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Item 7: Credit Hours: Variable form 1.0 to 6.0

This course is currently taught as X575, which is a 3 credit-hour course. We are requesting that the credit hours be variable for 1.0 to 6.0 credit-hours in order to reserve flexibility for the future curriculum needs. In particular, if this course were to be taught during an in-residence session, it would be offered as a 1.5 credit version.

Item 10: Course Description

Strategic Entrepreneurship 3.0

In developing the foundations of the entrepreneurial mindset, this course describes tasks such as: making sense of opportunities in the context of changing goals, constantly questioning one’s ‘dominant logic’ in the context of a changing environment, and revisiting ‘deceptively simple questions’ about what we think to be true about markets and the firm.

Item 15: Justification

This course – Strategic Entrepreneurship - is currently taught in the Kelley Direct MBA program as an experimental course (X575). It is a popular and important part of the KD curriculum as an elective. Accordingly, we wish to have this course become a permanent addition to the curriculum. This proposal is supported by the Management Department, as evidenced by the attached memo from Dr. Idalene Kesner, Management Department Chairperson.
Evans, D Susan

From: Kesner, Idalene F
Sent: Tuesday, June 19, 2007 11:18 AM
To: Evans, D Susan
Subject: RE:

With this e-mail I am requesting that the experimental course X575 entitled "Strategic Entrepreneurship" be given a permanent number. I believe the teaching evaluations and enrollments will indicate that this course has been well received by the Kelley Direct students.

Let me know if you need anything else from the Department of Management in order for this request to be brought before the Kelley Director Policy Committee.

Idie

Professor Idalene (Idie) Kesner
Frank P. Popoff Chair of Strategic Management
Chairperson, Management Department
Kelley School of Business, Indiana University
1368 E. 10th Street, BU 669C
Bloomington, IN 47405-1701
(812) 855-2707 (office) / (812) 855-8679 (fax)
ilkesner@indiana.edu

6/19/2007
COURSE: xx, Strategic Entrepreneurship

COURSE DATES: June 5 and ends August 26 (Summer Quarter)

INSTRUCTOR: Dean Shepherd, Kelley School of Business.

PHYSICAL LOCATION: Room BU650D, Kelley School of Business, Bloomington, IN

PHONE: 812-856-5220
E-MAIL: shepherd@indiana.edu (Note: this is my office e-mail address. Please use Angel e-mail when contacting me such that I can have all of my course correspondence in one place.)
FAX: 812-855-4246

COURSE OVERVIEW

Successful future strategists will exploit an entrepreneurial mindset - - the ability to rapidly sense, act, and mobilize, even under uncertain conditions. Therefore the ability to both sense and adapt in response to uncertainty characterizes a core competence of the successful manager. In developing the foundations of the entrepreneurial mindset, this course describes tasks such as: making sense of opportunities in the context of changing goals, constantly questioning one’s ‘dominant logic’ in the context of a changing environment, and revisiting ‘deceptively simple questions’ about what we think to be true about markets and the firm.

This course provides a forum for the in-depth examination of select issues involving strategic entrepreneurship. There is no generally accepted domain or framework that defines the parameters of a course such as this. Rather, topics are typically chosen by course designers based on what those individuals believe students taking such a course “ought to know.” With this proviso in mind, the current course is designed around five learning “modules” - (1) Entrepreneurship and Strategy, (2) Decisions Under Uncertainty, (3) Start-up Strategies, (4) Analyzing Business Models, (5) Managing Failure.

Within each of the five learning modules, two key readings have been chosen to give you a sense of the intellectual content and relevant managerial issues within the module’s theme, and a case has been chosen to serve as a vehicle through which you can apply the knowledge contained in the readings. Students will be asked to form teams that analyze case issues identified by the instructor. Additionally, individual students will have the opportunity to apply insights offered in the modules’ readings to the cases in class-wide discussion forums.

