PRESIDENT’S LETTER

Looking Forward to the DSI Meeting in Austin…

Funda Sahin, University of Houston

Dear DSI Family,

Our Annual DSI meeting is around the corner and like many of you I’m looking forward to seeing my DSI colleagues and friends again and having a first-ever DSI meeting in Austin. I have no doubts that you will enjoy a well-organized conference in the fun city of Austin. If you have never been to Austin before, please check out the conference website, local information section for highlights of the city. The city has a reputation for being the Live Music Capital. Don’t forget to explore the music scene if you have time. Austin is also home to numerous lakes, rivers, and waterways. The conference hotel is located close to Town Lake. Be sure to visit Zilker Park area by the Lake before you leave Austin. I guarantee that you will have a good time and will see crowds gathered for some fun event.

Under the leadership of Sri Talluri (Program Chair) and Jennifer Blackhurst (Associate Program Chair), the 2016 Program Team is working tirelessly to put together an exciting program that is not only informative, but also intriguing. The theme of the conference is “Effective Decision Making in Uncertain Business Environments: Strategies, Practices, and Techniques”. The theme is very timely given the challenges of making effective decisions mainly due to political and economic uncertainties facing businesses every day. Consistent with the theme, one of the two keynote speakers, Sunil Chopra (Professor-Northwestern University) will talk about uncertainty in omni-channel retailing. The second keynote speaker, Chuck Holland (Vice-President of Engineering-UPS) will share his experiences and insights on competing in an uncertain business world with the help of business analytics. Personally, I’m very excited to hear both keynote speakers. I hope you join me.

Depending upon your interest (research, teaching, professional development), I’m confident that you will find something of interest to you at the upcoming meeting. There are numerous interesting sessions, workshops, consortia and a great lineup of speakers. I look forward to seeing you at the conference. Why not bring along a colleague and/or a doctoral student and introduce them to DSI?

On a separate note, I would like to update you on a couple of DSI business-related issues. First of all, I’m pleased to report that we are
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This issue of Decision Line is filled with information about many regional news, the upcoming national and regional conferences, several high quality articles, the book review, and several reports from conferences. In addition, we have a member highlight in this issue as well.

President Sahin in her letter encourages DSII members to attend this year’s conference in Austin, Texas. She provides an update with the status of the search for DSII’s Executive Director. In addition, she describes the current state of DSII’s strategic plan and the ambiguous relationship that exists between the national and various regions of our organizations.

Starting on page 30, there are more interesting readings included in this issue. You will read vision and strategic statements of the two 2107 President-Elect Nominees. Please read these statements their state-ments will help you to make a more informed decision when time comes to vote. In addition, the list of all other nominees for different offices with the list of their DSII related activities are included.

Conference Chair Sri Talluri and his team have put a great conference together and I urge you to visit the conference site and check all sessions. You will notice that this year’s Annual Conference in Austin promises to be rich in quality sessions and excellent keynote speakers.

Jennifer Lewis Priestly in her article titled “Business Analytics, Data Engineering or the Science of Data? Lessons from Darwin’s Finches...” discusses the evolution of science and its spread around the nation. She discusses the evolution of this area from two perspective, business and sciences. In colleges with a focus on business, she argues that development and expansion of data science is oriented toward the business applications whereas programs such as computer science, technology, computational mathematics, the focus is towards the development of, for example, structure, machine learning, and scripting language. Furthermore, she explains that those who work in different areas of data science such application versus business have expertise that are not interchangeable. She ends the article by asking, “Will data science evolve and flourish with rich and meaningful iterations like Darwin’s finches? Or are we destined to be the short lived and unidimensional dodo?”

From the Bookshelf, Kristen Rosacker reviews “Leadership Lessons from a UPS Driver: Delivering a Culture of We, Not Me,” by Ron Wallace who worked his way up from a delivery driver to President of UPS. Dr. Roascker explains that at the end of each chapter of this book there are key take-away that will lent itself for classroom adoption. She mentions that Mr. Wallace believes a leader is a person who truly understands that more gets done when the leader do care who gets the credit. The author indicates that one of the most important key success factor is building an environment of trust and mutual respect.

As you may already know, Vijay Kannan has completed his term as the editor of Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education and in this issue you will read his last updated about the state of DSJIE. THANK YOU VIJAY for a job well done and your services to DSI. In addition, in this issue the new Editor of DSJIE is introduced. Matthew Drake is not the new editor. Please read both articles and learn more about Matt Drake as the new editor.

“The Policy Analyst: A Practitioner’s Perspective,” is the title of the article by Thomas Lang. In this article Lang discusses what policy analyst does and how this term found its way in US Government. He further discusses the value of a degree in this area. Lang identifies schools that offer the graduate program with this focus and where students with such a degree can find jobs and start their careers. He provides detail examples of how a policy analyst can play a major role in solving issues in government as well as in business.

Richard Schonberger, in his article “Rewriting History: How Lean Manufacturing Erased the Vibrant Pre-Lean Era of the 1980s,” reminds readers about several powerful ideas that served both service and manufacturing industries well for many years and slowly were sidelined due to various reasons. He argues that US industries have tendency to move toward the next “big thing.” He explains that there are JIT-Production has an abundant repository of process-management and improvement methodologies which scholars and companies need to revisit.

Several DSI regions provided reports from their regions relating to the this year’s conference or announcements of upcoming conferences. You can read about DSI’s First World Congress, EDSI, NEDSI, WDSI, SEDSI, and more in this issue.
Furthermore, we are introducing to you a write up highlighting one of our members. Kamran Abedini’s article “Enhancing Effective Technical Education through Application of “Puzzles Principles”,” discussing the issue of how curriculum is developed and how they are not truly sowing the connectivity between and among courses. In his article he uses engineering curriculum as an example and show how students cannot relate their basic courses to their majors. He proposes the idea of jigsaw puzzle for showing students how courses (each piece of the puzzle) are related together. I encourage you to read this article and get a better understanding of this approach, as it seems that it is applicable to business curriculum as well.

Two reports from two regional conferences indicate that there are great enthusiasms in the regions and the conferences are well attended. Reports from EDSI and NEDSI are evidence of such success. Please read them and try to attend regional conference(s) of your choice. They are always a great place to network and meet interesting scholars.

As always, I encourage you, our reader, to share your opinions and ideas with us by writing to me at mebrahimpour@uri.edu, or you may send it to the feature editors as shown in this section.

I am looking forward to reading your articles for inclusion in Decision Line.

Maling Ebrahimpour, PhD  Editor

From the Update from the Editor of DSJIE, page 11

Recognitions
Several individuals were recognized for their contributions to DSJIE in 2015:

Best Teaching Brief
‘Learning in the Fast Lane: The Freeway Game’ by Francois Giraud-Carrier, (University of Illinois, Springfield) and Glen M. Schmidt (University of Utah)

Best Research Article
Required Collaborative Work in Online Courses: A Predictive Modeling Approach’ by Marlene Smith and Deborah Kellogg (University of Colorado, Denver)

Outstanding Associate Editors
Ben Arbaugh (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh) and Susan Palocsay (James Madison University)

Outstanding Reviewers
Sunil Babbar (Florida Atlantic University) and Suzanne Warell (Carroll University) As they have done so throughout my tenure as Editor, several Associate Editors have taken on responsibilities above and beyond their roles in the editorial process:

Best Paper Awards
Chris Kydd (University of Delaware), Ceyhun Ozgur (Valparaiso University), and Susan Williams (Northern Arizona University)

Special Issue Proposal Review
Ben Arbaugh (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh), John Jensen (University of South Carolina), and Susan Palocsay (James Madison University).

Management Learning and Education Community

DSJIE’s position and visibility within the Management Learning and Education community continues to grow. DSJIE is regularly represented on the organizing team of the Research in Management Learning and Education ‘Unconference’ along with the Editors of the other ‘Big Four’ journals in Management Learning and Education: Academy of Management Learning and Education, Journal of Management Education, and Management Learning. This year's event at INSEAD in Fontainebleau, France, brought together sixty scholars from across the globe for dialog on key issues in management education and to seed new research projects.

Since 2012, the journal has been added to two key academic journal guides, the Australian Business Deans’ Council Journal Quality List and the Chartered Association of Business Schools Academic Journal Guide. Inclusion in these two journal lists gives added visibility and credibility to the journal and makes it a more attractive publication venue for scholars worldwide.

Moving On

Earlier this year, the Board of DSI appointed Professor Matt Drake of Duquesne University to take over the Editorship of DSJIE. The board has great confidence in Matt as do I. Matt is well qualified to serve as Editor, having established a productive research record that includes several publications in the domain of management education. Matt will bring energy, enthusiasm, and new ideas to the journal, and I have no doubt that he will take the journal to new heights.
Update on the 2016 Annual DSI Conference

The conference this year will include more than 350 sessions across various tracks. We have added several new tracks and workshops for this year, including:

- Decision Making in Practice,
- E-Commerce Technologies and Strategies,
- Humanitarian Operations and Logistics,
- Risk Management,
- Social Issues and Sustainability,
- Teaching Innovation,
- On-line Degree Programs & Execution,
- Business Analytics,
- Social Network Analysis,
- Behavioral Research and Experimentation

and others. Please visit the conference website to access the details: http://dsi-annualmeeting.org/about/

The conference hotel is J.W. Marriott (http://dsi-annualmeeting.org/venue/). 2016 Annual Meeting Participants will enjoy a discounted stay at the JW Marriott. The DSI hotel reservation portal URL: https://resweb.passkey.com/Resweb.do?mode=welcome_ei_new&eventID=13888093

We look forward to seeing everyone at the DSI 2016 Annual Meeting in Austin in November!
Data Science is a nascent discipline that is evolving out of primordial academic darkness to assume some evolutionary commonalities in university curricula across the country. The academic community should be applauded for pivoting in meaningful and unprecedented ways to respond to the demands of the private and public sectors for deep analytical talent. Since 2007, the number of masters-level programs in “Data Science” or “Analytics” has exploded from 0 to over 100. In the last few years, there has been a parallel emergence of PhD programs in Data Science, which is an important double-sided solution to the talent gap – not only are PhDs uniquely qualified to directly engage in private sector research and problem solving, but with a “terminal degree” these individuals are also qualified to teach the next generation of data scientists.

A scan of about 100 “data science” and “advanced analytics” program across the country is represented by the graphic below. As this constellation of data science-related programs illustrates, the proliferation of programs is not only geographically diverse, but is also evolving from completely different spheres of influence (the nodes represent the colleges where “data science” or “advanced analytics” programs are housed in universities across USA).

Select any of these programs at random and you will likely see commonalities of applied statistics, basic computer science and applied project work. Josh Wills appropriately tweeted that the data scientist is the “Person who is better at statistics than any software engineer and better at software engineering than any statistician”. The “Priestley Corollary” to this quote is that the data scientist is also the “Person who is better at explaining the business implications of the results than any scientist and better at the science than any business person” (can someone Tweet that out please?). However, the characteristics that are dominant will differ depending on their orientation and importantly on where they were conceived within the university.

Generally speaking, programs that evolved out of colleges of business, are more likely to have a stronger orientation towards applied problem solving, case studies, and utilize more “point and click” software to translate data into information. They are also likely to have a stronger emphasis on the “softer”, more latent skills associated with data science, including contextual interpretation, communication and visualization. These graduates are more closely aligned with “downstream” aspects of data science.
Alternatively, programs that have evolved out of a college of science (including computer science, technology and mathematics), are often more oriented with the computational mathematics of working with big data structures, scripting languages, machine learning, and statistics – on the “science of data” and applying the rigors of the scientific method to the translation of data into information for problem solving. They are less likely to emphasize domain expertise. These graduates are more closely aligned with “upstream” aspects of data science.

A scan of the emerging Ph.D. programs – the “youngest” evolutionary iteration of data science programs – illustrates that almost all are firmly grounded in mathematics and computer science even if they are housed in business schools. Because of the length of these programs (generally four or more years compared to two or fewer years for most masters programs), students have the luxury of time to develop deep technical skills combined with domain expertise and research experience to become the next generation of Chief Data Officers or Assistant Professors of Data Science.

For example, consider the constellation of the computing applications taken from the programs above:

The wider paths represent the more frequently used language/software from the programs above. While all programs generally emphasize SAS, R and SQL, programs housed in business schools are more likely to emphasize “point and click” software (e.g., JMP, SPSS, Excel, Minitab) while programs housed in science colleges are more likely to use scripting languages (e.g., Java, Python).

It is important at this point to emphasize that neither approach is “wrong”. Both orientations are evolving organically to meet the needs of the sectors/organizations which likely directly or indirectly were catalysts for their evolution. This evolution of programs is analogous to the characteristics of Darwin’s finches which have developed unique beaks to most efficiently thrive in the demands of the ecosystem from which they have evolved.

