|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Prerequisite: | You should have taken four 1 credit modules in the INF 523 series |
| Office/Telephone: | BA-315 / 442-4942 |
| E-Mail: | The best way to reach me is at [paul.miesing@albany.edu](mailto:paul.miesing@albany.edu). I generally respond quickly at any time, seven days a week. This is especially useful if you are struggling with an assignment. Otherwise, please feel free to come by my office whenever my door is open or make an appointment. |

# Texts and Materials

Readings from academic journals will be assigned for each topic. Principal organization journals include *Academy of Management Review*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Communications / Journal of the AIS*, *Information Systems Research*, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *MIS Quarterly*, *Organization Science*,and *Strategic Management Journal*. Articles relating to practice will be assigned from *California Management Review* and *Harvard Business Review*.

# Course Purpose

This course will introduce information systems research paradigms grounded in organizational theory and provide a framework for applying theoretical concepts and empirical tools to the management of information and technology in organizations.

As members of a doctoral seminar, we will survey and critically review current issues within the field. By examining theoretical concepts, empirical research supporting the literature, and examples, you will be able to pursue several of the more contemporary issues most in need of additional investigation. We will practice a methodology for reading journal articles individually and in topical groups: What the author’s points are, the theoretical arguments and supporting empirical evidence, a critique of both (alternative explanations in particular), bringing up additional research questions, some comprehensive examination questions that could be asked, and implications for research and practice. To achieve this, you should identify and develop possible research topics as you read the materials and discuss the topics.

## Learning Objectives

When finished, I expect you to be able to independently engage in research in the field. As such, this course will help Ph.D. students:

* gain an understanding of and appreciation for theories, concepts, issues, methods, research, and contributions in the field;
* stimulate your interest in organization issues, whether mainstream topics or integrated with your primary specialization so you may formulate ideas that advance theory or research in the field;
* develop the skills necessary to critically evaluate, constructively review, and ultimately contribute new ideas to the academic and practitioner literature; and
* prepare you to teach at a university or consult in the field.

## Course Format

As a seminar, each student assumes responsibility for the success of the class. *First*, this means being prepared to actively ***participate*** in class discussions by reading all the assigned materials for each class session: evaluate the material both theoretically and in terms of designing research, critique it, and analyze how it fits with other literatures. *Additionally*, at least two students will ***facilitate*** each of the ten topics by making short presentations and encouraging class discussion of the readings. (A template is provided in this syllabus.) We will assign these during the first meeting. Hence, you will be required to integrate the readings and to place them in the context of the field. *Next*, submit ***critical summaries*** of key contributions for any two (of the ten) current topics of your own choosing. These are to extend and elaborate the assigned readings. Please distribute these to your classmates prior to the session. *Finally*, you will also develop a major ***research proposal*** that will be presented to the class and submitted at the completion of the seminar.

## Learning Assessment

This course format is designed to achieve the learning objectives, which will be formally assessed by students’ meaningful and insightful contributions to the seminar by thinking critically about the material; demonstrated ability to clearly communicate their understanding and evaluation of the readings in a clear and professional manner; written constructive critiques of the extant research; and class presentations of an original research idea and a final conference-style research paper. There is a maximum value of 100 points per student. Final letter grades will be based on a relative curve of all points, awarded as follows:

Maximum Value

Discussion Facilitator (2 @ 10 each) 20

Critical Summaries (any 2 @ 10 each) 20

Class Participation and Contribution 20

Research Proposal (to be presented and submitted @ 20 each) 40

Total Possible Points 100

# Tentative Outline

This course reviews the extant literature by leading thinkers, researchers, and practitioners in the discipline. These topics offer a tremendous opportunity for cross-functional and interdisciplinary research and practice as well as public policy recommendations. Considering the constantly evolving nature of this field the following reading list is by no means exhaustive; it is intended to give you a broad overview of some current areas. Nor are all of these articles necessarily exemplary, seminal, or otherwise to be considered core to the field; they are representative and only scratch the surface. You are expected to read additional articles germane to your specific research interest.