The 2000 book, “The Entrepreneurial Mindset: Strategies for Continuously Creating Opportunity in an Age of Uncertainty,” by McGrath and Macmillan will be used as a second learning vehicle in this course. This book was chosen as a complement to the
module lessons rather than to further explore themes within the modules (although, in
certain instances, the book does this). The “Entrepreneurial Mindset” has been
incorporated into this course because the book offers, in the opinion of the instructor, the
best holistic overview of the nature of entrepreneurial challenges facing managers as well
as excellent discussion of how these challenges can be effectively met. Thus, while the
learning modules enable us to deeply probe into five carefully selected strategic
entrepreneurship-related topics, the book enables us to step back and see how these
topics (as well as many others) tie together in a big picture sense. Chapters from this
book will be assigned each week of class, and at the end of the quarter you will be asked
to submit “discussion point papers” on ideas from the book that you find particularly
appealing or otherwise discussion worthy.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this course are to increase student awareness and understanding of
strategic entrepreneurship-related topics. These topics include, but are not limited to…

- The strategic questions entrepreneurs face
- Making strategic decisions in the face of high uncertainty
- The formulation and implementation of start-up strategies
- Analysis of different business models
- The importance of speed and time pacing
- Managing crises and failure

The course should be of special interest to those seeking to build careers in
entrepreneurial firms or to those who simply wish to better understand the unique
managerial, organizational, and strategic demands associated with making decisions
under high uncertainty. By covering the types of topics listed above, which tend to be
recurring themes and challenges within the s domain of strategic entrepreneurship, this
course should provide important insights and knowledge to students who are or will be
tasked with maneuvering their firms through hypercompetitive environments.

COURSE MATERIALS

Materials delivered to student:

  for continuously creating opportunities in an age of uncertainty. Boston, MA:
- Ingvar Kamprad and IKEA. HBS 9-390-132.
- Internal entrepreneurship at the Dow Chemical company. HBS IMD145.
- ILinc (BAB111)
- Zipcar: Refining the Business Model (9-803-096)
- Fire at Mann Gulch. HBS 9-304-089.


Note on Developing Start-up Strategies (HBS 9-394-067)

Note on Business Model Analysis (9-802-048)

The Protection of Intellectual Property in the United States (9-897-046)


DELIVERABLES AND GRADING*

I. Team Case Analyses – 50% of grade

There are five cases in total. Your team should choose any four of these cases for your analyses. (Alternatively, your team can submit analyses for all five cases and I’ll drop your lowest grade.) Each team case analysis will count for 10% of your final course grade. The specific assignment questions to which your team should respond are identified in the Course Schedule and Assignments section of this syllabus. The team case analyses should be concise position statements in the 3-5 page range (double-spaced). Outside research on the cases (i.e., the seeking of additional case-related information) is not to be performed. (I don’t want teams basing their recommendations on “what happened” and whether or not that “worked” for the company.) I’ll provide brief written feedback to all teams regarding their submitted case analyses, along with a grade on the assignment.

II. Individual Case Analysis Discussion Forum Participation – 25% of grade

There are five case analysis discussion forums in total. Please (individually) participate in any four of the case analysis discussion forums. (Alternatively, you can participate in all five case analysis discussion forums and I’ll drop your lowest grade.) Each of the four discussion forums in which you participate will count for 5% of your final course grade.

The discussion forums are intended to be complementary to the team case analysis assignments. The content of the case discussion forums will also likely be at least partially redundant with the content of the submitted team case analysis assignments.

* The description for the underlying process for this course are kindly provided by Professor Jeff Covin.
This is fine. Through participating in the discussion forums and sharing thoughts with your classmates, you and your team should be able to craft stronger, better considered responses to the team case analysis questions. My only suggestion is that you refrain from too directly addressing the team case analysis assignment questions in the class-wide case analysis discussion forums. (This may be an unlikely scenario as team members may not wish to share their “best ideas” directly related to the team case analysis questions with the class.) The purpose of pairing the team case analysis assignments with discussion forums involving those same cases is to promote both targeted, instructor-directed analyses of case issues (in the team case analyses) as well as broad, student-directed commentary on case issues (in the discussion forum postings). This pairing should result in greater student understanding of the relevant technology and/or innovation management-related lessons embedded in the cases.

