

**Organizational Strategy
MANA5336
Fall, 2015**

Professor: M. Ann McFadyen

Office: COBA 227

Phone: 817.272.0214

Email: mcfadyen@uta.edu

Tuesday

Sect 001: 7:00pm – 9:50 pm

Room COBA 138

Office hours: By appointment

COURSE SYLLABUS

I. COURSE DESCRIPTION

Strategic Management takes the view of the general manager of an organization. It addresses how firms use their resources to pursue goals and adapt to the environment. Resources may be technological or managerial know-how, employees, capital, etc. Elements of the environment are competition, customers, economic, political, or sociological conditions, global and domestic markets, etc. The general manager sets the objectives of the firm together with its stakeholders, and formulates and implements strategies to achieve competitive advantages in certain markets. Strategic Management is about setting priorities for the firm and then charting a course to achieve those priorities. Consequently, this class is integrative in nature, using the skills developed in other courses such as accounting, marketing, finance, and information systems.

Three major approaches will be used in this course:

1. Readings, group work, discussion and lecture
2. Analysis of case studies
3. Case Competition

II. REQUIRED MATERIALS

Hoskisson, R.E., M.A. Hitt, R.D. Ireland, & Harrison, J.S. 2013. *Competing for Advantage*. Third Edition. Mason, OH: South-Western/Thomson Learning. SBN-10: 0538475161 | ISBN-13: 9780538475167

Course Readings – available electronically through the UTA library

Harvard Business Review Case studies – available on line through Harvard Business School Online
<https://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/39243405>

Wall Street Journal (discounted rate)

III. COURSE OBJECTIVES

Strategic Management serves as a practice-oriented capstone course. The course is intended to provide the opportunity for you to integrate the concepts, knowledge and skills that you have acquired in each of the various functional areas. Strategic Management takes the perspective of the top management team and will explore why firms differ. This course involves substantial reading, writing, speaking and critical thinking.

A case study problem solving approach is taken to increase your understanding of the issues and challenges that most organizations face. It is designed for interactive participative learning. Please be prepared to participate and contribute to all class discussions.

IV. Grading

Grades for the course will be computed as follows:

Assignment or Event	Points
A. MidTerm	250
B. Case Competition	
Consultant 1	175
Consultant 2	175
Management	150
Board Member	100
C. Participation	150
Total Points Possible	1000

Letter grades will be assigned in the following manner:

- A:** 1000 to 900
- B:** 899 to 800
- C:** 799 to 700
- D:** 699 to 600
- F:** Below 600 points

MID-TERM EXAM

You will be given one (1) take home essay mid-term exam. The mid-term will make up 25 percent of your overall grade. A make-up examination, which is only given for University excused absences, will be given within a week of the original examination date, and will be given on campus.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation grade is a critical element of this class, comprising 15 percent of your overall grade. You owe yourself and your fellow students your *presence* in the classroom, your *preparation* of the required material, and your *participation* in a timely manner. It is your responsibility to have read in advance the materials that will be covered during lecture. Please come to class prepared. Ask yourself why each reading has been assigned and how it fits into the overall course. Preparation and participation is expected and monitored. Simply attending class does not garner participation points. You cannot pass this course unless you attend class on a regular basis and actively engage in class discussions.

Please turn off ALL electronic devices throughout class discussions. Electronic device use is strictly PROHIBITED during class discussions.

Participation is assessed on both the quantity and the quality of the contribution to the discussion. We'll begin each class by discussing recent events in the WSJ and apply an ethical lens to our discussions. Please read the assigned materials, consider the issues raised by the cases and assignments, and arrive at a thoughtful position concerning the ethical issues facing the firms and managers we discuss. Please develop a personal position on the issues that the readings raise. Thus, complete the assigned readings prior to each class and be fully prepared to discuss them.

An effective participant:

- is a good listener
- makes points relevant to the ongoing discussion
- makes comments that add to our understanding of the reading or case
- is willing to challenge ideas that are being expressed
- integrates material from past classes and other courses
- overall is actively engaged in all class room discussions
- does NOT use electronic devices during class discussions.