Every week we will focus on one topic and discuss the articles, led by two facilitators. Every student is required to have read the assigned articles ahead of time and be ready to summarize, critique, and extend each article. Feel free to debate aspects of the readings that are counter-intuitive, confusing, or even contradictory. Bring up any relevant personal insights; e.g., what you learned that you did not know or what you did not understand. *I want you to form an opinion!* An extension should report on at least one additional article that is related to the topic under consideration that will extend our understanding of the topic. Present any gaps or possibilities for future research that are not specifically mentioned in the original article. In general, the AIS has a very useful set of research tools, resources, and references at <http://home.aisnet.org/>on the main page under the “Research” tab.

### Aug. 25

#### Course Overview

* Read: this syllabus (you are responsible for all the information it contains!)
* **Assignment:** Send an e-mail message to the instructor. Address the following: Why are you in this program? What are some research questions you would like to examine? How would you study those questions? What additionally are you interested in getting out of this seminar?

### Sep. 8

#### Introduction (P. Miesing)

* Clarke (2006). “Plagiarism by Academics: More Complex Than It Seems,” Journal of the AIS 7(2): 91-120; Gold (2004). “Maximizing the PhD Seminar Experience for Doctoral Students,” Decision Line (January) 35(1): 12-14; Lyytinen & King (2004). “Nothing At The Center? Academic Legitimacy in the Information Systems Field,” Journal of the AIS 5(6): 220-246; Rainer & Miller (2005). “Examining Differences Across Journal Rankings,” Communications of the ACM 48(2): 91-94; Starbuck (2005). “How much better are the most-prestigious journals? The statistics of academic publication,” Organization Science 16(2): 180-200
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* What is IT in organizations? What is the field’s domain? How does the IT literature inform other organization disciplines? Argue that organization theory should be required for all Information Studies PhD students.

### Sep. 15

#### Topic #1: Responses to IT Change in Organizations (M. Nelson)

* Brockner (1992). “The Escalation of Commitment to a Failing Course of Action: Toward Theoretical Progress,” Academy of Management Review 17(1): 39-61; Keil & Robey (1999). “Turning Around Troubled Software Projects: An Exploratory Study of the De-escalation of Commitment to Failing Courses of Action,” Journal of Management Information Systems 15(4): 63-87; Keil, Mann, & Rai (2000). “Why Software Projects Escalate: An Empirical Analysis and Test of Four Theoretical Models,” MIS Quarterly 24(4): 631-664; Mone, McKinley, & Barker (1998). “Organizational Decline and Innovation: A Contingency Framework,” Academy of Management Review 23(1): 115-132; Newman & Sabherwal (1996). “Determinants of Commitment to Information Systems Development: A Longitudinal Investigation,” MIS Quarterly, 20(1): 23-54; Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton (1981). “Threat-Rigidity Effects in Organizational Behavior: A Multilevel Analysis,” Administrative Science Quarterly 26: 501-524; Weitzel & Jonsson (1989). “Decline in Organizations: A Literature Integration and Extension,” Administrative Science Quarterly, 34: 91-109
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* In the face of large-scale technology-based change, what strategies and tactics might an organization employ in order to reduce the risk of maladaptive behavioral responses? How might the organization assess the risk or manage the presence of maladaptive behavioral responses to IT-based changes? How might the size of a project or level of technological change affect how maladaptive behaviors emerge or present themselves?

### Sep. 22

#### Topic #2: Organization Strategies, the Internet, and eCommerce (P. Miesing)

* Iyer & Davenport (2008). “Reverse Engineering Google’s Innovation Machine,” Business Review (April): 59-68; Mahadevan (2000). “Business Models for Internet-Based E-Commerce: An Anatomy,” California Management Review 42(4): 55-69; Oliva, Sterman, & Giese (2003). “Limits to growth in the new economy: Exploring the ‘get big fast’ strategy in e-commerce,” System Dynamics Review 19(2): 83-117; Pavlou & Fygenson (2006). “Understanding and Predicting Electronic Commerce Adoption: An Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior,” *MIS Quarterly* 30(1): 115-143; Porter (2001). “Strategy and the Internet,” Harvard Business Review 79 (March): 62-78; Soh, Markus, & Goh (2006). “Electronic Marketplaces and Price Transparency: Strategy, Information Technology, and Success,” MIS Quarterly 30(3): 705-723; Zhu & Kramer (2002). “e-commerce metrics for net-enhanced organizations: Assessing the value of e-commerce to firm performance in the manufacturing sector,” Information Systems Research 13(3): 275-295
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* How can strategies integrate digitization as an enabling technology? Which aspects hold greatest opportunities, and where are the largest threats? What are the expected impacts of political and cultural values on digitization? For instance, some countries ban or restrict some Internet Web sites (e.g., YouTube) while others receive concessions from Web portals (e.g., Google). What are the implications for a digitization strategy?