There are two thoughts I’d like you to keep in mind as you participate in the case analysis discussion forums. First, the best contributors to the discussion forums will be those whose comments are truly insightful and persuasive. The issue is one of the quality of your discussion comments, not the quantity of your postings within each forum. Second, what we’re shooting for here is a discussion. As such, you should feel free to take the discussion in new directions within the overall theme of the forum. It may be frustrating for you to log on and see that someone else just posted something very similar to what you were going to say. (Lesson: post early within the discussion forum period.) If we focus on adding new value to the discussion forum, it will be more interesting and educational for all of us. Think in terms of building on others’ comments. I would like to see back-and-forth discussion going on between individuals. In short, it’s OK to pose a new question or move the discussion forward in a way that enables you to offer novel insights. The questions I have posted are just starting points. If we act in accordance with these thoughts, the discussion forums will provide a positive and productive learning experience.

In the interests of providing more specific guidance for your participation in the discussion forums, I’d like to address the matters of (1) the frequency of postings and (2) the length of postings. Regarding the frequency of posts, I don’t want to place an arbitrary limit on the number of postings a student can make within the individual discussion forums. If a student is just posting to be heard, so to speak, I’ll know it and assign a grade that reflects my assessment of his/her contributions to the discussion forum. There’s really not a minimum number of postings I’m looking for either. A single strong and insightful posting (in response to each of the three suggested discussion forum questions contained within each module) will sometimes warrant the assignment of a very good grade. In general, however, the strongest contributors don’t just post once but are, in fact, involved in a true discussion of the issues in question. As a rule of thumb, I’ve noticed from past experience that most of the strongest discussion forum contributors have tended to post between 2 and, say, 4 times throughout the term/time period of the module’s discussion forum (that is, they post from 2-to-4 times over the duration of the module’s discussion forum, but they do not necessarily post 2-to-4 times in response to each of the individual discussion forum questions (of which there are three) within that module). The most significant criterion I’ll use in grading the
discussion forums is whether the student added significant value to the forums – i.e., made high-quality, non-redundant contributions. This really should be the focus of your efforts.

Regarding the length of posts, the reality of constructing posts around a limited number of suggested discussion questions is that the posting of “comprehensive” (i.e., lengthy and extensive in content) comments by forum participants, while often very impressive in a scholarly sense, can tend to increase redundancy within the forums. In some other courses where the specific focus of discussions can drift from theme to theme within a given discussion forum, this is not much of an issue. However, in our course the domains of the discussions tend to be closely circumscribed by specific case- and reading-related themes. As such, barring tremendous creativity by all, there’s only so much to say in reference to any particular suggested discussion forum question without being redundant. (Of course, this becomes less of an issue when discussion forum participants pose new questions or introduce new ideas within the forum themes – actions which are, as mentioned above, wholly permissible things to do.) Based on prior experience, let me suggest that you limit your comments to, say, 300 words in response to any single discussion forum question (i.e., a single posting in response to a discussion forum question could be up to 300 words or multiple postings in response to that question could total to 300 words). Please note that each module’s discussion forum includes three suggested discussion questions. What I’m proposing is that you limit your comments to 300 words in response to each of the three specific questions, for a total word cap of 900 per module. The number of times you post within the individual discussion forums is up to you.

My intent is to evaluate student contributions to the discussion forums after the individual forums have closed. In general, I won’t be directly involved in the discussion forums. (Rather, I’ll offer my thoughts on some key take-aways from the cases after the discussion forms have closed and the team cases analyses have been submitted.) However, students should feel free to contact me via Angel e-mail (not in postings within the discussion forums) if they’d like me to comment on particular matters within the discussion forums.

Given below is a description of what I expect from each individual in order to earn the indicated grade in the case discussion forums:

A -- Outstanding contributor (90-100%) -- Contributions suggest exceptional preparation. Ideas offered were highly substantive, reflecting major insights that strongly influenced the course of the discussion. Arguments were very well substantiated and persuasively presented. If this person had not been involved in this discussion forum its quality would have been significantly diminished.

B -- Strong contributor, (80-89%) -- Contributions suggest thorough preparation. Ideas offered were thoughtful and sound, reflecting meaningful and clever insights. Arguments were well substantiated and presented. If this person had not been involved in this discussion forum its quality would have been somewhat diminished.
C -- Fair contributor, (70-79%) -- Contributions suggest only modest preparation. Ideas offered were of little incremental value to the discussion forum. Arguments were not particularly well developed, persuasive, or insightful. If this person had not been involved in this discussion forum its quality would not have been diminished.