Description of Case Competition

After March 30, the class will be devoted to application of the models and frameworks discussed in the first half of the semester. We will form six groups (the group size will vary according to class enrollment), with the teams as interdisciplinary as possible (i.e., students from marketing, accounting, finance, and management, rather than all from one discipline). Each group will be used in four capacities: Consultants, Management, Board Members. First, each group will be assigned three cases in which they will present a solution to the Management of the firm that includes a diagnosis of the strategic issues facing the firm as well as recommendations to address those issues (350 points). Second, each group will act as Management in which they will hear diagnoses and recommendations of three consulting groups, will ask the groups questions, and then will select the group that has presented the best diagnosis and recommendations (150 points). Finally, each group will have the opportunity to evaluate how well Management does in its duty of running the firm, as members of the board of directors (100 points). Each of these roles is covered in greater detail below.

Consultants

Each consulting group will be randomly assigned two of the four cases covered in the second half of the course. For each case, the following is expected of each group:

- A **written assignment** comprised of two parts. First, a **strategic summary** in which the group presents key elements of the external environment, industry analysis, business-level strategy, competitive issues, etc. the firm may be following. This part of the written assignment is a summary and will be in the form of a standardized template I will provide on Blackboard. The second part is five to seven pages of **diagnosis of the strategic issues** facing the firm as well as **recommendations** to address those issues. This portion of the written assignment will rely heavily on the models and frameworks covered in the first half of the class.
- 1. A 5 - 7 minute **presentation** to the Management of the firm. This presentation will summarize the major points covered in your written assignment. Following the presentation, the group must be ready to field any questions from Management regarding their diagnosis and recommendations. ALL group members must participate in either presenting or fielding questions, and the Management may directly question any group member. ALL group members must turn in a “billable hours” sheet to Management. Furthermore, the group will be going head-to-head against two other consulting groups and must be ready to justify why their diagnosis and recommendations are superior to those of the competition.

The grading for the consulting group will be done by me.

Management

Each group will be randomly assigned as Management on one case we will cover in the second half of the course. As Management, you work for the Chairman/CEO (me) and your duty is to provide me with the best analysis possible to formulate a decision regarding the issues facing the firm. For this assignment, the following is expected of each group:

1. **Evaluate the written assignments** of the consulting groups. Management will receive copies of the written assignments from each of the consulting groups and must assess them as to their completeness and quality using a standardized template that I will provide. The assessment must be as objective and impartial as possible and should not select one consulting group over the others. The main purpose of the evaluation is to note strengths and weaknesses of the written assignments and should include key questions that remain after reading the assignments.
2. **Meet with the Chairman/CEO** of the firm (me) on the evening of the week before the case is presented in class. The meeting will be held the last hour of the class. In this meeting, the management team will discuss the relative strengths and weaknesses of the consulting team proposals and will formulate a list of unresolved issues or open questions that will be directed at the consulting teams the following week. Management must come prepared to this meeting, having read the case and the consulting team written assignments and be ready to discuss the issues. Coming unprepared to this meeting will affect your grade on this assignment.
3. **Evaluate the presentation** of the consulting groups. In this role, Management must listen carefully and note any discrepancies between what is in the written report and what is presented. Also, Management must be

ready to question the consulting group about their written and presented material. Civility and respect are essential in this role and personal or group attacks will affect the overall Management grade. Questions must be framed with the intention of obtaining more information, not as an opportunity to embarrass or harass the consulting group(s). It is important, however, for Management to make the best informed decision possible, and this requires that the team receive as much information from the consulting groups as possible. This is a very delicate role and if you have any questions about it, please do not hesitate to ask me.

4. **Selection of a consulting group.** After evaluating the written and presented material, Management will select one consulting group. The selection will be done as follows: up to 6 points may be given to the written assignment and up to 4 points may be given for the presentation. The scores of each member of Management will then be totaled into an aggregate number. If members of management allot the same point totals to each team, they must give a tie-breaking extra point and select one team over another. This selection must be well justified by the information presented and not swayed by emotion or capricious behavior. I will also not tolerate any collusive behavior where Management is ‘bought off’ by one of the consulting groups; such behavior will be considered scholastic dishonesty and will be dealt with according to the university’s policies on this subject. Finally, it is possible that Management may deem no team worthy of selection, and if this occurs, then Management may make the decision to not select a group.
5. **Presentation to the Board of Directors.** After Management has made their selection, they will prepare a 5 – 7 minute presentation to the board that justifies why they selected one group over the other. The claims made in the presentation must be substantiated from either the written assignment or the presentation to management. The board members will then question Management about their selection to ensure that Management has made a well-justified decision. NOTE: the position taken by Management must be well-justified, but does not need to be the same decision that the board would have made.