### Oct. 6

#### Topic #3: Network Effects, Peer-to-Peer Systems, and Open Source Innovation (P. Miesing)

* AlMarzouq, Zheng, Rong, & Grover (2005). “Open source: Concepts, benefits and challenges,” Communications of the AIS 16: 756-784; Bughin, Chui, & Johnson (2008). “The next step in open innovation,” The McKinsey Quarterly (June): 1-8; Goel, Miesing, & Chandra (working paper). “The Effect of File Sharing Systems on the Media Industry”; Huston & Sakkab (2006). “Connect and Develop,” Harvard Business Review (March): 58-66; Majumdar & Venkataraman (1998). “Network Effects and the Adoption of New Technology: Evidence from the U.S. Telecommunications Industry,” Strategic Management Journal 19(11): 1045-1062; Shankar & Bayus (2003). “Network Effects and Competition: An Empirical Analysis of the Home Video Game Industry,” Strategic Management Journal 24: 375–384; Stewart & Gosain (2006). “The Impact of Ideology on Effectiveness in Open Source Software Development Teams,” MIS Quarterly 30(2): 291-314
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* How is IT altering inter-organization relationships? On the other hand, how are inter-organization relationships shaping the future of IT? What new business models will develop and which industries will be most changed?

### Oct. 13

#### Topic #4: Knowledge Management and The Learning Organization (P. Miesing)

* Cohen & Levinthal (1990). “Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation,” Administrative Science Quarterly 35: 128-152; March (1991). “Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning,” Organization Science 2(1): 71-87; Nonaka (1994). “A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation,” Organization Science 5(1): 14-37; Paik & Choi (2005). “The shortcomings of a standardized global knowledge management system,” Academy of Management Executive 19(2): 81-84; Schultze & Leidner (2002). “Studying Knowledge Management in Information Systems Research: Discourses and Theoretical Assumptions,” MIS Quarterly 26(3): 213-242; Szulanski (1996). “Exploring Internal Stickiness,” Strategic Management Journal 17 (Special Issue): 27-43; Watson & Hewett (2006). “A multi-theoretical model of knowledge transfer in organizations: determinants of knowledge contribution and knowledge reuse,” Journal of Management Studies 43: 141-173; Zander & Kogut (1995). “Knowledge and the Speed of the Transfer and Imitation of Organizational Capabilities,” Organization Science 6(1): 76-92; also see <http://www.kmmagazine.com/>
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* Does IT create a learning organization, or vice versa? What are the barriers to managing knowledge? What conditions create a learning imperative?

### Oct. 20

#### Topic #5: Systems Thinking in Information Systems Research (E. Rich)

* Abdel-Hamid & Madnick (1990). “The Elusive Silver Lining: How We Fail to Learn from Software Development Failures,” *Sloan Management Review* (Fall): 443-452 – I requested a cleaner scan; Atwater, Kannan, & Stephens (2008). “Cultivating Systemic Thinking in the Next Generation of Business Leaders,” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 7(1): 9–25; Checkland (2003). “The Developed Form of Soft Systems Methodology,” Chapter 2 in Checkland & Scholes, *Soft Systems Methodology* (Wiley): 13-58; Kim (1999). “Introduction to Systems Thinking” (Pegasus Communications); Lane & Oliva (1998). “The greater whole: Towards a synthesis of system dynamics and soft systems methodology,” *European Journal of Operational Research* 107: 214-235; Nelson & Rich (2008). “Brown Spots on the Banana: Lessons Learned from Failed Large-scale IT Projects” (Working Paper)
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* Some authors have criticized information systems research as being overly focused on technology and ignoring important organizational issues. What is the substance of this concern? Is it appropriate or over-stated? Provide current and relevant references for your analysis.