This is the primary reason why the cries for “standardization” of data science curricula and required industry “certifications” for data scientists similar to those developed for accountants or actuaries are pre-mature – the discipline is continuing to evolve. Standardizations at this stage would only suppress the valuable and innovative work that is evolving organically across the academic constellation: artificially imposing “standards” for the beaks of finches would have likely lead to the pre-mature extinction of species that now contribute in rich and meaningful ways to the larger ecosystem.

However, this also raises an important issue. A business analyst has important skills to contribute to the talent gap. As does the data engineer. As does the graduate who was engaged in the science of data. But, they are not interchangeable. We do our discipline and the market a disservice when we fail to make the distinction of the business analyst and the data engineer. They both play a role in the data science ecosystem.
In the context of academia, data science could look to economics as a potential discipline role model. Why? One reason is related to organizational placement. A scan of economics programs across the country will reveal programs housed in business schools, schools of arts and science, and independent “schools” of economics. Economics programs exist at the undergraduate, masters and Ph.D. levels in all of these academic locations. A second reason is that these programs may emphasize microeconomics or macroeconomics - some have a strong mathematical orientation and require a series of calculus courses and some emphasize public policy and domain expertise. Finally, economics programs place graduates both equally well in academia as well as in the private sector with titles like “Chief Economist”. It is also worth noting that the now well-established discipline of economics has never instituted a “standardization” process – with no detriment to its evolutionary path.

As data scientists, we are living in our first evolutionary epoch – few people can claim that they were present and contributed to the development of a new discipline. As the evolutionary fathers and thought leaders of a nascent discipline, we have responsibility to our intellectual descendants. Will data science evolve and flourish with rich and meaningful iterations like Darwin’s finches? Or are we destined to be the short lived and unidimensional dodo? ■
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[5] Program information from college websites collected September, 2016

The Strategic Meeting in June highlighted this as one of the major issues to be resolved in moving forward. Following the Board of Directors’ June Strategic Meeting, the Executive Committee met in August in Fort Worth, TX to tackle this problem.

The committee had lengthy discussions to identify the most effective way that the Institute and its regions could operate as a whole and came to the conclusion that it cannot be determined without input from DSI membership. Hence, the Executive Committee is evaluating alternative structures for defining the organizational relationships between DSI and its regional sub-divisions. Upon completion, these will be discussed with the Board of Directors for refinement and then submitted to the membership in survey form for input. Please be sure to participate in the survey when you receive it and share your opinion as a DSI member. This is your society and your voice matters.

I look forward to seeing you in Austin soon,

Best Wishes.
Funda Sahin
President, Decision Sciences Institute
Book Review: Leadership Lessons from a UPS Driver: Delivering a Culture of We, Not Me, by Ron Wallace

by Kirsten M. Rosacker, PhD, CPA, CMA, Minnesota State University-Mankato, Feature Editor

Mr. Wallace began his long career at United Parcel Service (UPS) in 1966 as a delivery driver in the State of Idaho. When he retired from the company in 2002, he had advanced to become President of UPS International. This book describes the leadership and business experiences Wallace acquired from within UPS as well as working with other business leaders throughout the world. It tells a story of success built on common sense principles that have stood the test of time and provide a platform for today’s students to understand how important public perception is and has been in the business world.

Jim Casey and Claude Ryan founded UPS in 1907 as American Messenger Company. Starting with a bicycle and $100, these two teenagers grew a multinational success story in the true sense of entrepreneurship. In 2015, the company earned revenues of $58.4 billion while employing 444,000 people around the world in a service area that includes over 220 countries and territories and every address in North America and Europe. Everyone immediately recognizes the brown delivery van so commonly employed by UPS and expects (and receives) a friendly demeanor from their forward-facing employees who are the lens through which this successful business is viewed.

UPS is ranked 48th on 2016 Fortune 500 list and 168th on the Fortune’s Global 500 list as well as 33rd on Fortunes list of the World’s Most Admired Companies (Fortune, 2016). While “88 percent of the companies on the Fortune 500 list in 1955 are now dead and buried” (p. 14), UPS has not only survived but also excelled for over 100 years. Wallace attributes UPS’s success to the deeply engrained value-based culture and leadership principles that the company founders developed and fostered in all employees since the company’s formation.

“Jim Casey and his partners created policies, principles, and values in the early 1900s that continue to guide the company well over a hundred years later” (p. 8). UPS’s primary objective has always been “to provide the best possible service at the lowest possible rates” (p. 3).

“Quality is a matter of appearance. People judge us by the visual and mental impression they get” (p. 10). Appearance transcends the business environment including uniforms, personal hygiene, package cars, offices, and buildings. UPS employees gather with their supervisors each day before the start of a shift. These team-building meetings, which last only a few minutes, are multipurpose. They enable supervisors to inspect employees to ensure they meet the company’s appearance standards as well as keep employees informed about significant organizations events. Such open communication helps to avoid rumors while reinforcing the “we are” concept that is important in team-based environments. While there is no company song (like in some successful Japanese companies), there is a brief moment of bonding and sense of common interest that leads to successful efforts.

UPS invests in its people. The organization seeks out people that want a long-term career with UPS. The company promotes people to managers using a within perspective. All members of management started as drivers, loaders, washers, or clerks. This enables the company’s founding principles to carry on into the future as its leaders understand those that are being lead while offering guidance in the same principles that they were coached. Additionally, UPS believes that promotion from within insures that members of management know, understand, and believe in the core values of the organization. Furthermore, this policy simplifies the organization’s succession planning.
However, sometimes an organization may benefit from an external consultant or “new blood” as a means of encouraging change. “Whenever your employees have been conditioned to breathe the same exhaust you are breathing,” you might consider seeking a consultant from outside the organization. “Outsiders don’t stand inside your barn all day and will thus be able to quickly detect ‘that smell.’ A fresh perspective may be just what the doctor ordered” (p. 69). Change at UPS is managed by promoting from within and by using external consultants only in a limited manner. Slow is preferred to fast change, tradition is maintained to a more constant degree by such a process. The company understands its culture of success and is quite reluctant to deviate to any substantive degree.

“Organizations are successful because people work together as a team: no heroes, no superstars” (p. 18). Wallace believed that when it takes a team to address and accomplish a project correctly, “chemistry is as important as education, experience and skills” (p. 16). He composed teams of the “best five” rather than the “five best” individuals. He sought individuals who worked well together as such a group would achieve synergy, a key component of success (p. 16).

Wallace stresses throughout the book the importance of being a leader not a boss. While leaders inspire and motivate, a boss dictates and intimidate. Everyone has personal experience with this important concept whether it is in your past employment or educational experiences. Think of the times when you have done your best, when you have been encouraged, when you have been motivated.

“The best leaders understand that more gets done when you don’t care who gets the credit” (p. 33). Wallace indicates the “most important thing that every leader does is to establish relationships based on trust and mutual respect” (p. 32).

Are you such a leader? If not, can you be such a leader? This is among the most important lessons offered in this book – it sends a real and meaningful message to all of us, teachers and students alike.

This is a concise no-nonsense book, packed with leadership lessons derived from Wallace’s experiences at UPS. He succinctly and pointedly attributes UPS’s success to “(d)etermined people working together in a values-based culture that constantly strive to the best … We, not me” (p. 162). I strongly recommend this book to individuals who currently lead others or plan to lead others in their business career.

The book is presented in a manner that encourages its adoption in a classroom environment. Each chapter ends with a key chapter take-away, a consulting (teaching) concept that is well understood by those who wish to transfer knowledge. The book contains “A Study Guide for Leaders and Their Teams” (p. 125-132) and Wallace has a blog that accompanies the book that serves as a helpful teaching tool (http://leadershiplessonsbyronwallace.com/blog/).

Ron Wallace served as the President of UPS International at the time of his retirement in 2002. Since his retirement from UPS he has engaged in many business and consulting endeavors. In addition to this book, he has written, Power of Campaign Pyramid and co-wrote Irish Pubs in America: History, Lore, and Recipes. His book Leadership Lessons from the Old West will soon be released.


Reference:
As they say, all good things must come to an end. After a little over four years as Editor of DSJIE the time has come to pass the baton. I am deeply appreciative of the opportunity I have had to serve DSJ in this capacity. I am humbled by the support I have received from the DSJ Board over the years, the Associate Editors that I have leaned on to manage the editorial process, the reviewers who are central to a meaningful feedback process, and the authors without whose contributions there would be no need for the journal. The confidence and trust you have placed in me have made the journey worthwhile. In my final report to the DSJ membership I will not only summarize the journal’s activities of the past twelve months but over the duration of my tenure. I like to believe that the journal has come a long way since 2012.

Performance Metrics
The journal received 84 new submissions in the last twelve months (through September 30, 2015). Of these, 25% were Teaching Briefs, 25% were Conceptual Research Articles, and 50% were Empirical Research Articles. This is similar to the pattern of submissions in the preceding twelve month period as well as over the last four years (30% Teaching Briefs, 24% Conceptual Research Articles, 46% Empirical Research Articles). As the table below shows, the mean time to first decision has continued to fall, and as in past years, over 90% of submissions have been processed within 90 days.

Considering all new submissions since June 2012, the acceptance rate continues to be just below 20%. Approximately 41% of submissions are desk rejected and a further 30% rejected following the review process. Both in terms of acceptance rate and timeliness, the journal has continued to maintain high standards and a commitment to providing authors with a responsive review process.

Special Issues
The journal published a Special Issue earlier this year on ‘Identifying and Managing Critical Success Factors of Online Education’. Sean Eom (Southeast Missouri State University), Nicholas Ashill (American University of Sharjah), and Ben Arbaugh (University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh) served as Guest Editors for the issue.

A Special Issue on ‘Developing Executive Education Programs with Online Distance Education’ is scheduled to appear in early 2017. Marc J. Schniederjans and Dennis Lanham (University of Nebraska-Lincoln) and Stephen LeGrand (Valmont Industries, Inc.) are the issue editors.

Special Issues have become a regular feature of the journal, with previous issues examining ‘Rethinking Undergraduate Business Education: In the Classroom and Beyond’ and ‘Educational Innovation and Reform in the Decision Sciences Using Multidisciplinary and Collaborative Practices’. I am grateful to all the Special Issue editors for their commitment and leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Submissions</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to First Decision (days)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First decision within 90 days</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on Page 4
I would like to use this opportunity to introduce myself to those members of DSI who I have not yet met. My name is Matt Drake, and I am the incoming editor-in-chief of the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education. I have been working with the current editor, Vijay Kannan, for the past few months on the transition, and I am very excited about starting my new role as editor. I have been a faculty member in the Palumbo-Donahue School of Business at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, since 2006; and my current roles are as Associate Professor of Supply Chain Management and the Harry W. Witt Faculty Fellow in Supply Chain Management.

I became an academic chiefly because I wanted to work with students in the classroom, and I have been able to balance my research interests and output between functional research in my field as well as pedagogical research related to its teaching. I have found over the years that there are many excellent teachers in the decision sciences area, and quality pedagogical research is essential for helping future academics to succeed in the classroom. My main strategic objective as editor of DSJIE is to help to make it the preeminent outlet for publishing pedagogical research related to managerial decision making. The journal already has a strong reputation, and I am striving to make it the unquestioned leader in the field.

You, the members of DSI, can help me accomplish this lofty goal by submitting your manuscripts to the journal for publication consideration. Any journal can only be as good and effective as the papers it receives for review.

I encourage all of you to think about the innovations that you have developed for the classroom and consider writing them up as a teaching brief. I also encourage you to think about conducting more substantive pedagogical research studies and submitting them as conceptual or empirical research articles. If you have any ideas about which you would like to get some feedback, please reach out to me at drake987@duq.edu to discuss them. I am happy to give you some comments early on that will hopefully lead to a more successful submission down the road.

I am very grateful for the opportunity to serve the journal and the DSI community in this important capacity. I am excited about working with the excellent team of associate editors, members of the editorial review board, and frequent reviewers that have helped to make the journal the success that it is. I am indebted to Vijay for the leadership and guidance he has provided to me as we have worked through this transition period. With your help and support I will continue to build on the solid foundation that he and the other past editors have entrusted to me.
The Policy Analyst: A Practitioner’s Perspective

by Thomas E. Lang, LMI

What is policy analysis? This may sound like a simple question, but one not necessarily with an easy answer. A quick search of the Internet returns numerous books, blogs, and scholarly journal articles centered on providing some type of answer to this question. Bovbjerg defines policy analysis as “systematic thinking about public issues or decisions leading to practical responses that can be broadly communicated.” [1] While definitions vary, they usually revolve around applying tools and techniques to alternative policy options for the purpose of providing the policy maker with accurate information on cost and benefit tradeoffs to make informed decisions.

The terms policy analysis and public policy analysis are often used interchangeably in the literature, but for the purpose of this article, we will make a distinction between the terms, as the latter term imposes unnecessary limitations on the discipline. The phrase, public policy analysis, limits the focus to analysis of policies in the public sector (or for public good), where the public sector refers to federal, state, or local governments. Although government agencies were the early consumers of policy analysis, today, the discipline is found in a wide range of sectors, both publics and private. Figure 1 shows initial job placements for graduates of the Pardee RAND Graduate School (formerly The Graduate Institute of the Rand Corporation) with a PhD in Policy Analysis from 2004-2014.

