Harvard Univ.
Rakes, Terry R., Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State Univ.
Reinmuth, James R., Univ. of Oregon
Ritzman, Larry P., Boston College
Rothe, Aleda V., Clemson Univ.
Sanders, Naida, Texas Christian Univ.
Schladke, Lawrence L., Univ. of Texas at Arlington
Schnieders, Marc J., Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln
Schriber, Thomas J., Univ. of Michigan
Schroeder, Roger G., Univ. of Minnesota
Simone, Albert J., Rochester Institute of Technology
Slocum, John W., Jr., Southern Methodist Univ.
Smunt, Timothy, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
Sobel, Martin G., Southern Methodist Univ.
Soremekun, James E., Univ. of Denver
Sprague, Linda G., China Europe International Business School
Steinberg, Earle, Touche Ross & Company, Houston, TX
Summers, George W.*, Univ. of Arizona
Tang, Kwei, Purdue Univ.
Taylor, Bernard W., III, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
Trott, Marvin D., Kent State Univ.
Uhl, Kenneth P.*, Univ. of Illinois-Vazsonyi, Andrew*, Univ. of San Francisco
Voss, Christopher A., London Business School
War, Peter T., Ohio State Univ.
Wasserman, William, Syracuse Univ.
Wemmerlov, Urban, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
Wegh, Steven, Harvard Univ.
Whitten, Betty J., Georgia Whybark, D. Clay, Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Wickland, Gary A., Capricorn Research
Winkler, Robert L., Duke Univ.
Woodley, Robert E. D., Colorado School of Mines
Wortman, Max S., Iowa State Univ.
Zmud, Robert W., Florida State Univ.

*deceased
2012 Annual Meeting Registration Form • San Francisco, California • November 17-20, 2012

All attendees must register for the meeting. Conference registrations must be postmarked by October 29, 2012, to avoid a late fee of $50. After October 29, requests for cancellation refunds will not be accepted. Mail form and payment for registration to: Decision Sciences Institute, 75 Piedmont Avenue, Suite 340, 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 San Francisco?
   - Conference hotel
   - Other (please specify)

2. Type of accommodation:
   - Single
   - Double

3. Date of arrival:
   - Fri. (11/16)
   - Sat. (11/17)
   - Sun. (11/18)
   - Mon. (11/19)
   - Tues. (11/20)

4. Do you plan to attend:
   - Sunday’s luncheon?
   - Monday’s reception?
   - Tuesday’s luncheon?
   - All?
   - None?

5. Interest Area (check one):
   - Academic Administration
   - Accounting
   - Economics
   - Finance
   - Health Care Systems
   - Innovative Education
   - International Business
   - Marketing
   - Microcomputer Systems & Apps.
   - MIS/DSS
   - Managerial Problem-Solving
   - Organizational Behavior
   - Organizational Theory
   - Manufacturing/Service Management
   - Public/Nonprofit Management
   - Quantitative Techniques & Meth.
   - Statistics and Decision Theory
   - Strategic Management & Policy
   - Technology and Innovation
   - E-commerce
   - Other

6. What is your primary regional affiliation?
   - Asia-Pacific Region
   - European Region
   - Indian Subcontinent Region
   - Mexico Region
   - Midwest Region
   - Northeast Region
   - Southeast Region
   - Southwest Region
   - Western Region
   - All
   - None

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

8. What was the primary reason you decided to attend the annual meeting?
   - Annual Meeting in general
   - Job Placement
   - Doctoral Student Consortium
   - New Faculty Development Consortium
   - Program Miniconferences
   - Professional Devel. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member and non-member fees for all registration categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>include Sunday’s luncheon, Monday’s reception, Tuesday’s award luncheon, and the CD-ROM Proceedings (see information below about the Proceedings).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 2012 (see form below).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member registration</th>
<th>$325.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 Member dues renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For the exact amount owed, please refer to the dues renewal notice previously mailed to you.)</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Member registration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please check if you desire membership benefits. This fee entitles you to one year of membership in the Institute.)</td>
<td>485.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student member registration</th>
<th>80.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 Student dues renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For the exact amount owed, please refer to the dues renewal notice previously mailed to you.)</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Non-Member registration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please check if you desire membership benefits. This fee entitles you to one year of membership in the Institute.)</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emeritus Member registration</th>
<th>80.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Non-Member registration</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Sunday’s luncheon(s) @ $46.71 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Tuesday’s awards luncheon(s) @ $46.71 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra CD-ROM Proceedings @ $25.00 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After October 29, 2012 (LATE FEE)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CREDIT CARD INFORMATION:</th>
<th>❑ Visa ☐ MC ☑ American Express ❑ Discover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Card No. ____________________________ Expires: ___ /___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Holder’s Name ____________________________ (Please Print)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Address ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision Sciences Institute Application for Membership