The grading for Management will be done by me. Additionally, after Management makes its selection, I will poll the Board Members (the team that did not act as either the Management or the consulting groups presenting the case). Each board member will have one vote and it is an “up or down” vote on keeping Management or throwing them out. Management will not know the composition of the vote, only if they are sustained or thrown out.

Board Members

The role of the board members is to evaluate the job done by Management in evaluating the consulting groups. You are to take on the role of a major shareholder in the firm, *and your overriding objective should be to enhance shareholder value*. To do this, you will be required to read and understand the Management’s evaluation of the consulting groups’ written assignments. In class, while Management is interacting with the consulting groups, you will be required to take notes evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of how well management fulfills its responsibilities. You will take an active role in questioning Management as to why they selected the group that they did.

After the presentation by Management, if your group feels that Management has selected a path that does not enhance shareholder value or that Management has been negligent in their role of looking out for shareholders, you can vote to throw them out. If, on the other hand, you feel that Management has performed its responsibilities well, you can vote to sustain Management. This vote is confined to Management, and does not have any bearing on the consulting groups. In groups where there is a split (e.g., two for, two against), no vote will be cast.

The grading for the board members will be as follows. You must be present to vote; if you are not present, you will not receive the 30 points for voting. In addition, you will receive 70 points for a two to three page written evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of management and to support your decision to either retain or dismiss management based on their arguments.

PLEASE NOTE: The vote to sustain or toss Management must be based upon the merits of what Management does and should not be influenced by “score settling” with the group acting as Management. For this reason, if I (as chairman of the board) disagree with the board vote, I will ask those voting for the outcome with which I disagree to write a one page paper explaining why they voted as they did. If the explanation is sufficient in explaining the position, the vote will stand; if it is insufficient in explaining the position, Board Members providing the insufficient explanations will be fined 50 points.

Timeline of the Case Competitions

One week prior to the Competition **no later than 3 PM:**

- Consulting groups submit written assignment to Blackboard
- Management downloads the written assignments from Blackboard and begins their evaluation
- Board members download written assignment

After receiving the consulting groups' proposals, and prior to competition, Management may request a conference call with me to discuss any concerns.

On the Friday prior to the Competition **no later than 9:00 PM:**

- Management submits its evaluation of the consulting groups and it is posted to the website
- The consulting groups and board members download the Management evaluations and read them in preparation for the competition.

½ Day prior to the Competition:

- If you plan on using PowerPoint in your presentation, you must have a copy of your slides to me **at least 12** hours before you present. Additionally, please bring soft copy of your presentation to class.

Day of the Competition

1. Lottery, winner chooses who begins. Show up 5 minutes early for the drawing. If no member of a group is present for the lottery they forfeit the choice.
2. First consulting group makes its presentation (5 - 7 minutes).
 - 2a. Q&A between Management and first consulting group (up to 18 minutes, with the first consulting group having a **maximum** of 25 minutes)
3. Second consulting group gives its presentation (5 - 7 minutes) (Note: you may discuss critiques of and improvements over the first consulting group's presentation)
 - 3a. Q&A between Management and second consulting group (up to 18 minutes, with the second consulting group having a **maximum** of 25 minutes)
4. Third consulting group gives its presentation (5 - 7 minutes) (Note: you may discuss critiques of and improvements over the first two consulting groups' presentation)
 - 4a. Q&A between Management and third consulting group (up to 18 minutes, with the third consulting group having a **maximum** of 25 minutes)
5. The first consulting group may rebut for up to 5 minutes (any member of the group).
6. The second consulting group may rebut for up to 5 minutes (any member of the group).
7. The third consulting group may rebut for up to 5 minutes (any member of the group).
8. Management chooses a consulting firm (30 minutes)
 - 8a. Consulting Teams & Board are excused while Management deliberates
 - 8b. The scores of each member of Management will be totaled into an aggregate number.
 - 8c. Management selects a consulting group, and then composes a presentation that they will make to the board.
9. Class reconvenes, and scores for the consulting groups are listed on the board. The consulting group that wins receives 10 points of extra credit.
10. Management makes a 5 – 7 minute presentation to the board justifying their selection. Written assignment due by the next class meeting

- 10a. Q&A between boards and Management (up to 18 minutes, with a **maximum** of 25 minutes)
11. The Chairman/CEO leads a discussion with the two sets of board members about how well Management performed (consulting group / Management members do not participate).
- 11a. Each set of Board members vote to either throw out Management or keep them based on their ability to make good decisions for the future. Written assignment due before the next class meeting.
12. The Wall Street analysts briefly meet and present their position on future stock prices. Written assignment due before the next class meeting.
13. Class comments and discussion if time permits