### Oct. 27

#### Topic #6: e-HR in Organizations and Employee Acceptance of New Technology Implementations (J. Marler)

* Marler, Fisher, & Ke (forthcoming). “Employee Self-Service Technology Acceptance: A Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Relationships,” Personnel Psychology; Marler & Dulebohn (2005). “A Model of Employee Self-Service Technology Use,” Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management 24: 139-182; Venkatesh & Ramesh (2006). “Web and Wireless Site Usability: Understanding Differences and Modeling Use,” MIS Quarterly 30(1): 181-206; Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis (2003). “User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View,” MIS Quarterly 27(3): 425-478; Zhang & Li (2005). “The Intellectual Development of Human-Computer Interaction Research: A Critical Assessment Of The MIS Literature (1990-2002),” Journal of AIS 6(11): 227-291
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* What are the different technology acceptance models in the literature? What do you think of the “Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use”? Does it replace the other models? What are the key variables of these different technology acceptance models and how well are they measured? For instance, is there overlap or are they separate constructs? What is the unit of analyses for the empirical studies in technology acceptance? Could there be other levels of analyses?

### Nov. 3

#### Topic #7: IT and Finance (C. Faugere)

* Brynjolfsson, Hitt, & Yang (2002). “Intangible Assets: Computers and Organizational Capital,” Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1: 137-198; Brynjolfsson, Hu, & Smith (2003). “Consumer Surplus in the Digital Economy,” Management Science 49 (11): 1580-1596; Powell & Dent-Micallef (1997). “Information Technology as Competitive Advantage: The Role of Human, Business, and Technology Resources,” Strategic Management Journal, 18 (5): 375-405
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* tbd

### Nov. 10

#### Topic #8: Marketing and Privacy Issues (S. Commuri)

* Caudill & Murphy (2000). “Consumer Online Privacy: Legal and Ethical Issues,” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 19(1): 7-19; Milne (2000). “Privacy and Ethical Issues in Database/Interactive Marketing and Public Policy: A Research Framework and Overview of the Special Issue,” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 19 (1): 1-6; Petty (2000). “Marketing Without Consent: Consumer Choice and Costs, Privacy, and Public Policy,” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 19(1): 42-53; purchase (cost $11.85) at <http://harvardbusinessonline.hbsp.harvard.edu/relay.jhtml?name=cp&c=c29753>
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* Discuss the balancing act facing marketers who manage customer privacy. Which stakeholders must be considered and what issues might they raise?

### Nov. 17

#### Topic #9: Using IT for Corporate Governance and Control (J. Gangolly)

#### Note: This class will be held 2-4:30pm in Draper Hall 115

* Coffee (1999). “The Future as History: The Prospects for Global Convergence in Corporate Governance and its Implications,” *Northwestern University Law Review* 93(3): 641-708; Greenwood (2004). “Enronitis: Why Good Corporations Go Bad,” *Columbia Business Law Review* 773: 773-848; Vanasco (1998). “Fraud auditing,” *Managerial Auditing Journal* 13(1): 4–71
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* What contributions can information technology make in preventing good companies from going bad? Limit your answer to IT in the context of the governance of corporations through incentives to executives while protecting the rights of shareholders as well as the well-being of all the stakeholders.

### Nov. 24

#### Topic #10: Strategic Information Systems (P. Miesing)

* Curry & Stancich (2000). “The intranet - an intrinsic component of strategic information management?” *International Journal of Information Management* 20: 249-268; Dohertya, Marplesa, & Suhaimib (1999). “The relative success of alternative approaches to strategic information systems planning: an empirical analysis,” *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 8: 263–283; Grovera & Segars (2005). “An empirical evaluation of stages of strategic information systems planning: patterns of process design and effectiveness,” *Information & Management* 42: 761–779; Hirschheim & Sabherwal (2001). “Detours in the Path toward Strategic Information Systems Alignment,” *California Management Review* 44(1): 87-108; King & Teo (2000). “Assessing the impact of proactive versus reactive modes of strategic information systems planning,” *Omega* 28 667-679; Nolan & McFarlan (2005). “Information Technology and the Board of Directors,” *Harvard Business Review* (October): 96-106; Prahalad & Krishnan (2002). “The Dynamic Synchronization of Strategy and Information Technology,” *MIT Sloan Management Review* 43(4): 24-33
* *Comprehensive Examination Question:* Identify some of the characteristics of strategic information systems (SIS). How can these be directly applied to the value-added process to create a competitive advantage and alter the competitive landscape? Draw on other course perspectives as blueprints (e.g., responses to IT change in organizations; e-commerce and the virtual organization; network effects and open source; the learning organization). How would you empirically prove your position? What unresolved issues remain?

