

# A Web-Enabled Course Partnership

W

**Ned Kock***Texas A&M International University, USA***Gangshu Cai***Texas A&M International University, USA*

## INTRODUCTION

Notwithstanding fluctuations in enrollment, virtually every university in the U.S. and overseas has seen a significant increase in demand for information technology (IT) courses and programs in the last 15 years (Greenspan, 1999; Monaghan, 1998; Ross, 1998). At the source of this demand is an ever-growing need for qualified IT professionals in most companies, whether the companies are in technology industries or not (Alexander, 1999; Andel, 1999; Kock, 2005; Lee, 2006; Trunk, 2000; Wilde, 1999).

Given the previous practical motivation, one would expect university IT courses to be closely aligned with the industry's basic needs. Nevertheless, the gap between industry and academia in the field of IT (King, 1998; Kock, 2006; Kock, Auspitz, & King, 2002; Richter, 1999) seems to be widening rather than contracting, which is evidenced by some symptoms: (a) students complaining about their lack of "real world" IT experience when they graduate; (b) industry representatives pointing out that universities do not prepare students for the challenges and complexity of corporate IT management; and (c) faculty teaching topics that are related to their research yet far removed from the daily reality faced by IT professionals.

One way of addressing the problematic situation just mentioned is to establish industry-university partnerships. Such partnerships, particularly those involving research universities, have been commonplace for quite some time, and are arguably on the rise (Burnham, 1997; Wheaton, 1998). Irrespective of economic sector or industry, the vast majority of industry-university partnerships are of the *research partnership* type, which predominantly involves applied firm-specific research. In this type of partnership, funding from the industry partner is received in exchange for "intellectual horsepower" in the form of research services and technology transfer (Hollingsworth, 1998; Meyer-Krahmer, 1998).

A much less common type of industry-university partnership is what we refer here to as a *course partnership*, which gravitates around a regular university course (or set of courses) rather than a research project or program. In these types of partnerships, the industry partner agrees to sponsor one or more courses in which the students are expected to apply concepts and theory learned in class to the solution of

some of the industry partner's key problems. Students benefit from the direct contact with the industry they are likely to join after they graduate as well as professional relationships they are able to establish during the course.

This article discusses a *course partnership* involving a large engineering and professional services company, and a public university, both headquartered in Philadelphia. An action research study of the course partnership is used as a basis.

Like typical action research studies (Checkland, 1991; Lau, 1997; Peters & Robinson, 1984; Winter, 1989; Wood-Harper, 1985), ours aimed at providing a service to the research clients (Jonsonn, 1991; Rapoport, 1970; Sommer, 1994), while at the same time performing an exploratory investigation of the effect of Web-based collaboration technologies on course partnerships. The research clients in question were the students and the industry partner. Also, in line with a subclass of action research, namely participatory action research (Greenwood, Whyte, & Harkavy, 1993; Elden & Chisholm, 1993; McTaggart, 1991; Whyte, 1991), one of the research clients, the industry partner, participated actively in the compilation and analysis of the exploratory research data, as well as in the interpretation of the findings.

## BACKGROUND

Our study was centered on a different and arguably promising approach to implementing course partnerships that was recently proposed to address the problems outlined previously (Kock, Auspitz, & King, 2000, 2002, 2003). The approach involves conducting certain courses, particularly senior undergraduate and graduate courses, in close partnership with companies. Such courses are designed so that the concepts and theory discussed in class are applied in team course projects geared at solving immediate problems at the company partner. Other fundamental characteristics of these course partnerships are:

- **All Team Projects are Conducted in One Single Organization:** Letting student teams identify organizations they would want to work with, based on criteria defined by the instructor, usually leads to dif-

- ferent student teams conducting projects in different organizations, and thus to significant discrepancies in project complexity, project scope, and organizational support across different student teams. These problems can have a negative impact on learning and are considerably reduced when all team projects are conducted in one single organization.
- **Potential Projects are Identified in Advance:** The identification of a potential project by student teams can take up to five weeks of a 14-week course. One may argue that this is acceptable, as long as concepts and theory are covered in the classroom during those initial five weeks. However, in addition to identifying a project, a student team also needs to learn about the organizational culture, key people, and specific business processes they will be dealing with. This can easily take up another five weeks, leaving little time for other key project activities (e.g., business process redesign and IT implementation). The solution to this problem is to identify potential projects in advance, prior to the formal start of the course, and distribute them among student teams in the first week of the course.
  - **Top Management Personally Sponsors the Course Partnership:** Often, when students are asked to come up with their own company-sponsored course projects, the individuals who sponsor the projects are not senior managers. As a result, a project sponsor may be reluctant or lack the authority to approve organizational changes or purchases of hardware and software necessary for a project to be effectively completed. These difficulties are mitigated when top management directly sponsors team projects.

