

School of Information Management

MMIM 525 - Enterprise Systems

Trimester 2, 2014

COURSE OUTLINE

Names and Contact Details

Paper Coordinator:	A/Prof Pedro Antunes Room RH 526, Rutherford House, Lambton Quay, Wellington Ph: 463 5525 Email: pedro.antunes@vuw.ac.nz The most effective way to contact me is via e-mail at the above email address. If you would like to meet with me, the simplest approach is to arrange a time and place via email first. Use can also be made of Blackboard for communications with both me as well as other members of the class.
Programme Administrator:	Usha Varatharaju Room RH 521, Rutherford House, Lambton Quay, Wellington Ph: 463 5309 Email: usha.varatharaju@vuw.ac.nz
Trimester Dates:	Monday 14 July – 19 October 2014
Class Times:	Wednesdays - 17.40pm to 19.30pm
Venue:	RWW 311

Withdrawal from Course

1. Your fees will be refunded if you withdraw from this course on or before Friday 25th July 2014.
2. The standard last date for withdrawal from this course is Friday 26th September 2014. After this date, students forced to withdraw by circumstances beyond their control must apply for permission on an 'Application for Associate Dean's Permission to Withdraw Late' including supporting documentation. The application form is available from either of the Faculty's Student Customer Service Desks.

Course Delivery

A series of seminars will act as the foundation for the course and source for debate. In an attempt to increase participation and involvement, students will be responsible for delivering the final seminars. The seminars lectured by students will contribute to course grades. These activities will foster an approximation of the themes and concepts addressed by the course with the concrete organisational contexts lived by the students.

Group Work

You are encouraged to discuss and share aspects of assignment work with others. However, when it is time to submit your assignment, the materials you use must be entirely your own.

Expected Workload

This is a 15-point course. One point should equate to 10 hours of work, which means a total of 150 hours for a 15-point course. Students are expected to attend all course sessions, read assigned materials, and contribute to discussions. Students are expected to spend 2 hours in class and about 5 hours preparing for class every week. Additional time will be required for completion of the case study and presentation.

Prescription

This course explores the vendor and the adopter sides of the divided software life cycle of enterprise systems (ES). The strategies employed by vendors to develop and market ES are first examined. The course then examines the selection and implementation of ES, and the development of analytical capabilities from ES.

Course Learning Objectives

1	Describe the dynamics and current trends of the markets for enterprise systems;
2	Analyse the business models, product development practices, and marketing practices of enterprise systems vendors;
3	Evaluate and analyse the rationale for enterprise systems as an enabler of organizational and strategic change initiatives;
4	Evaluate and analyse the technical and organizational challenges of selecting, implementing and maintaining enterprise systems;
5	Describe and evaluate the practices required to capture organizational benefits from enterprise systems.

Course Content

See Annex 1.

Readings

There is no textbook for this course. The course is based on a collection of readings, including articles published in journals, conferences and book chapters. These readings will be made available on Blackboard. The specific readings and their relationships with lectures are listed in the Weekly Schedule presented in annex. Please note that slight variations might be made to this list during the trimester. Changes will be communicated in class and on Blackboard. Students are expected to read the materials before each class.

Materials and Equipment

Extensive use of the University Library print and electronic resources may be necessary to accomplish the assignments. As a starting point, Google Scholar provides a good entry point for obtaining relevant resources.

Assessment

Items	Weight	Length	Due date	CLO
Weekly debate	30%	5 x 250 words	Weeks 2 to 8, before lecture time	1
Case study	50%	10 pages (11pt, single-spaced, inc. bib.)	End of week 12	2-5
Case presentation	20%	20 min. + 10 min. discussion	Weeks 9 to 11, during lecture time	2-5

Weekly debate. In every seminar from weeks 2 to 9, a research paper will be selected for group discussion using de Bono's Six Thinking Hats. Each week students will be given different hats (facts, feelings, benefits, drawbacks, ideas, thinking) and are expected to 1) write a short statement about the paper reflecting the hat's perspective (250 words); and 2) debate the paper in class supported by that statement.

Case study. This assignment provides the opportunity to write a short essay that explores one or several topics discussed in lectures and that are considered of particular interest to students. The goal is to complement the discussion held in lectures with personal views and professional experience. A case study can be constructed either by analysing contemporary events reported in the literature, or by reflecting on events experienced in professional life. Case studies may be sent back to students for further clarification and development.