D -- Weak contributor, (60-69%) -- Contributions suggest little or no preparation. Comments were, at best, "cherry picking" efforts resulting in minor, isolated, obvious, or confusing points. If this person had not been involved in this discussion forum its overall quality would have been improved.

F -- Very weak contributor or non-participant, (0-59%) -- This person made very little or no substantive contribution to the discussion forum.

III. Individual “The Innovator’s Solution” Discussion Point Paper – 25% of grade

A discussion point paper (DPP) is a paper in which the student (1) precisely identifies THREE distinct discussion points (of the student’s choosing) from any three, separate chapters within the book “The Entrepreneurial Mindset” and (2) either broadly critiques these points or relates these points to their personal experiences, knowledge of a relevant current situation, or other readings or cases discussed in this course or others. The discussion points chosen by the students should be ideas from the book that really resonate with the student in that the student, for example, has seen this phenomenon in practice, appreciates the cleverness or insight demonstrated by the observation, disagrees with the point, believes the managerial prescription following from the point should be adopted in his/her organization, or sees how the point might be misinterpreted or used to justify counterproductive behavior. In short, it’s up to the student to choose what to do, in a commentary sense, with the identified discussion points.

The DPPs should be divided into three sections, each section covering a distinct discussion point. Students should provide the exact page or pages from the book in which each discussion point can be found, and either quote the sentences or paraphrase the sections from the book that are or contain the discussion points on which you’re choosing to comment. These quotes or paraphrases should serve as the “introductions” to the three sections of your DPP. The DPPs should be in the 6-10 page range (double-spaced).

I’ll evaluate the individual DPPs as follows:

A range (90-100%) – In my opinion, the DPP reflects clear thinking, insightfulness, and a very good effort on the student’s part.

B range (80-89%) – In my opinion, the DPP reflects a fundamentally accurate understanding of the chapter materials and a reasonable effort on the student’s part.
C range (70-79%) – In my opinion, the DPP reflects an incomplete understanding or misunderstanding of the chapter materials, these materials were not well or clearly incorporated into the student’s other points, or these materials were superficially discussed.

D range (60-69%) – In my opinion, the DPP reflects little more than a minimal effort by the student; i.e., the student “checked the box” of drafting a DPP.

F (0-59%) – In my opinion, the DPP is grossly deficient or no DPP was submitted.

MISCELLANEOUS IMPORTANT INFORMATION

I. Team Case Analysis Due Dates

You are expected to complete and submit your team case analyses by the dates indicated on the course schedule. However, I do understand that not everyone can control where they will be at all times throughout the quarter, and this may make the timely completion of joint work difficult. If your team knows that it will likely miss a case analysis due date, please let me know ASAP.

II. Individual Case Analysis Discussion Forum Due Dates

The discussion forums associated with each case will be open only for a certain number of days, as indicated on the course schedule. You are expected to participate in the case discussion forums within the indicated time periods, the sooner the better. However, please do not post within a forum before the start date. (Some students may be, for example, traveling during a certain time period, and that may preclude them from posting (or make posting very difficult) within the designated time slot. If this is the case, or if there are other extenuating circumstances, then an early posting would be permissible. In general, however, early postings should not be done.) Because there will be little, if any, reason for the class to go back to prior case discussion forums after they have closed (and the class is on to the next case), credit will not be given for postings after the identified closing dates of the case discussion forums. In other words, there is no “grace period” for late case discussion forum postings. If you must miss a case discussion forum, for whatever reason, that will be the forum you “drop” (remember, you’re only required to participate in 5 of the 6 case discussion forums).

III. Individual Discussion Point Paper Due Date

The DPP is due the last day of the quarter – March 25, 2006. I need all DPPs by then in order to have your final course grades completed and submitted within the time I’ve been allotted. Consider 2/25/06 a firm deadline. To meet this deadline, my strong suggestion is that you not put off writing your DPP until the final week or weeks of class. Rather,
write drafts of the individual sections (each section covering one of your three distinct discussion points) as you read and reflect on particularly interesting ideas from “The Innovator’s Solution.”