It is important to note that course partnerships with these characteristics require a considerable amount of extra time and effort from the students and instructor, well beyond what is usually expected in traditional courses. In addition to applying the concepts and theory learned in class, students would also have to learn “on-the-fly” how to effectively deal with issues that are found in real-world projects (e.g., organizational culture and politics). The instructor, on the other hand, has to also take on project management, industry-university liaison, and inter-organizational team facilitation responsibilities, in addition to traditional course delivery and student mentoring duties.

## **IMPLEMENTING A COURSE PARTNERSHIP: TEMPLE UNIVERSITY AND DAY & ZIMMERMANN, INC.**

The course partnership idea discussed previously has been implemented through a collaboration between Temple Uni-

versity, a large public university located approximately two miles from downtown Philadelphia, and Day & Zimmermann, Inc., a U.S. \$1.5 billion engineering and professional services company headquartered in downtown Philadelphia. The course was a pilot version of CIS650—Process Design and Information Technology, a newly developed course in Temple’s Computer and Information Science Department dealing with process analysis and redesign issues.

The course instructor (the author of this article) initiated the course partnership by sending a letter to one of the senior executives at Day & Zimmermann. In the letter, the course instructor inquired if the company would be interested in partnering with Temple University, providing details about the partnership. The partnership was approved after an initial meeting involving the course instructor and senior managers at the company.

The course project required students to analyze and redesign five of Day & Zimmermann’s business processes using the concepts, theory, and techniques taught in class. The course partnership and related project had direct support from Day & Zimmermann’s chief information officer (CIO) from the outset. A senior manager at Day & Zimmermann, who reported directly to the CIO, was assigned the responsibility of managing the project together with the course instructor. The project involved, directly and indirectly, over 30 Day & Zimmermann employees and 26 Temple students.

The students were split into five process redesign teams, which periodically met with key Day & Zimmermann employees at the company’s headquarters in downtown Philadelphia. Each team analyzed and redesigned one process, generated three reports, and delivered an oral presentation to Day & Zimmermann management at the end of the course. The first report generated by each team contained a detailed description of the process targeted; the second a detailed description of the redesigned process and the rationale behind the redesign decisions; and the third a detailed analysis of IT solutions to enable the new (redesigned) process.

## **WEB SITE REMOVES OBSTACLES TO PARTICIPATION**

Before the course partnership was started, two main obstacles had to be dealt with. First, Day & Zimmermann employees were expected to actively participate in the process redesign efforts. In order to do so, they had to understand the concepts and theory used by the students. Yet, most of the Day & Zimmermann employees likely to be involved in this project could not come to Temple to audit the course together with the students. Also, given that Temple students and Day & Zimmermann employees were not co-located, a great deal of their interaction would have to occur by means other than face-to-face meetings. The solution to overcome these two obstacles was the development of a password-protected

4 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/web-enabled-course-partnership/14194](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/web-enabled-course-partnership/14194)

---

## Related Content

---

### Project Management Best Practices to Increase Success

Jeffrey L. Brewer (2005). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, First Edition* (pp. 2335-2340).  
[www.irma-international.org/chapter/project-management-best-practices-increase/14609](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/project-management-best-practices-increase/14609)

### Obstacles for SMEs for E-Adoption in the Asia Pacific Region

Sushil K. Sharmaand Nilmini Wickramasinghe (2005). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, First Edition* (pp. 2168-2173).  
[www.irma-international.org/chapter/obstacles-smes-adoption-asia-pacific/14579](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/obstacles-smes-adoption-asia-pacific/14579)

### AMERIREAL Corporation: Information Technology and Organizational Performances

Mo Adam Mahmood, Gary J. Mannand Mark Dubrow (2001). *Annals of Cases on Information Technology: Applications and Management in Organizations* (pp. 21-31).  
[www.irma-international.org/article/amerireal-corporation-information-technology-organizational/44604](http://www.irma-international.org/article/amerireal-corporation-information-technology-organizational/44604)

### Global Organizational Fit Pyramid for Global IT Team Selection

Richard Colfaxand Karri Perez (2007). *Information Resources Management: Global Challenges* (pp. 373-385).  
[www.irma-international.org/chapter/global-organizational-fit-pyramid-global/23051](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/global-organizational-fit-pyramid-global/23051)

### Wrong Gallery: A New Paradigm for Art Space

Tsui-Yii Shihand Zhi-An Liu (2016). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology* (pp. 13-28).  
[www.irma-international.org/article/wrong-gallery/172152](http://www.irma-international.org/article/wrong-gallery/172152)