As Figure 1 illustrates, the majority of job placements are in non-government (non-public) jobs (62%). Does this mean that policy analysts in the government and non-government sectors require different training? From my own personal experiences, and those of my colleagues, the answer is no. While the policy arena may be different, the underlying tools and techniques the analysts employ are often the same.

Origins

In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson required all federal agencies to adopt the Policy Planning Budgeting System (PPBS) established by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. In order to train the expert analysts needed to execute the new requirements, the Ford Foundation funded eight graduate level (master’s and doctoral) public policy programs. Table 1 lists the original eight programs.

The purpose for establishing and funding these new programs was to train policy analysts through a rigorous curriculum, which provided tools and techniques that could be applied across various policy arenas. Rather than focus on any one particular policy arena, the programs provided qualified graduates to fill the growing number of analyst positions across the government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Eight Graduate Level Public Policy Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate Institute of the Rand Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School of Public Policy at Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School of Urban and Public Affairs at Carnegie-Mellon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute of Public Policy Studies at Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School of Business at Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Institute of Policy Sciences and Public Affairs at Duke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [Muns, 1979][3]
In addition, the programs provided practical experience allowing the students the opportunity to apply the tools and techniques they were learning in the classroom to real world problems. Graduating students had a unique combination of theoretical and practical training. This differed from the traditional public administration programs of the time, which typically focused on training future managers and administrators with the skills to implement policies. The new programs would provide policy analysts who could inform decision makers on the various trade-offs and potential effects of the various policy alternatives.

What Makes the Policy Analysis Degree Unique?

Today, there are over 285 policy schools in the United States. [4] The schools offer a range of degrees at the master’s and doctoral level including but not limited to: public policy, policy analysis, public administration, and public affairs.

Policy schools have been accused of diluting the policy degree due to the growing number of schools offering degrees and the growing fields of study within the schools. [4] This makes the policy analysis degree that much more important and relevant in today’s environment. Policy analysis programs provide a wide range of courses across various academic disciplines. As students proceed in the program, they are also given the opportunity to focus on specific areas as they work on master’s thesis and dissertations. A well-designed policy analysis program is built around the methods being taught, not the specific area of policy. For example, if a prospective student wanted to completely focus on the health arena, they may be better served to enter a public health degree program.

The students in the policy analysis programs arrive with undergraduate and graduate degrees in fields like economics, engineering, law, medicine, and journalism to name a few. This diverse student body provides a unique academic environment, one where students approach the same issues from different perspectives. Courses offered at policy analysis programs include micro- and macro-economics, operations research, probability and statistics, regression analysis, and social science research.

An early study on policy schools by Dunn in 1975 found “A feature common to all of the programs is to require either workshops or an internship.” In addition, “It is evident that the policy analyst is being trained as an adviser rather than as an academician and as a consequence the necessary techniques and skills cannot be taught entirely in the classroom.” [5] This internship is called on-the-job training (OJT) at the Pardee RAND Graduate School. OJT is conducted from the time a student enters the program through graduation. “Most opportunities for OJT arise through ongoing RAND research. Pardee RAND students have the opportunity to join teams of RAND researchers, initially as apprentices and later, as their skills develop, in roles of increasing responsibility and independence. At any time at RAND, more than 500 research projects are underway, which students may apply to join.” [6]

Graduating students of a well-designed policy analysis program should feel confident they have the necessary skills needed to immediately contribute in their new positions.

What does a policy analyst do?

“Today a large percentage of the policy analyst jobs are found outside of government. They rarely include any executive-level jobs.” [7] Policy analysts are found in all areas of the workforce. They choose careers in the public sector, research institutes, private industry, academia, and other nonprofit organizations. Table 2 provides a sample of initial positions accepted by graduates from 3 graduate level policy programs.

Policy analysts are involved in all stages of the policy process. Walker laid out an eight-step approach for making policy decisions. [8] The approach is based on systems analysis and demonstrates how policy analysts are involved in every stage. “Policy analysis is systems analysis applied to public sector decision making. It is not a set of techniques, but rather an approach to problem solving. It is, in fact, a philosophy for carrying out decision-oriented research; a perspective on the proper use of available tools.” [8] The approach is summarized as follows:

1. Identify the Problem to be solved.
2. Identify the Objectives of the Analysis: Decide what the policy that results from the analysis should achieve.
3. Choose the Measures: Determine a way to evaluate the different policy options being analyzed.
5. Analyze the Alternatives: Examine each alternative policy using the measures identified in step 3.
6. Compare the Alternatives and Choose the Policy to Implement: Examine outside factors that may impact the policy outcome in combination with the results from step 5 and choose the policy to implement (or recommend)
7. Implement the Chosen Policy: Create and carryout the implementation plan.
8. Monitor and Evaluate the Results: Continue to monitor to policy outcomes to ensure the desired objectives continue to be met.

Walker also noted that, “The policy analyst, however, must keep his work problem oriented, remembering that his primary job is to solve a problem, not build a model.” [8] While building a model may be needed, the objective of the analyst needs to be identifying the best method for solving the problem identified in the first step.

Table 2: Policy Analyst Careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Research Institutes</th>
<th>Private Industry</th>
<th>Academia</th>
<th>Other Nonprofit Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
<td>RAND Corporation</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Housing and Development</td>
<td>MITRE Corporation</td>
<td>Anagen</td>
<td>University of California, San Diego</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Intelligence Agency</td>
<td>American Enterprise Institute</td>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>African Center for Economic Transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example
As mentioned in the introduction, policy analysts are found in both the public and private sectors, which provides analysts the opportunity to work on a diverse set of policy issues. As an illustrative example, consider a recent study that explored how to improve precision and reliability in the Department of Defense supply chain. [9]

The Department of Defense enterprise is large and complex, with an estimated 3 million employees, 5,000 locations, and a $600 billion budget. [10] In support of that enterprise, the DoD supply chain deals with 5 million items, approximately $98 billion in inventory, and a worldwide distribution system. With such a large scale of operations, it is always a possibility that a supply chain activity can introduce unwanted variability and uncertainty, leading to inventory losses, delays, or inaccuracies. Therefore the study analyzed DoD supply chain variability to address the concern that, while DoD has largely transitioned into a leaner fighting force, its supply chain is still characterized by a brute-force approach.

The study investigated opportunities to:

- improve supply chain reliability and precision across the five supply chain processes of Plan, Source, Make/Maintain, Deliver, and Return, as well as Enable activities that support each process;
- help DoD overcome the significant cost of human capital, inventory, and redundant infrastructure in a less-than-lean system; and
- improve confidence in supply chain planning and lessen reliance on expensive performance buffers, such as safety stocks and the expediting of material.

The goal was to advance the ability of DoD’s supply chain to meet the strategic and fiscal challenges of the coming decade. The study approached the task in three stages:

- Identify where variability exists across the five supply chain process areas.
- Demonstrate the negative effects of that variability and conduct sensitivity analyses to highlight the potential benefits of a reduction in variability.
- Develop a detailed plan for reducing variability and capturing associated benefits in supply chain reliability and precision.

Figure 2 illustrates the overall approach to accomplishing the objectives of the study.
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- Interviewed logistics managers in the DoD headquarters, DoD component organizations, and industry.
- Researched and reviewed literature on DoD supply chain precision and reliability, including past research reports, GAO reports, and government documents.
- Compiled supply chain performance measurements from collected DoD data.
- Modeled supply chain processes and simulated the impacts of reduced variability.
- Modeled a plan after the Comprehensive Inventory Management Improvement Plan.
- Linked plan to other DoD plans and initiatives.

DoD Instruction 4140.01 establishes policy and assigns responsibilities for management of materiel across the DoD supply chain. Similarly, volumes 1–11 of DoD Manual 4140.01 implement policy, assign responsibilities, and provide procedures for materiel managers and others working within or with the DoD supply system. The study team consulted these guidance documents as they developed the plan of action to reduce and mitigate the effects of variability. For example, procedures in volumes 2–6 of the manual deal with the five supply chain processes of Plan, Source, Maintain/Repair, Deliver, and Return. The five volumes also provide important background about what actions are possible when reducing or mitigating the effects of variability.

The study team also reviewed and incorporated information from three DoD strategic initiatives:

- **The Comprehensive Inventory Management Improvement Plan (CIMIP);**
- **The Strategic Network Optimization (SNO) initiative;** and
- **The Strategy for Improving DoD Asset Visibility.**

As a framework for accomplishing the study’s objectives, the team mapped DoD’s supply chain processes and activities (see Figure 4). Using the map, the study team:

- conducted structured interviews to identify variability in supply processes performed throughout the DoD supply chain;
- collected data and performed modeling and simulations to analyze and quantify the effects of process variability; and
- built an action plan for reducing process variability along the supply chain.

As the team developed the plan, they aligned proposed actions with the existing initiatives’ actions, or offered additional actions not covered by those initiatives.

The DoD supply chain is expansive in more than size. It encompasses a large number of activities and supply chain processes, as illustrated in Figure 3.

The supply chain starts with the supplier and raw material (the left of Figure 3) and ends with the customer and finished product (the right of Figure 3). This view of the DoD supply chain aligns with DoD Instruction 4140.01, which states, “the supply chain is the linked activities associated with providing materiel from a raw material stage to an end user as a finished product.” [11]

As a framework for accomplishing the study’s objectives, the team mapped DoD’s supply chain processes and activities (see Figure 4). Using the map, the study team:

- conducted structured interviews to identify variability in supply processes performed throughout the DoD supply chain;
- collected data and performed modeling and simulations to analyze and quantify the effects of process variability; and
- built an action plan for reducing process variability along the supply chain.

As the team developed the plan, they aligned proposed actions with the existing initiatives’ actions, or offered additional actions not covered by those initiatives.

The goal was to advance the ability of DoD’s supply chain to meet the strategic and fiscal challenges of the coming decade. The study approached the task in three stages:

- Identify where variability exists across the five supply chain process areas.
- Demonstrate the negative effects of that variability and conduct sensitivity analyses to highlight the potential benefits of a reduction in variability.
- Develop a detailed plan for reducing variability and capturing associated benefits in supply chain reliability and precision.

Figure 2 illustrates the overall approach to accomplishing the objectives of the study.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppliers’ supplier</th>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Wholesale</th>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>Customer’s customer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Prime contractor</td>
<td>Maintenance activities</td>
<td>Maintenance depot</td>
<td>Operating forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OEM</td>
<td>Distribution/transportation</td>
<td>Retail supply/maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance depot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Installation support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DoD Supply Chain
Figure 4 demonstrates the complexities of the DoD supply chain from the supplier on the far left to customer on the far right. The white boxes are DoD supply chain activities, with the yellow boxes defining the process that each supply chain activity performs. Blue dashed lines show the movement of supplier materiel and black lines show the movement of DoD materiel. The movement of information is also critical, and is denoted by the green dashed lines.

The study demonstrated through modeling and simulation and other quantitative examples, how reductions in variability will help improve supply chain reliability and precision. The study then provided a detailed plan to reduce both the variability customers experience and the variability materiel managers experience. The result is more effective materiel support and management and greater customer confidence. Completion of each plan action will ensure the maintainer and the warfighter have what they need when they need it, while reducing inefficiencies and eliminating excesses.

In addition to the detailed plan, the study team also concluded that reducing variance for individual segments of the supply chain does not necessarily reduce overall supply chain variability, and that DoD supply chain policies should be analytically driven.
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Rewriting History: How Lean Manufacturing Erased the Vibrant Pre-Lean Era of the 1980s

By Richard J. Schonberger, Ph.D.

Lean manufacturing made its debut via the book, The Machine that Changed the World, (Womack and Jones, 1990). In reporting on how lean manufacturing had given Japanese automakers significant competitive advantages in its industry, and in its review of Toyota’s central role in lean’s development, the book said little about lean’s methodologies. That omission seemed of small consequence in that throughout the 1980s the manufacturing practices made famous largely by Toyota had been widely promulgated and implemented by manufacturers in most manufacturing sectors, in the U.S. and numerous other countries. The primary practices—for convenience, referred to herein as the “JIT core”—include: cellular manufacturing; quick setup; lot-size reduction/one-piece flow; kanban; simple, low-cost dedicated equipment; cross-training/job rotation; just-in-time purchasing; supplier-certified quality; reduction of suppliers (to a few good ones); point-of-use deliveries; SS; total productive maintenance (TPM); and fail-safing. To those stalwarts of the JIT core, we should recognize, as ancillary devices: stack lights, reduced-size, fixed-quantity containers; conveyor, fork truck, stockroom, and wall removal; recording of causes of stoppages and slowdowns; backflush costing, and activity-based costing.

