Cass assignment

Case assignments are designed to challenge students by bringing them as close as possible to business situations of the real world. It will not only provide empirical illustration to the concepts and issues that are covered in class but also the opportunity to pick up on issues and ideas that are NOT yet discussed in but relevant. There are a total of 4 cases that we will cover in this course. Each group will be randomly assigned to two cases. You will need to write an analysis for those two cases. In your write-up, please directly address the key issues suggested by the case questions.

There is no need for a lengthy introduction and please try to avoid lengthy repetitions of case facts. Instead justify your logic through case specifics (by referencing case facts)! Be careful to distinguish between case facts and stereotyped sweeping generalizations. Clear logic and case specifics should substantiate your recommendations. Diagrams and schematics are helpful in both sharpening your thinking and your exposition. Incorporation of learning from assigned readings and class material into analysis s a plus and is expected.

Written analyses are due at the beginning of the lecture in which the case will be discussed. Each group will also be assigned to facilitate the discussion of a (or multiple) question(s) for the case they are working on. Please have your presentation on Powering slides and limit your presentation to minis per question. Case questions have been provided in this course packet to guide your write-up. The case write-ups should be the equivalent of no more than 3 singleness’s, 12-point font pages.

Any appendices attached are not counted in the page limit. Each case would be graded out of a total of 100 marks. There is no right or wrong answer to the questions. What counts in a case analysis is the argument that you develop to support your interpretation of the issues being raised by the questions. Hence, your answers will be graded based on the quality (rather than correctness) of your answer. A sample of the grading template is available on the last page of this course packet for your reference. Case Grading Template Criteria for grading Completeness Identifies key issues and problems as required in the case questions Prudent SE of all relevant case facts Appropriate solutions/recommendations provided (where required) Points Critical thinking and creativity Critical analyses of data Substantiate arguments with references to case specifics Theoretical basis for reasoning Separation of facts from opinions 40 Written Presentation Logical flow to the paper as the argument is developed.

Good paragraph structure Clean syntax, grammar and punctuation Clean spelling and no typographical errors Overall readability of the paper 10 Class Presentation Ability to lead class discussion Ability to present ideas in a clear, interesting and retrieve fashion Total Score: 4 out of 100] Case 1 – Managing Knowledge and Learning at NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JP) This case provides a broad overview of knowledge programs and problems at Anna’s Jet Propulsion Laboratories as directed by the Knowledge Architect, Jeanne Holmes.

Building on a historical perspective of the Agency’s culture and accomplishments, the case turns specifically to examine the effects of NASA Administrator Daniel Golden’s vision in 1 992 that the missions to explore

Mars should be done “ better, faster and cheaper”. Questions: 1) Identify the Knowledge Management challenges at NASA 2) How serious is the problem for JP of knowledge loss through retirement and what do you think can be done about this? 3) What are the implications of “ faster, better, cheaper” for knowledge management?

That is, what advantages and disadvantages are there for the creation, capture and transfer of knowledge? 4) As Jeanne Holm, what would you recommend to Chief Administrator of NASA Sean Coffee, as the most important knowledge management initiative? 5 Case 2 – McKinney & Company: Managing Knowledge and Learning This case revised a broad overview of Muckiness’s development since its founding in 1926, concentrating in particular on the last two decades of its growth under the leadership of three managing directors – Ron Daniel, Fred Cluck, and Raja Guppy.

You will read about the “ One Firm policy” – Muckiness’s effort to establish and maintain cohesion, and to integrate the knowledge that exists in the company (especially in the people). Getting close to the One Firm ideal is crucial for Muckiness’s continued success, but is very difficult with near 4000 people. Questions: 1) How effective was Ron Daniel in leading McKinney to respond to challenges identified in the Commission on Firm Aims and Goals? 2) McKinney has over the years developed a number of knowledge management information systems initiatives.

For three of these systems, FPS, Patent, and KURD, please evaluate how they contribute to the process of achieving the “ One Firm” ideal. Consider

technology, organizational processes, content and contextual factors, among others. 3) Compare and contrast Cluck’s actions with Daniels emphasis. How were their focus and goals different or similar?) What is your evaluation of Raja Septa’s “ four-pronged” approach to knowledge development and application within McKinney?

What advice or alternative initiatives might you propose to him? 6 Case 3 – Siemens Sharpener: Building a Knowledge Network The case describes the development and implementation of a knowledge management network for the Sales and Marketing function of Kinsmen’s Information and Communication Networks group. You will read about the problems that Siemens faced in getting people to use and contribute to the network and the decisions that were made to dress the challenges faced.

Questions: 1) What are the difficulties associated with developing knowledge management networks, in general? 2) What has Siemens done well in terms of the implementation of Sharpener? 3) How could the management evaluate the performance of Sharpener? 4) Should Icon’s five product divisions be charged to use Sharpener? Why/why not? 7 Case 4 – Wise at Dressier Quillwort Wassermann In late 2004, Dressier Quillwort Wassermann (Draw), a German investment bank, decided to experiment with wick technology within their information technology (IT) department.

In this case you will read about the discussion between two senior executives in the firm on the capabilities of the wick technology, its appropriateness and how it should be implement in the organization. Questions: 1) What are the most important capabilities of the wick technology? Why? 2) Do you think

wise will catch on at Draw? Why or why not? 3) If a business leader wants to encourage wick use, what should she do? Or should she do nothing? 4) What are the best uses for a corporate wick, in your opinion? In companies you are familiar with, would they have been useful? If so, where? If not, why not?