Case presentation. The main goal is to present the case study to the course's audience and raise significant discussion. A 20-minute presentation should be elaborated. 10 additional minutes should be allocated for discussion, which should be promoted and supported by the presenter.

Grading

The grading of assessment items will follow the mark allocation scheme described in Annex 2.

From Trimester 1, 2014, a revised Assessment Handbook will apply to all VUW courses: see <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/documents/policy/staff-policy/assessment-handbook.pdf>

In particular, there will be a new grade scheme, in which the A+ range will be 90-100% and 50-54% will be a C-.

Penalties

The course has planned debates from weeks 2 to 9 but students are only required to submit 5 weekly debate assignments. This provides some flexibility to deal with unexpected circumstances with no questions asked. The participation in a debate without the corresponding written statement, or submission of written statement without participation in the debate, will not be marked.

There will be a 10% per day penalty for late delivery of case study assignments. Assignments delivered more than 5 days after the due date will not be marked.

Unusual or unforeseeable circumstances (e.g. serious illness, family bereavement) may lead to a waiver of these penalties but need to be discussed with the Course Coordinator as soon as possible. If a word or page limit is imposed, the examiner will only mark the assignment up to 150% the limit.

Use of Turnitin

Student work provided for assessment in this course may be checked for academic integrity by the electronic search engine <http://www.turnitin.com>. Turnitin is an on-line plagiarism prevention tool which compares submitted work with a very large database of existing material. At the discretion of the Head of School, handwritten work may be copy-typed by the School and submitted to Turnitin. A copy of submitted materials will be retained on behalf of the University for detection of future plagiarism, but access to the full text of submissions will not be made available to any other party.

Mandatory Course Requirements

None.

Communication of Additional Information

All communication will be done through email and Blackboard.

Student feedback

Student feedback on University courses may be found at
www.cad.vuw.ac.nz/feedback/feedback_display.php

Link to general information

For general information about course-related matters, go to
<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/vbs/studenthelp/general-course-information>

Note to Students

Your assessed work may also be used for quality assurance purposes, such as to assess the level of achievement of learning objectives as required for accreditation and academic audit. The findings may be used to inform changes aimed at improving the quality of VBS programmes. All material used for such processes will be treated as confidential, and the outcome will not affect your grade for the course.

Annex 1 - Weekly Schedule

NOTE: Small adjustments to the course contents may be accomplished to reflect the course dynamics. Such changes will be published on Blackboard.

Wk	Date	Topic	Readings
1	16/7	Introduction and course arrangements	-
2	23/7	<p>Effectiveness: Why implementing ES projects is usually more arduous than expected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure factors - Success factors 	<p>Case: Svejvig and Jensen: Making sense of enterprise systems in institutions. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems</i>, 2013, 25(1), 3–36</p> <p>Debate: Rettig, C. (2013). The trouble with enterprise software. <i>MIT Sloan Management Review</i>, 49.</p> <p>Other: Shaul, L., & Tauber, D. (2013). Critical success factors in enterprise resource planning systems: Review of the last decade. <i>ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)</i>, 45(4), 55.</p>
3	30/7	<p>Steering: Why is it so difficult to control ES evolution?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enterprise architecture - Architecture governance - The board room 	<p>Case: Walker, L. (2007). IBM business transformation enabled by service-oriented architecture. <i>IBM Systems Journal</i>, 46(4), 651-667.</p> <p>Debate: Valentine, E. (2013). Are boards flying blind when it comes to enterprise technology governance? <i>Boardroom Magazine</i>, 2013, 36-37.</p> <p>Other: Valentine, E. & Stewart, G. (2013) The emerging role of the Board of Directors in enterprise business technology governance. <i>International Journal of Disclosure and Governance</i>, 10(4), pp. 346-362.</p>
4	6/8	<p>Agility: Why is it so difficult to adapt an ES to a changing environment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agile systems - Agile organisations - IT drivers 	<p>Case: Bider, I., Bellinger, G., & Perjons, E. (2011). Modeling an Agile Enterprise: Reconciling Systems and Process Thinking. In <i>The Practice of Enterprise Modeling</i> (pp. 238-252). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.</p> <p>Debate: Sengupta, K., & Masini, A. (2008). IT agility: striking the right balance. <i>Business Strategy Review</i>, 19(2), 42-48.</p> <p>Other: Wendler, R. (2013). The Structure of Agility from Different Perspectives. In <i>Computer Science and Information Systems (FedCSIS), 2013 Federated Conference on</i> (pp. 1177-1184). IEEE.</p>
5	13/8	<p>Flexibility: Why is it so difficult to adapt an ES to changing needs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work standardisation - Process orientation - Process continuum 	<p>Case: Yeung, K., & Dixon-Woods, M. (2010). Design-based regulation and patient safety: a regulatory studies perspective. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i>, 71(3), 502-509.</p> <p>Debate: Hall, J. M., & Johnson, M. E. (2009). When should a process be art, not science? <i>Harvard business review</i>, 87(3), 58-65.</p> <p>Other: Dorner, C., Draxler, S., Pipek, V., & Wulf, V. (2009). End users at the bazaar: designing next-generation enterprise resource planning systems. <i>Software, IEEE</i>, 26(5), 45-51.</p>
6	20/8	<p>Design: How can organisations change through ES design?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wicked problems - Design thinking - Design thinking in ES 	<p>Case: Hakio, K., & Mattelmäki, T. (2011). Design adventures in public sector. In <i>Proceedings of the 2011 Conference on Designing Pleasurable Products and Interfaces</i> (p. 60). ACM.</p> <p>Debate: Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2010). Design thinking for social innovation. <i>Development Outreach</i>, 12(1), 29-43.</p> <p>Other: Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. <i>Harvard business review</i>, 86(6), 84.</p>