The manufacturing practices of that “pre-lean” era took on the following names: material as needed (M.A.N.) (Harley-Davidson, 1982); continuous-flow manufacturing (CFM) (IBM, 1982); zero-inventory production system (ZIPS) (Omark Industries, 1983); stockless production (Hall, 1983); short-cycle manufacturing (SCM) (Motorola, mid-1980s); and, more durably and in vast usage, “just-in-time (JIT) production” (Sugimori, et al., 1977; Ashburn, 1977). Or, sometimes, the term was just in time with total quality control (JIT/TQC), the combination making up “two cornerstones of the Toyota production system” (Shingo, 1985, pp. xvii, 154).

The JIT core was the main subject matter in numerous 1980s books and hundreds of articles, many of them focused on or including case-study reports on manufacturers that had implemented large aspects of JIT. A briefly annotated bibliography of thirty-one 1980’s-dated books, monographs, and conference proceedings, included at the end of this article, is suggestive of the volume and breadth of the JIT/TQC movement of that era.

The Disappearance

The mystery is that, beginning in the early 1990s and still today, JIT production’s vibrant history has gone missing. The JIT term is still in use—in books, articles, and the press—but rarely next to the word “production.” Rather, JIT has been downgraded and relegated to a modifier of the word, inventory; viz, just-in-time inventory. How or when JIT came to be used in that way is unclear, but just-in-time inventory is the way the JIT term appears in the index and two places in the text of Womack and Jones (1990).

Nevertheless, lean manufacturing’s arrival was well received; JIT production was shop-worn: my own research on long-term inventory trends (inventory being a widely recognized overall JIT performance metric) was showing, in hard numbers, that JIT was faltering. My view at the time was that given all the attention that lean was getting, lean might re-energize JIT, and doing so with a catchy and apt new name. I presumed that, since both JIT and lean had the same Japanese-manufacturing roots, JIT’s core elements would populate the body of lean manufacturing.

What Lean Became

But lean turned out to play down much of the core JIT legacy, and play up such devices as value-stream mapping (VSM); going to the place; A3; value-add/non-value-add (VA/NVA) analysis; spaghetti diagramming; the five whys; and kaizen events. Notably, none of these seven...
methodologies acts on or in the process; that is, they do not change any manufacturing practices. Rather, all are ways of studying or analyzing processes. In contrast all of the JIT-core methodologies change and improve processes, bringing about quicker flows, fewer stoppages, clearer sightlines, silo elimination, obviation of nonconformities, simple shop-floor communication, higher-validity cost information, and more.

The point should be obvious: Methods that change/improve processes are essential; those that study or analyze can be beneficial but are not essential. That includes VA/NVA, spaghetti charts, five whys, and kaizen events, which were not native to the lean era: they were well known among the JIT community of the 1980s. But nobody would have considered them to be essential. Furthermore, in some, maybe many cases, lean’s process-analysis tools can be over-used to the point of being un-lean: They can consume excessive time and professional-grade talent that could be better employed in breaking the silos, cutting lot sizes, installing kanban, and so forth. In other words, lean’s analyze-and-study elements can become vehicles of over-planning and over-management.

What To Do
This article’s title raises the question as to how all this happened. A convenient answer is that, especially in the U.S., there is a strong tendency to seize the latest “big thing,” and puff it up for a few years while allowing “well-meaning practitioners to stuff it with all things good and beautiful” (as Galsworth, 2015, put it) to the point where there’s scarcely any agreement on its definition, main elements, and purpose. Then (as in the 1955 movie, The Seven Year Itch, with Marilyn Monroe), ditch it in favor of the next thing (or, in the movie, the next women). That happened to reengineering and to total quality management; then to JIT production; and now, probably, it’s happening to lean.

We scholars should know better than to fall for such debilitating tendencies. Moreover, our objectivity, as professionals, is called into question when we are lax in our research about maintaining full sets of references, while discounting or casting off whole blocks of academically important one, in favor of themes that practitioners and their consultants have taken up.

In this article, given limited space, I chose to include only book-length works in the bibliography. Some such works contain original matter, others include more-comprehensive treatments of given topics than are possible in published articles, and many of the books include their own large bibliographies. Also, in this era of on-line literature searches, book titles may come up, but not the content of books. So, it seems, we lack convenient means of researching what’s inside books.

The purpose of this article, however, does not revolve around research methods. More basic than that, the purpose is to bring back the lost JIT-production decade and its abundant repository process-management and improvement methodologies. Without that, our research gets a grade of incomplete.
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Deep Roots: A History of Mentorship at WDSI
By John E. Bell

At a recent Western Decision Sciences meeting in Napa California, I reflected with the President of the Decision Sciences Institute about the ongoing success of the Western Region and the continued success of its annual meetings. Of course, much of the credit for any conference goes to the volunteers and track chairs that recruit, organize and execute the conference each year. However at a higher level, the strategic management of the Board of Directors of WDSI has a secret weapon that has helped to guide it through the decades: the dedication and continued service of our WDSI Past Presidents. These professors, many of whom are already retired, continue to serve WDSI, attend our annual conference and work to ensure the success of the Western region. For example, it is not uncommon for 8-12 Past Presidents of WDSI to be in attendance at every WDSI annual meeting and to actively take part in the activities of the conference including our annual board meeting and conference planning committee meetings. This culture of service by the Past Presidents has created a system of mentorship and knowledge management that allows the current WDSI board to be innovative without repeating the mistakes of the past. For example, each year as new board members select conference sites or make financial decisions, it is not uncommon for a Past President to point out the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach, or to reflect on how success was achieved in a previous decade. This mentorship and sharing of knowledge by the Past Presidents has been a key to success at WDSI that needs to be acknowledged.

Although each board member at WDSI serves for a six year rotating term through each of the Vice President roles and the Presidency, their commitment to WDSI and DSI often continues for many decades after the term of WDSI President. Two of the recent WDSI Presidents, Keong Leong and Krishna Dhir, also went on to serve as Presidents of DSI in 2011 and 2012, and many others have moved on to become Deans and successful administrators throughout the Academy. Additionally, WDSI Past President Eldon Li is the current DSI Vice President for Asia, Past President Vijay Kanaan has served the last four years as the editor of the Decision Science Journal of Innovative Education, and Past President Mahyar Amouzegar has been the research feature editor for Decision Line for the past four years. Regardless of their current duties, each year the presence of the Past Presidents is felt and appreciated at the annual meeting of WDSI. This year several of the recent Past Presidents were in attendance at the most recent WDSI conference in Las Vegas in April of 2016 including John Davies, Marc Massoud, Sheldon Smith, Nafi Heiat, Bruce Raymond, Keong Leong, Karen Fowler, Hamdi Bilici, Mahyar Amouzegar and Debbie Gilliard and each offered sage advice and guidance to the current Board of Directors about our conference activities and future strategy. Having been on this board of directors for the past five years, I can honestly say that we could not function with our current level of efficiency or effectiveness without the mentorship and guidance of these leaders. These individuals have created a welcoming and supportive culture at WDSI that is visible throughout the organization.
But where did this culture start and how did WDSI build such a strong tradition? I recently had the chance to explore this question in May when I met and had lunch with the first WDSI President, Dr. Bob Hopfe, who served as the President of WDSI in its first year of existence in 1972. Bob currently resides near the Great Smoky Mountains in Maryville, Tennessee. He is retired from a thirty-five-year career at the California State University at Sacramento and visiting stints at Georgia State University and The University of Tennessee.

In reflecting with Bob about the roots of WDSI, it was fascinating to hear him talk about the first meeting. According to Bob, the idea for a Western Region was put forward at the first DSI meeting in New Orleans and while at that meeting he was asked to head up the first regional meeting. Less than a year later, the first Western region meeting was held at a small hotel near Sacramento’s International Airport. About twenty professors attended. The next year WDSI met at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona.

Bob still laughs about how Chuck Bonini, then a Professor at Stanford, arrived and registered at the meeting. This was considered a "late" registration by the meeting’s host. To Bob's chagrin, the host decided to charge Chuck a late fee for not registering prior to the meeting. Since those early days, Bob has watched WDSI grow and transition for over forty years, and it was great to see him reflect proudly about the contents of our most recent conference program and the academic rigor of the presentations at WDSI this year. A legacy that he and his colleagues started in California over four decades ago continues to grow and prosper. According to Bob, DSI and WDSI have far exceeded the expectations of early founders such as Dennis Grawoig, George Summers, Bill Peters, Rodger Collons, Gene Groff, Ken Uhl, Al Simone, and others. In his opinion, the vision for creating an outlet for decision sciences research at both the national and regional levels has been achieved in spades.

In summary, the story of the success of WDSI has always stemmed from the service of its Past Presidents. From Bob Hopfe in 1972 to Debbie Gilliard in 2016, our Past Presidents have left a legacy of service and mentorship to the Decision Sciences Institute that has helped to guide the Western region and contribute to the Institute. I’m sure that I can speak for all of the current members of the WDSI Board of Directors when I say that we are grateful to these leaders for their mentorship and guidance. We know we have big shoes to fill, and we will work hard to keep the legacy going.
The 3R's at SEDSI - Research, Relationships, and Restoration

by: Shona D. Morgan  
North Carolina A&T State University

The 46th Annual Meeting of the Southeast Decision Sciences Institute (SEDSI) was held on February 17-19, 2016 at the Colonial Williamsburg Hotel in Williamsburg, Virginia. The conference brought together a global network of over 120 attendees interested in the decision sciences. Conference goers traveled from as far as Japan and Turkey to participate and interact with a group of highly dedicated and committed scholars. Colonial Williamsburg offered the perfect backdrop for attendees to explore 18th century life through a variety of tours, museums, carriage rides, and reenactments. The Revolutionary City is also home to a wide selection of golf, dining, and shopping options.

As a result of careful planning by the Program Chair, Suzie Smith (Presbyterian College), the meeting proved to be a stimulating academic gathering with over 83 papers, panels, and workshops in 38 regular sessions. The three-day event featured sessions that embraced the interdisciplinary focus of the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI). Attendees enjoyed thought-provoking sessions on topics such as data mining, statistics, cybersecurity, organizational behavior, and sports and tourism.

SEDSI continues to be an engaging venue to showcase best practices in innovative teaching and pedagogy in the decision sciences. The Data, Analytics and Statistics Instruction Track and the Innovative Education, Teaching and Pedagogy Track offered in-depth sessions on teaching with cases, enhancing online instruction, and curriculum and course design considerations. The conference also remains attractive for students to present their work. Over 11 students participated by submitting papers and posters for presentation.

Of particular note, was the presentation of the Distinguished Service Award to George Lowry (Randolph Macon College). In addition, we honored the accomplishments of our outgoing President, Shannon Gibson (East Carolina University) and welcomed our new President, Jason Dean (Virginia Tech).

We are a vibrant community of scholars and hope that you will make plans to join us in Charleston, South Carolina in 2017. The deadline for papers and special session proposals is October 17, 2017 and the deadline for student papers is November 21, 2017. For more information about SEDSI, please visit our web site at http://www.sedsi.org.

The President’s Reception (with generous sponsorship from East Carolina University) allowed SEDSI to celebrate exemplary scholarship and service.

By: Shona D. Morgan  
North Carolina A&T State University
8th Annual Conference of the European Decision Sciences Institute (EDSI) 2017, Granada, Spain

Information and Operational Decision Sciences

The Conference theme is “Information and Operational Decision Sciences: The Interplay of Information Technology and Operational Decision Sciences”. Information technology (IT) capabilities enable firms to digitally transform their business processes to pursue business flexibility, quality, and innovation, thus improving the firms’ operational performance. Operational capabilities and performance are the heart of the business model to survive in the long run.

The 1st Annual Conference of the EDSI was hosted by IESE Business School in Barcelona (Spain) in 2010, and it came back to Spain (Granada) in 2017. The Conference is hosted by the Department of Management of the University of Granada, an “anti-disciplinary” Department that integrates the field of Operations Management, Strategy, Information Systems, and Human Resource Management, which converts it in an ideal place to manage the Conference.

We look forward to seeing you in Granada!

Jose Benitez, Conference Chair
Javier Llorens, Conference Co-Chair

As two separate fields in many Business Schools (i.e., Information Systems and Operations Management), sometimes it seems as IT is from Mars and operations management from Venus. The Decision Sciences community is the ideal platform to pursue an “anti-disciplinary” (i.e., multi-disciplinary) approach to develop research and teaching work combining the two fields. Because in the interplay of IT and operational decision making the whole is more than the sum of its parts, this Conference calls for high-quality research on the interplay of IT and operational decision making.
8th Annual EDSI Conference
Call for Papers

Call for papers
We call for high-quality research on the Conference theme: “Information and Operational Decision Sciences”, and for rigorous research on any of the following tracks and topics. Other interesting topics not explicitly included in the list are also welcomed.