### Dec. 1

#### No Class – prepare research presentation and paper

### Dec. 8

#### Research Proposal Presentations

* A 1-2 page summary or overhead is to be handed out to the class and a 10 minute presentation made by each person.
* Summary, critical views, and concluding thoughts and directions as to where the field is heading

### Dec. 15

#### Final Research Proposal Due

# Evaluation

## Discussion Facilitator

(2 @ 10 points each)

The first hour of the topic sessions will be for the discussion facilitator(s). You will summarize ***two*** sets of readings from ten topics and lead the class discussion. As discussion leader, you will take primary responsibility for all the readings as well as preparing a bibliography of additional readings that extend or criticize the assigned articles. The leaders should not merely lecture the class, but facilitate dialogue. The goal should be to try to elicit discussion through different media (presentation, questions, handouts, etc.). The rest of the class should read the required articles and be prepared to further the discussion, but will not be held responsible for as thorough an understanding as the facilitator(s). The discussion facilitator should summarize each session by stating what was learned from this body of research. Then, the class will conclude each session by outlining new research questions that are raised by the research, such as extensions of the research, unanswered questions, and avenues for future research. The following *general* questions may help you prepare to discuss the articles or facilitate a discussion:

1. *Purpose of Readings:* Describe how the readings fit into a broader stream of research, why they were written, what the fundamental objectives are, etc.
   1. What are the readings about? What are the phenomena of interest and constructs examined?
   2. What are the authors’ purposes? What motivated the study? (E.g., to help solve problems of practitioners, to better understand a phenomenon?)
   3. What are the study’s claims, findings, events, and available data?
   4. Which are the *three* most important questions and why?
2. *Theoretical Arguments:* What are the key relationships and major propositions? What is the theory underlying these relationships?
   1. What are the readings’ major premises and logical arguments? What are the basic arguments?
   2. What is the theory? What drives the theory?
   3. Does the theory have internal logical consistency?
   4. What is the usefulness of the theory? Does it reconcile important issues, conflicting opinions, or conflicting prior research?
   5. Are the theoretical constructs operationally appropriate?
3. *Methodologies:* If applicable, is the methodology used appropriate? Critique the research methods (if any) used. What are the assumptions and trade offs inherent in using this method?
   1. Are the research designs appropriate?
   2. How were alternative explanations controlled?
   3. Are the statistical methods appropriate?
   4. Is the analysis complete?
   5. Are the interpretations and conclusions consistent with the evidence presented?
   6. What are the important questions that still need to be addressed to further understand the phenomenon?
4. *Results and Conclusions:* Summarize the empirical results, theoretical conclusions, implications, etc.
   1. How useful are these articles to scholars or students? to managers and practitioners?
   2. How does this stream relate to others you have encountered?
   3. What future research directions do these articles spark? How might you design a study to pursue these directions?
5. *Overall*: What are the implications of the articles for the study and the practice of “Information and Technology in Organizations”?
   1. Can you think of a suitable comprehensive examination question based on the materials? (Like research questions, these examination questions can require students to synthesize the literature, extend it further, replicate it, or apply it to a different setting.)
   2. Identify a question, comment, or concern for the readings. (Go beyond asking information about the content of specific articles and instead focus on the relationships among them and their implications for the field as a whole.)

## Critical Summaries

(2 @ 10 points each)

You are required to write a short summary of any ***two*** sets of readings from the ten topics (excluding the two you facilitate) and distribute them to the class session for which they are discussed prior to the session. Your review should summarize the articles’ contributions and major points or key findings, and briefly critique them. Each one should have a summary on one single-spaced page. (These summaries can follow the same format as the discussion facilitator.) In addition, add a second page outlining a research idea for that topic that presents a research question, a brief defense, and the probable methodology. The purpose of this assignment is to help you think of research projects for your dissertation and develop publishable research projects.

## Class Participation and Contribution

(20 points)

As appropriate for scholarly inquiry, the class will operate in a collegial fashion. My main role in this class is to facilitate discussion and provide context for the topics being discussed. Your main responsibility is to come to class prepared to discuss the articles assigned for each session. As is true of most seminars (and indeed, classes), you will get out of this seminar what you put into it. *Read, understand, and critique the articles assigned for discussion each week.* In class, you will be asked to identify a question, state your comments, or express your views concerning the readings. To assist you, each session has a *Comprehensive Examination Question* as an example to help frame discussion.