7	27/8	<p>Sensemaking: How can ES help organisations having a better sense of their business?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bounded rationality - Sensemaking framework 	<p>Case: Albu, O. B., & Wehmeier, S. (2013). Organizational Transparency and Sense-Making: The Case of Northern Rock. <i>Journal of Public Relations Research</i>, 1-17.</p> <p>Debate: Hasan, H., & Kazlauskas, A. (2009). Making sense of IS with the Cynefin framework. <i>Proceedings of PACIS</i>.</p> <p>Other: Snowden, D. J., & Boone, M. E. (2007). A leader's framework for decision making. <i>Harvard business review</i>, 85(11), 68.</p>
8	17/9	<p>Reliability: Why ES fail and what roles technology, people and organisations play in ES failure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vulnerability - From human to organisational factors - Normal failure - Crisis management 	<p>Case: http://chemwiki.ucdavis.edu/Physical_Chemistry/Nuclear_Chemistry/Case_Studies/Chernobyl</p> <p>Debate: Reason, J. (2000). Human error: models and management. <i>Bmj</i>, 320(7237), 768-770.</p> <p>Other: Tinsley, C. H., Dillon, R. L., & Madsen, P. M. (2011). How to avoid catastrophe. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 89(4), 90-97.</p> <p>Sheffi, Y., & Rice Jr, J. B. (2005). A supply chain view of the resilient enterprise. <i>MIT Sloan Management Review</i>, 47(1).</p>
9	24/9	<p>Resilience: Why some organisations are better than others at avoiding and overcoming failure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complexity - Characteristics of resilient organisations 	<p>Case: Shirali, G. H. A., Motamedzade, M., Mohammadfam, I., Ebrahimipour, V., & Moghimbeigi, A. (2012). Challenges in building resilience engineering (RE) and adaptive capacity: A field study in a chemical plant. <i>Process Safety and Environmental Protection</i>, 90(2), 83-90.</p> <p>Debate: Limoncelli, T., & Robbins, J. Resilience Engineering: Learning to Embrace Failure. <i>Communications of the ACM</i>, 55(11), 2012.</p> <p>Other: Park, J., Seager, T. P., Rao, P. S. C., Convertino, M., & Linkov, I. (2013). Integrating risk and resilience approaches to catastrophe management in engineering systems. <i>Risk analysis</i>, 33(3), 356-367.</p>
10	1/10	Student presentations	
11	8/10	Student presentations	
12	15/10	Student presentations	

Annex 2 - Grading

Type of assignment	Marks	Criteria
Weekly debate	6	[0..3] Relevance of written statement [0..3] Quality of participation
Case study	50	[0..10] Structure [0..10] Relevance (regarding the course materials) [0..5] Introduction and conclusions (focus) [0..10] Literature review (referenced works) [0..10] Case description (detail) [0..5] Analysis and personal comments (thoughtful)
Case presentation	20	[0..5] Structure of slides [0..5] Detail of presentation [0..5] Implications (key points) [0..5] Answers to participants' questions