Information Systems
- Interplay of IT and operational decision making.
- Business value of IT.
- IT-enabled organizational capabilities.
- IT and innovation activities.
- Business value of social media.
- Social media and business activities.
- Social media and customer value proposition.
- Social media and innovation activities.
- Big data and business analytics.

Decision Sciences in Accounting, Finance, and Marketing
- Accounting, financial, and marketing decision making in organizations.

Operations Management
- Interplay of IT and operational decision making.
- Big data and operational decision making.
- Supply chain management.
- Innovation management.
- Supply chain management and open innovation.
- Globalization of manufacturing operations.
- Quality management.
- Triple bottom line and operations management.
- Behavioral aspects of operations management.
- Decision making in public organizations.

Strategy and Human Resource Management
- New trends in entrepreneurship activities.
- Interface between IT and strategic management.
- Interface between IT and human resource management.
- Interface between strategic and operations management.
- Interface between human resource and operations management.

Instructional development in Decision Sciences

The best full papers selected by the Scientific Committee will be considered for publication in the International Journal of Production Economics subject to review.

MEMBER HIGHLIGHT

Anthony Ross
Rockwell Automation Endowed Chair in Supply Chain Management
Professor, Supply Chain and Operations Management

Education
Ph.D., Operations Management and Decision Sciences (double major), Indiana University-Bloomington

Background
Dr. Ross left Michigan State University in 2010 and joined UW-Milwaukee faculty in the Lubar School of Business. Industry demand for supply chain management graduates in the State of Wisconsin and the larger region created the opportunity for Dr. Ross to lead the faculty's redesign of the undergraduate curriculum and to strengthen MBA and doctoral programs. Using grass-roots efforts to engage industry, high schools, and current undergraduates, the program size has grown at the rate of 30% per year since 2011 to nearly 490 supply chain majors. The doctoral program has also grown to over seven students at various stages of their degree program.

Dr. Ross’ research interests include logistics system design, supplier performance, and operations analysis with funding from a variety of sources. Dr. Ross has published over 60 refereed articles and proceedings in top journals such as Decision Sciences, Journal of Operations Management, Journal of Business Logistics, International Journal of Logistics Management, IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, and several other leading journals.

He has co-authored sponsored research monographs on topics including electronic-procurement, RFID, service supplier quality, warehousing, and supply chain inventories. He serves on the Editorial Board of Operations Management Review, was special guest editor of Intl. Journal of Production Research, and as ad hoc reviewer for many leading journals.

Professional Activities
Dr. Ross is Professor and the Rockwell Automation Endowed Chair in Supply Chain Management. He is the Founding Director of the Supply Chain Management Institute in the Sheldon B. Lubar School of Business at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. The Institute focus includes industry engagement, fundraising, interdisciplinary academic collaborations, student engagement with industry, corporate training, and basic/applied research. Prior to joining the Lubar School, Dr. Ross served on the faculties of Eli Broad College of Business at Michigan State University, and the Lowry Mays Business School Texas A&M University-College Station. Professor Ross also held appointments as the Donald Gordon International Fellow, Graduate School of Business, University of Capetown (UCT) in South Africa where he was instrumental in launching MBA curriculum in supply chain management.

UCT is rated among the top business schools in the African continent, and listed in the Financial Times Top 100 Business Programs. Professor Ross continues to teach in all areas of supply chain management including Global Logistics, Manufacturing and Service Operations Management, Transportation and Logistics Management, Sourcing Strategy, and Decision Modeling (Analytics).

Dr. Ross’ activities in Decision Sciences Institute began in 1993 as a student member. He is affiliated with Midwest DSI. He has served DSI in several roles on multiple occasions as Track Chair, Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Committee (member and chair), Annual Doctoral Student Workshop (panelist and chair), and Proceedings Editor for the Annual Conference, and Ad hoc committees. He currently serves on the DSI Nominating Committee.
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Enhancing Effective Technical Education through Application of “Puzzles Principles”
by Kamran Abedini, PhD
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Introduction
Traditionally, technical education, in particular engineering, has been segmented, with many courses taught as independent subjects. It is typically divided into core, electives, support and general education courses. In many instances, a student spends the first two years taking support and general education courses and will not be introduced to major (core) courses until the junior year. This is especially true when students attend Junior Colleges to prepare for a four-year university. Thus almost fifty percent of a new engineering student’s college life is spent on a set of diverse courses with little or no mention of any technical application. Assuming that a student enters university as a freshman, he or she would possibly be exposed to an orientation course or an introduction course in their field. However, in most cases reasons for why these courses or the subject matters are important are not mentioned. Students assume that a faculty knows best and they would help them eventually to understand what is expected of an engineer.

In most programs, a course is selected or defined as a prerequisite for another course, without a clear genuine relation between these courses or even a minimal mention of its relationships to other courses. Worse, review of several programs has shown that often courses are taught without even mentioning their interactions with specific programs. If we are shaping and developing engineers and scientists of the future, then we have to change from a segmented pedagogy, and look at the curriculum more from a “Systems” point of view, with visible interactions between courses and interrelations amongst them.

Additionally, to enhance this interaction, the author believes, students should be viewed as a whole person who possess much higher cognitive capabilities than we might currently expect from them.

This is of particular importance in a capstone course. Finally, a typical general education course would not give the person the thirst and the desire to learn about engineering (or other technical fields).

College freshmen most often start their technical program, in particular engineering filled with uncertainty. Some possibly have heard of what they are supposed to do and others have no idea, just that it sounds good to be an engineer, a financial analyst or a biologist. Civil engineers build roads, Mechanicals design products, but how does double integrals help them with roads, products, computers, etc. Universities design curriculum for technical programs, identify pre-requisites, co-requisites, general education, and support classes, to build a solid foundation for student’ education. To a freshman, the foundation hardly shows any correlation with the final goal of becoming a designer of products and processes. It is time to reexamine technical education to ensure that students fully realizes the importance of learning every course and know the relationship of pre-requisites and the sequential course design.

Puzzles Principles
The concept of Puzzles Principles is developed to address the above concerns. To better understand the concept, consider a jigsaw puzzle (Figure 1), which consists of many pieces that once joined make up a big picture, just like courses in a curriculum. When trying to assemble the puzzle, one looks at the main scene, visually divides the scene into sections (e.g., for a natural scene you might have trees, sky, water, etc.), and groups the pieces in sub groups (e.g., borders have straight edges, pieces that look like they belong to a body of water, etc.).
Although, the pieces could be connected into subgroups, the relationship between the big picture, the segments and the pieces are still clear to one’s mind. Similarly, it is essential a freshman should also be able to see the big picture from day one and visualize the relationship between courses (puzzle pieces), the main subjects being taught (e.g., operations management) and the big picture (i.e. actual major). This visualization requires understanding, creativity and intelligence, with all three as the major components of the Puzzles Principles.

Consequently, we propose a process of redesigning an introductory course, where real life puzzles are introduced (the big picture), main problems are identified (a sub-scene), and the need of the specific subject of study is clearly defined (pieces of the puzzle), and then show how the course fits within the curriculum.

Furthermore, such redesigned courses should be developed so that students are guided to not only solve puzzles but also define these puzzles. From a real life industry point of view, it can be argued professionals most often are faced with puzzles (i.e., real world problem) and not homework problems. In essence, how one could solve a puzzle and what data are more relevant are more essential than discussing solving situations that computer software can actually solve problems faster and students relegated to a data entry position. This basically means wisdom in decision making should be more emphasized than just the use of intelligence to solve them. In our approach, effective methods to problem definition is emphasized (looking at the big picture), than how optimally big scenes could be divided into smaller sub-scenes, and then how to find the right pieces that belong to the sub-scenes. Once this activity is performed, not only solutions could be provided more efficiently, the cognitive skills used in decision making is enhanced, leading to better and more creative designs of products and processes.

Initially, the application of Puzzles Principles was developed as cases for a capstone course in Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering (IME) Department at Cal Poly Pomona. These cases were based on real industry problems and data sets were provided, without revealing its relationship to the problem. Students, working in teams, competed against each other to discover the main reason behind the case (the puzzle), provided problem statements, searched and justified the best tools for problem solving, identified and used the right data to solve problems, and provided solution for the puzzle, the main case. The courses paralleled a real scenario for which the recommendations were required within a limited time (usually a week), and only one team was chosen by the customer (the professor) as having the right solution meeting the customer’s expectation. However, unlike in real life, the “losing” teams don’t fail, but they receive lower scores. The feedback from the Course Evaluations provided at the end of each term showed a very high level learning achievement. The results of an exit interview showed almost every student praised the course as the one that gave him/her the confidence needed to enter the job market. Moreover, alumni expressed that although they may have used some of the subjects that they learned at school in their various jobs, they most benefited from the experience of tackling the puzzles of the capstone course when they were faced with a day to day problem (puzzles) they faced in the industry.

In the IME department, we have reviewed and proposed redesigning the entire undergraduate curriculum to ensure links discussed above became apparent, and in each course real life puzzles are introduced, main problems are identified, and the need of the specific subject is clearly defined. Figure 2 shows the procedural stages of the puzzles principles.

For introductory courses, the curriculum design should include the application of Puzzles Principles through stepwise systematic process. This model is explained further through an engineering curriculum setting:

A final product is shown. There would be discussions on why the product was designed. Preliminary advantages and disadvantages are observed and analyzed.

The Product starts going through dissections through major parts (a car is divided in the frame assembly, engine assembly, etc. as a puzzle picture is divided into the different scenes).

At the time of dissections every skill needed to design the part is discussed. Why a certain fastener is used? How it was designed? What software is used for graphical presentation and testing? What forces it should endure to keep the assembly together? Etc. By the time the product is fully dissected all future courses are validated, the roadmap is identified, and the reasons for next steps is clearly realized.

**Figure 1:** Jigsaw Puzzle Pieces (Elements of a System)

**Figure 2:** Puzzles Principle Procedural Stages
The First World Congress, in conjunction with the 21st Asia Pacific DSI Conference, has been successfully hosted by Guanghua School of Management, Peking University during July 24-27, 2016. With the rapid development of the Chinese economy in recent years, a large number of enterprises with extraordinary vitality have emerged such as Huawei, Alibaba, and Baidu. These enterprises drew on the extensive experience of foreign enterprises and engraved deeply the characteristics of Chinese culture into their business models.

To understand the success of these emerging Chinese enterprises better, we must develop new research perspectives. The objective of the conference is to promote the development of theory and technology in the field of decision sciences as well as to create an excellent academic platform for international scholars to exchange research ideas.

The conference theme is MANAGING BIG DATA AND DECISION MAKING IN A NEW GLOBAL ECONOMY. The topics are divided into 32 tracks, including Business Analytics & Big Data, E-Commerce, ERP & Manufacturing Management, Health Care Management, Manufacturing Management, MS/OR Techniques, Models & Applications, Statistics & Decision Analysis, Supply Chain Design, Integration, & Network, Sustainability, among others. These are chaired by 55 outstanding scholars from 7 countries.

The papers are contributed by 160 authors from 18 countries and 91 institutions. During the four-day conference, 58 research papers out of 77 submissions are selected for presentations, in addition to 3 keynote speeches. These papers are assigned into 17 sessions. At the Award Ceremony on July 26 evening, 6 best paper awards in Application, Case Studies, Environmental Issues, Interdisciplinary, Theoretical/Empirical Research, and Innovative Education categories, one per category, were bestowed.

With the diversity of countries, organizations, and academic disciplines represented in this conference, the participants have a great opportunity to share their knowledge. The experience from this conference lays a solid foundation for future World Congresses and Asia Pacific DSI Conferences.
To Serve, to Produce and to Servitize In the Era of Networks, Big Data, and Analytics
Budapest and Győr, Hungary, June 2018

The historical, easy-to-access locations, the state-of-the-art facilities and the cooperation of academic institutions from the forefront of engineering and management research with world-class companies guarantee, we believe, the success of EurOMA 2018 focusing on multidisciplinary approaches, and the integration of varied knowledge bases.

The theme of the conference aims at fulfilling EurOMA's vision in the new era of networks, big data, and advanced data analytics by giving theory-based, practically relevant, generalizable and innovative answers to current and emerging issues in services, manufacturing and capability development (that is servitization, at its core). We also intend to broaden EurOMA's base in three ways: by highlighting the interfaces between operations management - engineering and operations management - data analytics, by securing initial organizational commitments from reputable academic and industrial partners and, lastly, by placing the conference, after 13 years, again in the centre of Europe, in the inspiring environment of Hungarian history and culture.

Conference Chairs
Prof. Gyula Vastag, Széchenyi István University (Győr) and National University of Public Service (Budapest), Prof. Tamás Koltai, Budapest University of Technology and Economics (Budapest), Prof. László Monostori, Hungarian Academy of Sciences Institute for Computer Science and Control (Budapest) and Budapest University of Technology and Economics (Budapest).