## Research Proposal

(20 points for presentation; 20 points for paper)

An important part of this course will be your socialization into the journal submission and review process. “Publish or perish” is a very relevant performance criterion for aspiring academics. Hence, as a semester project, each student is to develop at least one creative idea of publishable quality. You are to present and submit a ***research proposal*** (drawing on a topic covered in or related to the course). This may be a conceptual paper/review paper or an empirical design paper. Whichever you select, it must demonstrate a deep knowledge of the literature, an ability to integrate it, and skills to carry out research based on real data. *It must also be an original work* and written in the form of a journal article (e.g., *SMJ* or *AMR*). This is your chance to think outside of the box. As you read through and discuss the articles during the semester, look for unanswered questions and areas where you may challenge the common wisdom of the field, or where you might synthesize diverse streams within strategy or related area. Or try to combine aspects of micro and macro theory, i.e., How important is a sound HRIS plan to the overall strategy of the firm? What constitutes value in terms of inbound and outbound logistics? How does one know that a learning organization has truly learned?

Your paper must include the theoretical background, an extensive review and critique of the literature, a discussion section, and suggested directions for future research. A conceptual/review paper might be a new strategy model or an integrative framework. Or you might compose an essay that, for instance, develops and supplies the reasoning for two alternative scenarios for the future of the field. If you submit a research design paper, then define your research question, justify it, develop a few hypotheses, and propose a method for testing them. You need not have the data; however, you should suggest where you could get the data, what type of analysis you would do, and interpret the “best-case results” you expect to find.

You will have approximately 10 minutes to present your proposal during the final class session. Your written proposal is due one week after the presentation and should include comments, critiques, and feedback from the class (considered as your peer reviews). Papers should not exceed 25 pages (including exhibits, tables, figures, references, etc.) and include your research question, its relevance and scope, a literature review, framework or theoretical model, and proposed data source and analysis approach. You may find it helpful to begin with a survey of past research on the topic organized using a framework that indicates how the ideas from each of the articles link together. The framework will also highlight any missing pieces or gaps in that research stream. Your paper will seek to address some of these gaps by suggesting interesting research possibilities along with the appropriate methodologies to carry out the research. If possible, attach a drawing of the conceptual model, a table that lists the constructs, their definitions, and their main references and specify known operationalizations of each construct. The proposal will be evaluated on its originality, sound use of theory, potential for contribution, and appropriate use of methodology. Some guidelines that will help you create a coherent literature review can be found at Webster & Watson (2002). “Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review,” *MIS Quarterly* 26(2): xiii-xxiii.

I will not accept any late papers. Your final grade will reflect your presentation and your final paper. (*Note:* Incompletes will not be given in this class except in the case of illness or family emergency.)

# Miscellaneous Notes

Academic dishonesty – including plagiarism, sabotage, falsification of material or information, bribery, as well as theft, damage, or misuse of University resources – of any sort will not be tolerated. This is clearly stated in University and School policy, and you are responsible for knowing the policies and adhering to them. Work assigned for individual credit must be completed by individuals; group work requires everyone to contribute their fair share. Plagiarism is an issue in all schools (and at all levels). Particular violations involve self-plagiarism (using the same material more than once without citing your first work or paper; for example, submitting the same paper or excerpts from the paper to multiple classes. Work submitted for credit in other classes may not be submitted (in part or whole) for credit in this class. Another violation is cutting and pasting from material on the internet and failing to cite the source. Avoid these issues by giving yourself adequate time to complete your research and by citing others’ ideas and materials that you use.

Session Facilitations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | *Sign up for 2 of the 10 topics below* | | |
| 1. Responses to IT Change in Organizations |  |  |  |
| 2: Organization Strategies, the Internet, and eCommerce |  |  |  |
| 3: Network Effects, Peer-to-Peer Systems, and Open Source Innovation |  |  |  |
| 4: Knowledge Management and The Learning Organization |  |  |  |
| 5: IT Project Development and Management |  |  |  |
| 6: e-HR in Organizations and Employee Acceptance of New Technology Implementations |  |  |  |
| 7: IT and Finance |  |  |  |
| 8: Marketing and Privacy Issues |  |  |  |
| 9: Using IT for Corporate Governance and Control |  |  |  |
| 10: Strategic Information Systems |  |  |  |