IV. Formation of Teams

Students will choose the team members with whom they’d like to work. The team formation process will need to be concluded quickly (due date is [Insert Date]) since the first team deliverable (the “Ingvar Kamprad and IKEA” case analysis) is due at the end of the second week of class (Insert Date). Teams of 4 or 5 members should be formed. The formation process can take place by your (1) reviewing the class roster and directly contacting classmates with whom you’d like to work, (2) sending out an e-mail to the entire class indicating your willingness/availability to form or join a team, and/or (3) posting of messages on the “Team Formation Message Board” indicating that you wish to join a team or wish to add members to your team. (Note: the Team Formation Message Board can be found in the Module 1 folder and under the In Touch tab.) As soon as your team has formed, please e-mail me stating (1) the names of individuals who are part of your team, (2) your self-selected team name, and (3) the name of the individual who will serve as your team’s principal contact person. Once I have this information, I’ll create a separate (and private) discussion forum for each team. In the event that not every individual finds a team of 4 or 5 persons, I may have to add the “free agents” or members of less-than-4-person teams to the 4-person teams.

V. Evaluation of Team Members

At the end of the term, I’ll ask each of you to evaluate your team members’ performance by responding to the following question:

“How much did (insert name of individual team member) contribute to the overall quality and content of your set of submitted case analyses?”

All students should send an e-mail message to me in which you assign a percentage score (0 to 100) to each person in your team, excluding yourself, based on your perception of that person's contribution to the total team case analysis effort. If each person in your team has contributed equally and, in your opinion, deserves full credit, assign a score of 100 to everyone. Scores of less than 100 should be assigned at your discretion depending upon your evaluation of any team member's less-than-equitable contributions. Again, you should not evaluate yourself. These evaluation forms will be used to differentiate, if necessary, the contributions/performance of individual team members for evaluation purposes. You should feel free to also include a written evaluation of your team’s members, or an explanation of the scores you have assigned to these individuals, if you so desire.
How I’ll handle the submitted percentages is as follows. If a person is evaluated at less than 100% by only one team member, I’ll consider that an anomaly and not downwardly adjust the four case analysis scores (totaling 50% of the course grade) of the downgraded individual. However, if two or more team members assign scores of less than 100% to one of their fellow members, I’ll average the team’s evaluations to create a multiplier that I’ll use to assign a grade to the downgraded team member. So, for example, if a team earns an average score of 90% across the four case analyses, but a particular team member receives an average evaluation of 80% from his or her other team members, I’ll assign that person an average score on all case analyses (again, constituting 50% of one’s total grade) of 72% (90% X 80%).

As you can see from the above, I take the internal team equity issue very seriously. All teams should have an explicit discussion about what is expected from each of their members in order to be regarded as a “100%” contributor to the team effort. No one should be caught off guard or surprised by being downgraded by their team members. Also, if certain individuals are not pulling their share of the load, they should be confronted with this belief and given an opportunity to rectify the situation.

VI. Grading Standards

The following percentages will define the grade ranges in this course:
97.00-100.00% - A+
94.00-96.99% - A
90.00-93.99% - A-
87.00-89.99% - B+
84.00-86.99% - B
80.00-83.99% - B-
77.00-79.99% - C+
74.00-76.99% - C
70.00-73.99% - C-
67.00-69.99% - D+
64.00-66.99% - D
60.00-63.99% - D-
Below 60.00% - F

Please note that there will be no rounding up. So, for example, an 89.75 overall percentage score will result in a B+ grade, not an A-.

COURSE SCHEDULE AND ASSIGNMENTS

Module 1: Entrepreneurship and Strategy

Read:
The syllabus in its entirety.
Ingvar Kamprad and IKEA
Chps. 1 and 2 of The Entrepreneurial Mindset

Participate in the “Ingvar Kamprad and IKEA” case analysis discussion forum, open from [insert date]. Suggested discussion forum questions:
1. How does any of the information contained in the two journal articles assigned for this module relate to the issues or information presented in the case?
2. What were the sources behind IKEA’s successful entry into furniture retail?
3. What were the organizational/management processes by which IKEA coordinated and controlled its Europe wide operations?

Team identification: (1) the names of individuals who are part of your team, (2) your self-selected team name, and (3) the name of the individual who will serve as your team’s principal contact person. Information to be forwarded to course instructor via Angel e-mail.