The conference, excluding the pre-conference PhD Workshop and the optional post-conference tours, will be held in the state-of-the-art Q building on the campus of the Budapest University of Technology and Economics (BME). The central campus of BME, including the Q Building, is on the Buda side of Budapest and it is easily accessible by public transport (tram, underground, bus).

The Budapest University of Technology and Economics (BME) is the most significant University of Technology in Hungary and is considered the world's oldest Institute of Technology, which has university rank and structure. It was founded in 1782, and it was the first institute in Europe to train engineers at university level. More than 110 departments and institutes operate within the structure of eight faculties. About 1,100 lecturers, 400 researchers and other degree holders and numerous invited lecturers and practicing expert specialists participate in education and research at the Budapest University of Technology and Economics. Approximately 800 of the university's 14 thousand students are from 50 countries abroad. By creating the Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences in 1998 BME returned to its historical traditions. In 1934, the first university-level faculty of economic studies in Hungary started to operate at the Hungarian Royal Palatine Joseph University of Technology and Economics. Operations management, production economics and financial analysis of the operation of industrial and service enterprises are among the most important research areas, which are supported by the synergy of the long standing coexistence of high level engineering and management education within the same organization.

The Institute for Computer Science and Control, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTA SZTAKI, the former Computer and Automation Research Institute), is one of the few scientific centres in the Central-East European (CEE) region who received the prestigious title of Centre of Excellence in Information Technology, Computer Science and Control from the EU in 2001, just three years before Hungary joined the European Union. Earlier, in 1994, SZTAKI was elected as the first member from the region in the European Research Consortium of Informatics and Mathematics (ERCIM). SZTAKI in the past decade was intensively engaged in international scientific cooperation, for example the institute has taken part in 44 granted projects within the EU FP7 programme, in 8 cases acting as the head of consortium. The Fraunhofer-SZTAKI Project Centre for Production Management and Informatics (PMI) works under the legal framework of SZTAKI.

The PhD Workshop and the company visit of Audi Hungaria will be on or start from the campus of Széchenyi István University (SzE) in the city of Győr. SzE is one of the youngest universities in Hungary but it is, perhaps, the most dynamically developing with the goal of becoming a full-scale comprehensive university in the Budapest-Vienna-Bratislava triangle. Currently, SzE has three schools of engineering (including the Audi Hungaria School of Automotive Engineering), schools of business and economics, law, teachers’ training, agriculture and food science and institutes of musical art, health and social studies. SzE has about 540 lecturers and 14 thousand students; 500 students are from abroad. Recently, SzE has received major grants to expand and modernize its campus and to develop new management and engineering programs, Audi Hungaria Motor Kft (one of the largest engine manufacturers in the world and the producer, among others, the iconic Audi TT), since its foundation 23 years ago, has invested more than €8 billion to create one of the most modern and efficient engine and car manufacturing plants in the world.
I am extremely honored and humbled to be nominated for the role of president-elect of the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI). It is my firm belief that DSI is the leading professional organization for academia in all decision science fields. This interdisciplinary nature combined with special focuses is indeed the main strength of DSI, a strength that places it above many other academic organizations. Since the early 1980’s and throughout the advancement of my professional career, I have had many wonderful experiences with DSI and my DSI colleagues. I identify most strongly with the principles of DSI and that devotion is truly evident by my ongoing commitment to the Institute. I have always been gratified by its professional spirit and energy, and wish to help lead DSI into the future.

For the past 31 years I have been particularly fortunate to have had numerous opportunities to serve as a constant contributing DSI member, both at the Institute level and at the regional level. I understand perfectly the importance of regional divisions through my two terms as the president of NEDSI, an exemplary DSI division, from 1999-2000 and again from 2002-03. I have continued to extend my services to NEDSI by serving as an active Advisory Board member. I value the significance of DSI’s global engagement for future growth and sustainable strategies from my work as DSI’s Global Development Coordinator, 2007-13, and as chair of the Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee, 2007-13. I was bestowed with the honor of managing the financial strength, constraints and flows of DSI in my role as the DSI Treasurer from 2010-12. I have been well prepared, acculturated, and mentored through service on the DSI Board as chaired by six DSI presidents from 2007-12. It is my firm belief that I possess a proven record of imperative foresight that is best able to now clearly articulate DSI’s goals and means to the primary constituents served.

2016 is monumental year for the Institute. DSI is moving forward with the appointment of a permanent executive director on October 24, 2016. This position is certainly vital and can be pivotal for the long term success of DSI. The new appointment of the editor for the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education certainly brings new and fresh perspectives while continuing to build on the solid foundation for innovative teaching and pedagogical research in the decision sciences. Nevertheless, DSI is far from being perfect as recently stated by 2016-17 President Funda Sahin in the October 2016 Decision Line, “the Institute has been distracted with its internal inefficiencies and ineffectiveness to the point of losing sight of its strategic focus, which contributed to DSI’s losing of its competitive advantage and relevance.” The future of DSI should not be a matter left to chance, but is the matter that we need to collectively strive for with a clear vision and consistent and effective actions to capitalize all opportunities in the transitional and transformational processes. I have every confidence that my leadership skills and administrative experience will enable me to facilitate an effective planning process and to streamline DSI’s priorities and action plans. While I am humbled and privileged with the opportunities to serve the Institute and the members, I would also like to shed some light on my vision and priorities as we move forward into the future.

My goal is to build DSI into a professionally respected and favored global multidisciplinary decision sciences organization that offers focused, relevant, value-added quality, services, culture, and pride to all members. It is my belief that two priority directives, a professional community directive and a scholastic learning directive, are essential to achieve this vision and enhance the competitive edges for the Institute, the regional subdivisions, and the members. Granted, these two directives are not mutually exclusive, but need to be integrated in the process of formulating action items and priorities to provide the value added for DSI. DSI needs to be conscientious in serving all constituents as a community and a family that includes students, faculty, academic administrators, researchers, and professionals globally. The professional community directive includes matters such as organizational structure, shared culture and identity, job placement, membership support, membership benefits, professional networking mechanisms, career development, and web and media exposure. It is essential that DSI position itself as a premium value-added provider of choice for all constituents. The scholastic learning directive comprises areas such as research outlets and research journal publications, dissimilation of teaching pedagogy, delivery, assessment, practices and philosophy, platforms for intellectual exchanges, and branding (to academic deans, professional communities, and others).
In order to succeed:

- I envision that the DSI Board will be a vibrant and focused working group to act, direct, and implement matters of strategic importance to DSI and to lead DSI with transparency, integrity, and legitimacy.
- I will push for consensus on consistent and continuing focuses and executable action plans from both the (constantly changing) Board and the Home office.
- I pledge to work with the Annual Conference program committee for an exciting, dynamic, and rewarding venue of career development, scholarly exchanges, and professional networking.
- I expect DSI’s journal editors continue to promote scholarly excellence and enhance the intellectual impact that lead DSI journals to recognition as the top target journal list by all major universities.
- I will promote DSI to foster an entrepreneurial spirit to take on innovative challenges and creative approaches for branding, membership services, and member engagement.
- I will advocate a global DSI by positioning and promoting regional characteristics with DSI identity with a seamless collaborative governance structure.

Many of these matters require our conscientious attention, innovative thought leadership, and prudent actions from the DSI Board, officials, home office staffs and all affinity groups. I sincerely pledge my total commitment to devote my presidency to focusing on relevant and critical propositions for a growing a quality and member-oriented DSI. Let’s look to the future.

DSI Member Activity

- Nominee, President-elect, 2016
- Advisory Council Member, Northeast Decision Sciences Institute, 2000-Present
- Nominee, President-elect, 2014
- Nominating Committee, 2013-2015
- Member Service Committee, 2007-09, 2010-14
- Finance & Investment Advisory Committee
- Global Development Coordinator, 2007-2013
- Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee, chair 2007-2013
- Executive Committee/Strategic Planning Committee, 2011-2012
- Finance Committee Chair 2011-12; Member 2010-11
- Investment Advisory Committee Chair 2011-12 Member 2010-11
- Treasurer, 2010-12
- Executive Committee 2010-11
- Ad hoc Committee on World Congress, 2010-11
- Track Chair, 1999, 2001, 2010
- At-Large Vice President, 2008-10
- Vice President, Northeast, 2007-2008
- Regionally Activities Committee, 1988-00, 2002-03, 2006-08
- Regionally Elected Vice President, Northeast, 2006-08
- Acting President, Northeast, 2004
- President, Northeast 1999-2000, 2002-03
- President-Elect, Northeast, 1998-99, 2001-02
- Nominating Committee, 2000-2002
- Program Chair, Northeast, 1998
- Vice President Program Chair, Northeast, 1996-97
- Publication Committee, 1994-96
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Vision Statement

I am truly honored to be nominated for President of the Decision Sciences Institute (DSI). Should I be elected, I look forward to continuing my service to the Institute and to you.

Who Am I in DSI?

Like my predecessors and many others, I grew up professionally in DSI. My journey began as a Ph.D. student making my first presentation at the 1992 Annual Meeting of DSI in San Francisco. I was well prepared but nervous nonetheless. The support from the audience, including the senior scholars in the room, is what endeared me to DSI. Over the years, I have been very fortunate to be mentored by a long list of past and current DSI leaders; a list that easily takes up an entire page. Lee Krajewski, for example, appointed me to be the 1999-2000 Chair of the Publications Committee; at the time, I was not even tenured and very humbled by his trust in me. Linda Sprague and Norma Harrison involved me in Asia Pacific DSI, eventually serving as the Secretary-General. Many others on this long, personal list have opened doors to allow me to serve DSI in other visible roles – from providing editorial service to Decision Sciences for which I was recognized with the “Outstanding Associate Editor” award twice by two different editors (Vicki Smith-Daniels and Asoo Vakharia) to serving on the Board of Directors of DSI as Treasurer and Vice President to being the Program Chair for the 2014 Tampa annual meeting (thanks to Maling Ebrahimpour for picking me and to Marc Schenedjers for allowing me to experiment with new ideas). I can go on and apologize that page limits constrain my ability to publicly acknowledge the many who opened doors for me to benefit from participation in DSI. Thank you.

So, why am interested in serving as DSI President? Many of you perhaps realize that I have just stepped off being the Interim Executive Director, after having been in this role for about two years. Have I not had enough? I admit a part of me is tired but there is another part of me (perhaps it is my Chinese roots) with a sincere desire to serve by opening up opportunities for others to grow professionally and find their way in DSI. This is my “pay it forward” scheme and, hopefully, a true demonstration of gratitude to those who had mentored and allowed me to grow professionally in DSI.

What Do I See Are Challenges Facing DSI?

My two-year stint as the Interim Executive Director of DSI has been illuminating. DSI has come a long way but there are major challenges that remain to be resolved.

For one, our membership . . . Membership size is not where it used to be. It is holding steady at approximately 1300 but the number is deceptive since core membership, those who renew year after year, is probably lower. The membership profile has also evolved as other functionally-oriented societies siphon away younger members who need to maximize reputational return on their travel budgets. On top of this, the ratio of members from institutions with a primary research agenda to those from institutions with a more balanced research-teaching agenda differs substantively from the past.

For another, the annual meeting of DSI is attracting a more diverse profile of attendees, whose needs extend beyond just research presentation and feedback. Many of the better attended sessions are teaching-oriented sessions and how-to workshops geared towards doing more rigorous research or engaging students better in and out of the classroom. Many sign up and attend DSI for the first and only time because they know this is where interviews take place.

Finally, DSI is not as nimble as it can be in reacting. Progress has been made but progress remains to be made. DSI still operates under the guidance of policies and procedures from before the dawn of Internet-enabled connectivity and communications.

What Then Is My Proposed Platform?

The President of DSI serves only one year. In that one year, it is naïve of me to promise that I can lead DSI to completely mitigate or implement breakthroughs to our challenges. I would rather under-promise and over-deliver than over-promise and disappoint you. So, with this caveat in mind, here is my platform to begin to address our challenges.

1. Expand the DSI journal portfolio through Wiley, our strategic publisher partner

DSI currently has two highly respected journals – Decision Sciences and Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education.

The need for more journals has been identified by previous Boards. Attention on other issues, however, has not allowed DSI to move forward in growing the journal portfolio in a manner that does not cannibalize our flagship journals.
I believe we need to realize this aspiration of an expanded journal portfolio. DSI does an excellent job in providing oversight and transition of its journals. Our publications governance processes can be extended to other journals that are already in existence, thereby alleviating the huge setup costs involved in starting new journals. As DSI brings journals (without an academic home) under its umbrella, the opportunity for authors and reviewer of these journals to find a welcoming home in DSI exists, as does the opportunity to offer additional publication outlets for current members. To this end, a major initiative of my Presidency is to work with Wiley to bring other Wiley journals (without academic homes but well aligned with interest of DSI members) under the DSI umbrella; at least three highly-visible and niche journals have been identified that may be of interest to current and potential DSI members.