Name, Institution or Firm

Address (Home Business)

Phone Number

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

Regular Membership .................. $160 ........ $160
Student Membership .................. $25 .......... $25
(Student membership requires signature of sponsoring member.)

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

Institutional Membership ............. $160 ........ $160
(You have been designated to receive all publications and special announcements of the Institute.)

Please send your payment (in U.S. dollars) and application to: Decision Sciences Institute, Georgia State University, J. Mack Robinson College of Business, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303. For more information, call 404-413-7710 or email dsi@gsu.edu.

CREDIT CARD INFORMATION: ❑ Visa ❑ MC ❑ AmEx ❑ Disc.
Total amount $__________________
Card No. __________________________ Expires: ___ / ___
Card Holder’s Name ____________________________
Signature ____________________________________ (Please Print)

Decision Sciences Institute
Application for Membership

INSTITUTE CALENDAR

■ NOVEMBER 2012
November 17 - 20
42nd Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute will be held in San Francisco at the Marriott Marquis. www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/

■ DECEMBER 2012
December 27 - 29
The 6th Conference of the Indian Subcontinent Decision Sciences Institute will be held in Hyderabad, India.

■ JANUARY 2013
January 31
Deadline for paper submission. Decision Sciences Journal is publishing a focused issue on “Management of Innovation Within and Across Borders.”

■ FEBRUARY 2013
February 19 - 24
The Southeast DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in the historic district of Charleston, SC, at the DoubleTree. www.sedsi.org

■ MARCH 2013
March 12 - 16
The Southwest DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in Albuquerque, NM, at the Albuquerque Convention Center. www.swdsi.org
March 26 - 29
The Western DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in Long Beach, CA. www.wdsinet.org

■ APRIL 2013
April 5 - 7
The Northeast DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in New York. www.nedsi.org
April 18 - 20
The Midwest Region will hold its annual meeting at Kent State. www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

■ NOVEMBER 2013
November 16 - 19
The 43rd Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute will be held in Baltimore, Maryland, at the Baltimore Waterfront Marriott.

For updated 2013 regional meetings listings, visit www.decisionsciences.org/regions/default.asp

■ APRIIL 2013
April 5 - 7
The Northeast DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in New York. www.nedsi.org
April 18 - 20
The Midwest Region will hold its annual meeting at Kent State. www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

■ NOVEMBER 2013
November 16 - 19
The 43rd Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute will be held in Baltimore, Maryland, at the Baltimore Waterfront Marriott.

For updated 2013 regional meetings listings, visit www.decisionsciences.org/regions/default.asp

Institute Calendar

FEBRUARY 2013
February 19 - 24
The Southeast DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in the historic district of Charleston, SC, at the DoubleTree. www.sedsi.org

MARCH 2013
March 12 - 16
The Southwest DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in Albuquerque, NM, at the Albuquerque Convention Center. www.swdsi.org
March 26 - 29
The Western DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in Long Beach, CA. www.wdsinet.org

APRIL 2013
April 5 - 7
The Northeast DSI Region will hold its annual meeting in New York. www.nedsi.org
April 18 - 20
The Midwest Region will hold its annual meeting at Kent State. www.pom.edu/mwdsi/

NOVEMBER 2013
November 16 - 19
The 43rd Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute will be held in Baltimore, Maryland, at the Baltimore Waterfront Marriott.

For updated 2013 regional meetings listings, visit www.decisionsciences.org/regions/default.asp

December 27 - 29
The 6th Conference of the Indian Subcontinent Decision Sciences Institute will be held in Hyderabad, India.

January 31
Deadline for paper submission. Decision Sciences Journal is publishing a focused issue on “Management of Innovation Within and Across Borders.”

November 17 - 20
42nd Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute will be held in San Francisco at the Marriott Marquis. www.decisionsciences.org/annualmeeting/