Ingvar Kamprad and IKEA Case Analysis (concise, 3-5 page (double-spaced) position statement)

Team case analysis assignment question:
What are the issues of internationalization? Your answer should discuss (a) the extent to which IKEA had some competitive advantages at an international level and, (b) what challenges did IKEA face while expanding internally and how did it overcome them.

Module 2: Decisions Under Uncertainty

Read:
“Internal entrepreneurship at the Dow Chemical company”
Chps. 2 and 4 of The Entrepreneurial Mindset

Participate in the “Internal entrepreneurship at the Dow Chemical company” case analysis discussion forum, open from [insert date]. Suggested discussion forum questions:
1. How does any of the information contained in the two journal articles assigned for this module relate to the issues or information presented in the case?
2. What were the sources behind IKEA’s successful entry into furniture retail?
3. What were the organizational/management processes by which IKEA coordinated and controlled its Europe-wide operations?

Due

“Internal entrepreneurship at the Dow Chemical company” Case Analysis (concise, 3-5 page (double-spaced) position statement)

Team case analysis assignment question:
1. How would you approach internal entrepreneurship?
2. Specifically, how tolerant should Dow be of Telford’s antics?
3. What are the major challenges that you face in nurturing internal entrepreneurship in a large company?

Module 3: Start-up Strategies

Read:
“ILinc”
Note on Developing Start-up Strategies (HBS 9-394-067)
Chps. 5, 6 and 7 of The Entrepreneurial Mindset

Participate in the “ILinc” case analysis discussion forum, open from
Suggested discussion forum questions:
1. How does any of the information contained in the two journal articles assigned for this module relate to the issues or information presented in the case?
2. Is there a real opportunity here?
3. Does it make sense for Bernstein and Usluel to forgo more secure employment?

Due

“ILinc” Case Analysis (concise, 3-5 page (double-spaced) position statement)

Team case analysis assignment question:
1. Assuming that each partner has $10,000 to invest in the start-up, but each brings a different skill set and contracts, how should they divide the equity of the firm?
2. What options do they have for financing their start-up?
3. Have they figured out their market?

Module 4: Analyzing Business Models
Read:
“Zipcar: Refining the Business Model”
Note on Business Model Analysis
The Protection of Intellectual Property in the United States
Chps. 8 and 9 of The Entrepreneurial Mindset

Participate in the “Zipcar: Refining the Business Model” case analysis discussion forum, open from 08/21. Suggested discussion forum questions:
1. How does any of the information contained in the two journal articles assigned for this module relate to the issues or information presented in the case?
2. Evaluate this potential venture and the progress that Chase has made.
3. What is the business model, and how has it changed between December 1999 and May 2000?

Due 08/21
“Zipcar: Refining the Business Model” Case Analysis (concise, 3-5 page (double-spaced) position statement)

Team case analysis assignment question:
1. What do the data from actual operations in September say about how the business model is playing out in practice? Does this data give you comfort or concern?
2. What actions should Chase take as a result of the September operating results?
3. What is the strongest argument Chase could make to a potential investor about the attractiveness of the venture? What, specifically, should her elevator pitch be at the Springboard forum?

08/21, Module 5: Time and making strategic decisions

Read:
“Fire at Mann Gulch”
Chps. 10 and 11 of The Entrepreneurial Mindset

Participate in the “Fire at Mann Gulch” case analysis discussion forum, open from 08/21. Suggested discussion forum questions:
1. How does any of the information contained in the two journal articles assigned for this module relate to the issues or information presented in the case?
2. What mistakes did Dodge make in terms of his leadership?
3. Why did the firefighters follow Mackey’s orders to build a firm line downhill, despite their reservations and doubts, while ignoring Dodge’s sound orders to join him in the escape fire?

Due 3/27
“Fire at Mann Gulch” Case Analysis (concise, 3-5 page (double-spaced) position statement)

Team case analysis assignment questions:
What was the cause of the tragedy and what role did stress and experience play?

Wrap Up

Read:
Chps. 12 and 13 of The Entrepreneurial Mindset

“The Entrepreneurial Mindset” Discussion Point Paper is due. Please see earlier comments in syllabus for instructions regarding preparation of this deliverable.