2. Develop a three-year plan and budget to work on getting Decision Sciences listed on UT Dallas, Financial Times, and/or Bloomberg Business Week

Decision Sciences is the flagship research journal for our society. DSI needs to not only protect the reputation of the journal but also craft a path to allow its inclusion in listings that are increasingly being used to make the case for tenure and promotion decisions. Prior boards are well aware of this imperative but a coherent, strategically-funded path remains to be charted.

I believe we need to help Decision Sciences break into the listings – whether UT Dallas, Financial Times Top 50, or Bloomberg BusinessWeek. The work cannot and should not fall on the editor; the job of the editor is clear . . . to source and publish high-quality, rigorous, impactful research that can be cited by scholars and the media using a fair and transparent review process. Getting the journal onto one of these listings is a multi-year (at least three, in my opinion) game that must leverage our strategic partnership with Wiley. Doing this successfully, I believe, will help to attract new members and shore up the value proposition to current members. Let us be clear that this will happen in one year but I am hoping that a structure can be created and funding can be allocated to design and implement the path to being listed. To this end, a second major initiative of my Presidency is to commission and financially support a three-year committee of “to-be-named distinguished scholars” whose charter is to work with Wiley to get Decision Sciences on one or more listings.

3. Formalize the DSI mentorship program

An idea that emerged from the 2014 annual meeting in Tampa is for DSI to implement a mentorship program. This is a great idea, in keeping with my own professional growth. I have been fortunate in that I had individuals who not only gave me opportunities to serve but also spend time socially to give me professional and personal advice. A story that many of you may know is the “how did Johnny get on the timeshare property bandwagon? Well, it started with Keong Leong at an annual meeting in Orlando, which led to investing in a Marriott timeshare property, a drive-through Las Vegas style wedding with Keong as best man, and my involvement with Decision Sciences as the Feature Editor for the International Issues column.

I believe we need to reinvest in these chance encounters that lead to deep personal and professional relationships. Doing this well continues the tradition of DSI being a friendly welcoming society – one wherein those more experienced influence those less experienced along personal and professional career paths. Doing this well is how DSI can attract new members and excite current members. To this end, a third major initiative of my Presidency is to implement a formal mentorship program pairing DSI leaders and senior scholars with DSI members in their pre-tenure years; this program will culminate in a mentor-mentee gathering at the annual meeting each year.

4. Enhance the placement service capabilities before and at the annual meeting of DSI

Our annual meeting competes, in format and in timing, with others (e.g., INFORMS, AMCIS, AOM, POMS, etc.). For a long time, the annual meeting of DSI stood apart because of its placement activities. This advantage is slowly being eroded.

Currently, DSI members (other than students) pay to identify themselves as available for placement; institutions seeking candidates pay to post their job descriptions. I believe that DSI should abolish this payment scheme and make it easier for job seekers and employers to match up, especially when those seeking placement and those seeking applicants are already members of DSI. Similarly, at the annual meeting, setting up interviews between applicants and employers is a hassle for all parties. Imagine, instead, a platform that allows DSI members to post job description and CVs without interfacing with the DSI Home Office and that allows either party to identify blocks of available time for face-to-face interviews at the annual meeting. At many academic institutions, this latter capability is already in place as students reserve time with instructors and/or breakout rooms.

To this end, a fourth major initiative of my Presidency is to invest time and financial resources to revamp the placement-related policies and information support.

5. Modernize the policies and procedures under which DSI and the Home Office operates

DSI is nearing 50. In August 2015, the Board approved a cleaned-up version of the policies and procedures. The version prior to this numbered 270+ pages. The importance of this document cannot be overstated since it explains how and why DSI (i.e., the Board, the committees, and the Home Office) operates in the manner it does. Unfortunately, the document dates back to the 1979! The world around us has changed dramatically since.
I believe DSI needs to examine its processes and procedures and rewrite policies and procedures that are enabled by the communications and internet technologies of today, if not tomorrow. We need to question how we do our business and ask whether or not the technologies we have today can make our processes faster, more flexible, and more robust. To this end, my fifth and last initiative is to have DSI (Board and Home Office) review and revise policies and procedures with an eye towards enhancing customer service to DSI members who are individuals at one level and sub-divisions (i.e., regions) at a more aggregate level.

Concluding Remarks

I ask for your vote because I see an opportunity to continue to serve DSI and you. I believe my platform will move DSI forward without sacrificing its historical roots. I hope you agree and look forward to seeking your help.

DSI Member Activity

DSI Service Recognition
• 2015 Dennis E. Grawoig Distinguished Service Award from DSI.

DSI Home Office-Related
• Interim Executive Director for DSI (January 2015-October 2016).

DSI Board-Related
• Treasurer (2012-2014).
• VP-At Large (2008-2009).
• Regionally-Elected Vice President – Asia Pacific Region (2006-2008).

DSI Committee-Related
• Chair/Treasurer Finance & Investment Advisory Committee 2012, 2013, 2014
• Chair Publications Committee 1999-2000; 2010-2011.
• Chair Ad Hoc Committee on Regions and Meetings 2007-2008.
• Member:
  Programs and Meetings Committee (2013-2015)
  Finance & Investment Advisory Committee (2013-2014)
  Home Office Review Committee (2012)
  Development Committee (2012-2014)
  Doctoral Affairs Committee (1995-1997)
  Nominating Committee (2005-2007)
  Case Studies Committee (2006-2008)

DSI Conference-Related
• Keynote Speaker EDSI 2015 Conference in Taormina, Italy.
• Program Chair, 2014 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Tampa, FL, USA.
• Coordinator, Instructional Innovation Award Competition, 2012 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Francisco, CA, USA.
• Coordinator, Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition, 2011 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Boston, MA, USA.
• Best Case Studies Award Competition and Workshop Coordinator, 2009 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, New Orleans, LA, USA.
• Special Events Co-Coordinator, 2007 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Phoenix, AZ, USA.
• Proceedings Coordinator, 2001 Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute

DSI Publications-Related
• Recipient “Outstanding Decision Sciences Journal Associate Editor” Award (2009 and 2011).
• Recipient 2004 Best Paper Award from Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education.

Sub Division-Related
• Served as the Secretary-General, Board of Directors, Asian Pacific Decision Sciences Institute (2003-2007).

Sub Division-Related
• Served as the Secretary-General, Board of Directors, Asian Pacific Decision Sciences Institute (2003-2007).
SECRETARY

Anand Nair – Michigan State University

DSI Member Activity

• Coordinator - Doctoral Student Consortium (2016 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Austin, TX)
• Track Chair – Health Care Management (2015 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA)

• Vice President – Publications Committee (2015 – 2017)
  ○ Facilitated the recruitment of the new Editor for the Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education (2016)
• Member, Publications committee (2014 – 2015)
• Chair – Professional Development Workshop titled, “What's Trending: Cutting Edge Research Methods” (2014 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Tampa, FL)
• Session Chair – “Relating outsourcing to performance of healthcare facilities” (2014 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Tampa, FL)
• Judge – Best paper award competition. (2014 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Tampa, FL)
• Associate Editor – Decision Sciences Journal 2013 – Present
• Judge – 2014 Elwood Buffa Best Dissertation Competition
• Track Chair – Supply Management (2013 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Baltimore, MD)
• Track Chair – Manufacturing Operations Management (2012 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA)
• Judge - 2012 Instructional Innovation Award Competition (2012 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA)
• Session Chair – Manufacturing Operations Management Track Caucus (2012 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA)
• Judge – 2011 Elwood Buffa Best Dissertation Competition
• Session Chair – 2004 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Boston

SECRETARY

Anthony D. Ross – University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

DSI Member Activity

• Invited Panelist (2016), The Changing Climate of the Classroom, Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Austin, TX.
• Chair (2015), DSI Elwood Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Award Competition, Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Seattle, WA.
• Chair (2013), DSI New Faculty Development Workshop, Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Baltimore, MD.
• Invited Panelist (2012), DSI New Faculty Development Workshop, Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Francisco, CA.
• Invited Panelist (2010), Global Issues in Operations Management, Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Phoenix, AZ.
• Program Co-Chair (2010), Mini-Conference on Globalization, Annual Meeting of the Decision Science Institute, San Diego, CA.
• Committee Member (2008-2011), DSI Doctoral Student Affairs.
• Proceedings Coordinator (2008), Annual Meeting of the Decision Science Institute, Baltimore, MD.
• Track Chair (2007), Supply Chain Management, Annual Meeting of the Decision Science Institute, New Orleans, LA.
• Session Chair (1995-2006): Annual DSI Conferences.
• Discussant and Reviewer (1994-2000), Annual DSI Conference.
VP AMERICAS DIVISION
Ray Qing Cao – University of Houston-Downtown

DSI Member Activity
• Associate Program Chair, Decision Sciences Institute Conference, 2008
• Chair, Ad hoc Committee on Colleges, Decision Sciences Institute Conference, 2014 -2015
• Session Chair, Supply Chain Management Track, Decision Sciences Institute Conference, 2012
• Session Chair, DSS/AI/Expert Systems Track, Decision Sciences Institute Conference, 2004 Session Chair, Emerging Information Technologies Track, Decision Sciences Institute Conference, 2004
• Conference Proceedings Reviewer (average 2 per conference), Decision Sciences Institute Conference, 1999 – Current

VP AMERICAS DIVISION
Vijay R. Kannan – Utah State University

DSI Member Activity
• Vice President, 2009 - 2011
• Vice President, 2006 - 2008
• Editor, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 2012-2016
• Editor, ‘From the Bookshelf’ Column, Decision Line, 2009-2011
• Associate Editor, Decision Sciences Journal, 2010 to date
• Publishing in DSJIE Workshop Coordinator, 2014 Annual Meeting
• New Faculty Development Consortium Coordinator, 2009 Annual Meeting
• Curricular Issues Mini-Conference Coordinator, 2008 Annual Meeting
• Doctoral Dissertation Competition Coordinator, 2002 Annual Meeting
• Track Chair, 1999 Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting
• Ad Hoc Committee on Marketing DSI Journals, 2016
• Publications Committee (ex officio), 2012 to date
• Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic DSI Journal Portfolio, 2012
• Nominating Committee, 2011-2013
• Strategic Planning for International Affairs Committee, 2009-2011
• Regional Activities Committee, 2006-2007, 2009-2011
• Innovative Education Committee, 2004-2006
• Doctoral Student Affairs Committee, 2001-2003
• Chair, Programs & Meetings Committee, 2000-2001
• Member Services Committee, 2000-2002
• Programs & Meetings Committee, 1999-2002, 2005-2007
• Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Financial Affairs, 1996
• Panelist, New Faculty Development Consortium, 2011, 2015 Annual Meetings
• Judge, Instructional Innovation Award, 2012 Annual Meeting
• Judge, Doctoral Dissertation Competition, 1996, 2007 Annual Meetings

Western DSI
• Past President, 2008 - 2009
• President, 2007 - 2008
• President Elect, 2006 - 2007
• Program Chair/Proceedings Editor, 2006 Annual Meeting
• Vice President - Programs, 2005 - 2006
• Chair, Best Paper Award Committee, 2013
• Track Chair, 2002-2004
• Judge, Best Graduate Student Paper Award, 2012
• Judge, Best Paper Award, 2011
Southeast DSI
• Vice President - Member Services, 2000 - 2002
• Proceedings Coordinator, 2001 Annual Meeting
• Vice President - Finance, 1996/97
• Track Chair, 1996, 1998 Annual Meetings

Other
• Session Chair
  o International Decision Sciences Institute Meeting, 2013
  o Western Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, 2001
• Manuscript Reviewer
  o Decision Sciences Journal, 1995-2002
  o Midwest Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, 1994
  o Southeast Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, 1997, 1999
  o Southwest Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, 2011
  o Western Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, 2001, 2008-2011

VP ASIA-PACIFIC

Ravi Kumar Jain – Symbiosis Institute of Business Management-India

DSI Member Activity
• Spearheaded Membership drives and coordinated Member services APDSI 2013, 2014, 2015
• APDSI member service committee

Xiande Zhao – CEIBS-China

DSI Member Activity
• Member DSI Marketing Committee
• Member DSI Nomination Committee
• Member DSI International/Global Affairs Committee
• Member DSI Regional Activities Committee
• Ambassador to DSI Asia-Pacific Region
• Served as Chair, speaker/panelist for invited sessions for doctoral student consortium at Annual DSI conferences
• Associate editor for Decision Sciences Journal since 2010
• Conference Program Co-Chair 2018 Annual DSI Conference
• President APDSI 2008-2009, 2015-2016

VP MARKETING

Sri Talluri – Michigan State University

DSI Member Activity
• Conference Chair for the 47th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Austin, Texas, November 2016.
• Member Nominating Committee, Decision Sciences Institute, 2014-2016
• Member DSI Publications Committee, 2009-2011.
• Member Decision Sciences Institute Programs and Meeting Committee, 2003-2005.
• Chairman of the Sub-Committee on conference arrangements at the Annual DSI meeting, 2003-2005.
• Panelist - Innovation Panel, DSI Conference, 2014
Committee Member DSI Doctoral Dissertation Award, 2013
Panelist - Editor’s Panel at DSI Conference, 2012, 2013
Panelist - Editor’s Panel at International DSI Conference, 2013
Committee Member for DSI Instructional Award, 2012
Track Chair for Decision Models for Operations/Manufacturing at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Seattle, Washington, November 2015.
Track Chair for Decision Models at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, Tampa, Florida, November 2014.
Track Chair for Supply Chain Management at the Midwest Decision Sciences Institute Conference, Toledo, Ohio, April 2005.
Session Chair for Supply Chain Contracts at the 37th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Antonio, Texas, November 2006.
Session Chair for Supply Chain Performance at the 37th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Antonio, Texas, November 2006.
Session Chair for Supply Chain Performance at the 36th Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Francisco, California, November 2005.
Session Chair for Honorable Mentions of Case Studies in Operations Management at the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Diego, California, November 2002

VP MARKETING

David Peng – University of Houston

DSI Member Activity
- Decision Sciences Institute Marketing Committee member, 2016-2017
- Decision Sciences Institute Publication Committee member, 2014-201
- Decision Science Conference Best Paper competition coordinator 2016
- Decision Sciences Conference track chair, 2015
- Decision Science Journal Editor Search Committee, 2104
- Track Chair, Decision Sciences Conference, 2014
- Panelist in new faculty development consortium, 2013
- Program committee member, Asia Pacific Decision Science Conference 2010
- Faculty development workshop coordinator, Asia Pacific Decision Science Conference 2009

VP TECHNOLOGY

Natalie Simpson – State University of New York at Buffalo

DSI Member Activity
- Recipient, Best Paper Award, NEDSI, 2016
- Co-Coordinator, DSI’s Classroom Technology Sandbox, 2013.
- Coordinator, DSI’s Mini-conference in Classroom Technology, 2012.
- Recipient, DSI’s Best Case Study Award, 2005.
- Recipient, DSI’s Instructional Innovation Award, 2004.
- Ad-hoc reviewer for Decision Sciences and Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education.
- Alpha Iota Delta Member, 1994-present
Natalie Simpson – State University of New York at Buffalo (Cont.)

- “Course-casting for the Millennial Generation: Examining the Myths and Realities of Lectures-on-Demand.” Workshop taught with Philip Hancock at the Annual Conference of the Decision Sciences Institute, New Orleans LA, November 2009.
- “Agent-Based Simulation within a Multi-Player Virtual Reality Environment: Modeling Emergency Medical Services in *Second Life*.” Presentation with Philip Hancock at the Annual Conference of the Decision Sciences Institute, New Orleans LA, November 2009.

VP TECHNOLOGY

Silvana Trimi – University of Nebraska-Lincoln

DSI Member Activity

Committee Member:

Track Chair

VP PUBLICATIONS

Nallan C. Suresh – State University of New York at Buffalo

DSI Member Activity

- Senior Editor of *Decision Sciences Journal* (since February 2012); Recipient “Outstanding Senior Editor” award for 2013 for service to Decision Sciences Journal.
- Coordinator Workshop for new authors on Publishing in *Decision Sciences Journal* at DSI National Meeting, Tampa, FL, November 2014.
- Coordinator Elwood Buffa Dissertation Award Competition for Decision Sciences Institute, 2010.
- Member, Doctoral Student Affairs Committee, Decision Sciences Institute, since 2010.
- Associate Editor, *Decision Sciences*, 2010 - 2012.
- Served as Chair, referee and discussant for numerous papers presented at Decision Sciences Institute (DSI) National Meetings.
VP PUBLICATIONS

Jennifer V. Blackhurst – University of Iowa

DSI Member Activity

- Associate Program Chair, 2016 DSI Annual Meeting
- Board of Directors for Decision Sciences Institute, Secretary, 2015 – 2016, Decision Sciences Institute
- Track Chair, Supply Chain Design/Integration Track, 2015 DSI Annual Meeting
- Member, Selection Committee for 2014 Best Teaching Case Study, 2014 DSI Annual Meeting
- Member, Selection Committee for the 2014 Elwood S. Buffa Doctoral Dissertation Competition, 2014 DSI Annual Meeting
- Associate Program Chair, 2013 DSI Annual Meeting
- Associate Editor, Decision Sciences Journal, 2011 – present
  - 2013 Outstanding Associate Editor Award, Decision Sciences Journal
  - 2011 Outstanding Reviewer Award, Decision Sciences Journal
PAST DSI PRESIDENTS

2015-2016 - Morgan Swink, Texas Christian University
2014-2015 - Marc Schniederjans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
2013-2014 - Maling Ebrahimpour, University of Rhode Island
2012-2013 - E. Powell Robinson, Jr., University of Houston
2011-2012 - Krishna S. Dhir, Berry College
2010-2011 - G. Keong Leong, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
2009-2010 - Ram Narasimhan, Michigan State University
2008-2009 - Norma J. Harrison, Macquarie Graduate School of Management
2007-2008 - Kenneth E. Kendall, Rutgers University
2006-2007 - Mark M. Davis, Bentley University
2005-2006 - Thomas E. Callarman, China Europe International Business School
2004-2005 - Gary L. Ragatz, Michigan State University
2003-2004 - Barbara B. Flynn, Indiana University
2002-2003 - Thomas W. Jones, University of Arkansas-Fayetteville
2001-2002 - F. Robert Jacobs, Indiana University-Bloomington
2000-2001 - Michael J. Showalter, Florida State University
1999-2000 - Lee J. Krajewski, University of Notre Dame
1997-1998 - James R. Evans, University of Cincinnati
1996-1997 - Betty J. Whitten, University of Georgia
1995-1996 - John C. Anderson, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
1994-1995 - K. Roscoe Davis, University of Georgia
1993-1994 - Larry P. Ritzman, Ohio State University
1991-1992 - Robert E. Markland, University of South Carolina
1990-1991 - Ronald J. Ebert, University of Missouri-Columbia
1988-1989 - William L. Berry, Ohio State University
1987-1988 - James M. Clapper, Aladdin TempRite
1986-1987 - William R. Darden, Deceased
1985-1986 - Harvey J. Brightman, Georgia State University
1984-1985 - Sang M. Lee, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
1982-1983 - Linda G. Sprague, China Europe International Business School
1981-1982 - Norman L. Chervany, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
1979-1981 - D. Clay Whybark, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
1978-1979 - John Neter, University of Georgia
1977-1978 - Charles P. Bonini, Stanford University
1976-1977 - Lawrence L. Schkade, University of Texas-Arlington
1975-1976 - Kenneth P. Uhl, Deceased
1974-1975 - Albert J. Simone, Rochester Institute of Technology
1973-1974 - Gene K. Groff, Georgia State University
1972-1973 - Rodger D. Collons, Drexel University
1971-1972 - George W. Summers, Deceased
1969-1971 - Dennis E. Grawoig, Deceased
In order for the nominee to be considered, the nominator must submit in electronic form a full vita of the nominee along with a letter of nomination which highlights the contributions made by the nominee in research, teaching and/or administration and service to the Institute. Nominations must highlight the nominee’s contributions and provide appropriate supporting information which may not be contained in the vita. A candidate cannot be considered for two consecutive years.

**Send nominations to:**
Chair of the Fellows Committee
Decision Sciences Institute
C.T. Bauer College of Business
334 Melcher Hall, Suite 325 Houston, TX 77204-6021
info@decisionsciences.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam, Everett E., Jr.</td>
<td>Franz, Lori S.</td>
<td>Latta, Carol J.*</td>
<td>Schroeder, Roger G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, John C.</td>
<td>Ghosh, Soumen</td>
<td>Lee, Sang M.</td>
<td>Simone, Albert J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, P. George</td>
<td>Glover, Fred W.</td>
<td>Luthans, Fred</td>
<td>Slocum, John W., Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beranek, William</td>
<td>Gonzalez, Richard F.</td>
<td>Mabert, Vincent A.</td>
<td>Smunt, Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry, William L.</td>
<td>Grawoig, Dennis E.*</td>
<td>Malhotra, Manoj K.</td>
<td>Sobol, Marion G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonini, Charles P.</td>
<td>Green, Paul E.</td>
<td>Malhotra, Naresh K.</td>
<td>Sorensen, James E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brightman, Harvey J.</td>
<td>Gro , Gene K.</td>
<td>Markland, Robert E.</td>
<td>Sprague, Linda G.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffa, Elwood S.*</td>
<td>Gupta, Jatinder N.D.</td>
<td>McMillan, Claude</td>
<td>Steinberg, Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cangelosi, Vincent*</td>
<td>Hahn, Chan K.</td>
<td>Miller, Jeffrey G.</td>
<td>Summers, George W.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase, Richard B. C.</td>
<td>Hayya, Jack C.</td>
<td>Moore, Laurence J.</td>
<td>Taylor, Bernard W., III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chervany, Norman L.</td>
<td>Heineke, Janelle</td>
<td>Moskowitz, Herbert</td>
<td>Troutt, Marvin D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapper, James M.</td>
<td>Hershauer, James</td>
<td>Narasimhan, Ram</td>
<td>Uhl, Kenneth P.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collons, Rodger D.</td>
<td>Holsapple, Clyde</td>
<td>Neter, John</td>
<td>Vakharia, Asso J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couger, J. Daniel*</td>
<td>Horowitz, Ira</td>
<td>Nutt, Paul C.</td>
<td>Vazsonyi, Andrew*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings, Larry L.*</td>
<td>Houck, Ernest C.*</td>
<td>Olson, David L.</td>
<td>Voss, Christopher A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darden, William R.*</td>
<td>Huber, George P.</td>
<td>Perkins, William C.</td>
<td>Ward, Peter T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, K. Roscoe</td>
<td>Jacobs, F. Robert</td>
<td>Peters, William S.</td>
<td>Wasserman, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Mark M.</td>
<td>Jones, Thomas W.</td>
<td>Philippatos, George C.</td>
<td>Wemmerlov, Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, Ralph L.*</td>
<td>Kendall, Julie E.</td>
<td>Ragsdale, Cli  T.</td>
<td>Wheelwright, Steven C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digman, Lester A.</td>
<td>Kendall, Kenneth</td>
<td>Raiffa, Howard</td>
<td>Whitten, Betty J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock, V. Thomas</td>
<td>Keown, Arthur J.</td>
<td>Rakes, Terry R.</td>
<td>Whybark, D. Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebert, Ronald J.</td>
<td>Khumawala, Basheer M.</td>
<td>Reinmuth, James R.</td>
<td>Wicklund, Gary A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrahimpour, Maling</td>
<td>Kim, Kee Young</td>
<td>Ritzman, Larry P.</td>
<td>Winkler, Robert L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Ward</td>
<td>King, William R.</td>
<td>Roth, Aleda V.</td>
<td>Woolsey, Robert E. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, James R.</td>
<td>Klein, Gary</td>
<td>Sanders, Nada</td>
<td>Wortman, Max S., Jr.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetter, Robert B. F.</td>
<td>Koehler, Anne B.</td>
<td>Schkade, Lawrence L.</td>
<td>Zmud, Robert W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iores, Benito E.</td>
<td>Krajewski, Lee J.</td>
<td>Schniederjans, Marc J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn, Barbara B.</td>
<td>LaForge, Lawrence</td>
<td>Schriber, Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deceased
INSTITUTE CALENDAR


Western Decision Sciences Institute Annual Meeting, Apr 4-8, 2017, Vancouver, Canada. Deadline for Papers – Oct 1, 2016. Program Chair: Albert Huang, ahuang@pacific.edu.
**DSI MEMBERSHIP RATES**

Based on the DGP per Capita (PPP)
Rates Effective June 1, 2014
All dues amounts are in United States Dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Type</th>
<th>Greater than 75th Percentile</th>
<th>50th - 75th Percentile</th>
<th>Less than 50th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Countries**

Australia, Austria, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei, Canada, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, (Isla Malvinas), Gibraltar, Guernsey, Hong Kong, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Jersey, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Macau, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Sweden, Switzerland, United States, Andorra, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Denmark, European Union, Faroe Islands, Finland, France, Germany, Grenada, Guam, Guan, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, South, Malta, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Oman, Saint Pierre and Miquelon, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Spain, Taiwan, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, American Samoa, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Aruba, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Republic of the Congo, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Cote d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Curacao, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Gabon, Gambia, The Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Korea, North, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Macedonia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia, Federated States of Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Montserrat, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Northern Mariana Islands, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Saint Helena, Ascension, and Tristan da Cunha, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sint Maarten, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tokelau, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Virgin Islands, Wallis and Futuna, West Bank, Western Sahara, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

To become a member or renew your membership, please visit the following hyperlink:

[https://www.decisionsciences.org/Home/Sign-In?returnurl=%2fMembership%2fJoin-Renew](https://www.decisionsciences.org/Home/Sign-In?returnurl=%2fMembership%2fJoin-Renew)