Other Information

- I reserve ALL oversight authority, which means that in addition to being the Chairman/CEO, I am, in effect, the SEC and the government. This gives me the ability to intervene whenever I feel that the competition is going awry or to break any ties that may arise.
- Group work is a fact of life for the overwhelming majority of businesses, and unfortunately group dynamics do not always work. If your group is having a problem you must notify me **as soon as possible** so that any issues may be resolved. Do not wait until late in the semester to notify me of problems, thereby jeopardizing the grade of the entire group. Although many group problems do work themselves out over time, some problems do not without some form of intervention. In the case of severe problems, a group may 'fire' a member of the team. This must be a consensus decision from the other team members with compelling evidence of negligence by the accused team member. If this occurs, the fired team member will receive a full grade reduction and will be assigned other work by me.

Peer Evaluation

A peer evaluation will be administered at the **team** level for all groups at the end of the semester. This is a peer evaluation only - in other words, you do not rate yourself along with your peers, only the work done by others - so you will rate them while they rate you and all final grades are binding. The scores are then averaged across individuals and applied to the final case competition grades. So, for example, if your team rates you at 85 percent effort overall, and you received a grade of 500, you would receive 425 points; but if your team rates you as 115 percent effort overall, and your grade was 500, you will receive 575 points.

The peer evaluation is zero-sum: You have $(N-1)*100$ points to allocate among your team members, where N is the number of team members. So, for example, if you have 4 team members, you have 300 points to allocate $[(4-1)*100]$ among your team members. Under this process, if you give one team member, say, 120 points, you must take 20 points from one or more other team members. Here is an example of how it might work:

		Group Members				
		Ted	Sally	Fred	Jen	Total
Graders	Ted		85	100	115	300
	Sally	120		95	85	300
	Fred	100	100		100	300
	Jen	105	95	100		300
	Average Grade	108%	93%	98%	100%	100%

NOTE: Gaming this system (i.e., team members colluding to increase their grades at the expense of a team member) will not be tolerated. For this reason, provide an explanation of why you allocate the points the way you do in the final entry of this peer evaluation. This information will become public record and is subject to review and adjustment by me if necessary. If I have reason to believe that the system is being gamed, I reserve the right

to disallow an individual or group peer evaluation and to assess penalties as are appropriate to those attempting to game the system.

V. OTHER INFORMATION

CLASS CONDUCT

Conduct that is unprofessional or otherwise detracts from the educational goals of the course may be penalized at my discretion by reducing the offender's participation grade. If the problem becomes acute, further disciplinary measures may be imposed consistent with university policy.

LATE PENALTY

Assignments that are turned in late will be penalized $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total points possible. For example, if an assignment is worth 20 points and is turned in late, it will automatically be assessed a five-point penalty.

ATTENDANCE POLICY

This course depends on not only attendance but also participation from all students for every class. As a member of this classroom you are obligated to complete all assigned work promptly, to attend class regularly, and to participate in whatever class discussion may occur. Absence from more than 10 percent of the scheduled class sessions, whether excused or unexcused, is considered excessive and a grade penalty will be assessed for such absences.

SANITY CHECK

You are encouraged to provide me feedback as to your feelings on the course. I will periodically ask you for anonymous, written feedback during the course in addition to the formal evaluation at the end of the course. You are encouraged to be forthright with me regarding improvements that may be made to the course.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact Disability Services for Students at 817-272-3364 or visit the website: <http://www.uta.edu/disability/links.php>. No accommodations will be provided to students unless they are registered with the Disability Services for Students.

LAST, BUT NEVER LEAST

Scholastic dishonesty will not be tolerated in this course. Scholastic dishonesty includes plagiarism, which is passing someone else's work off as your own. Although it is easy to cut-and-paste from websites and other digital media, this generally constitutes plagiarism **UNLESS** the individual or organization is given proper credit through citation in your paper. If you have any questions about this, please talk to me before turning in the assignment. To obtain information on what constitutes scholastic dishonesty and how the university addresses it visit the website: <http://www.uta.edu/studentaffairs/judicialaffairs/academicintegrity.html>.

Week 1- September 1

Topic:	Syllabus What is Strategy? How to Prepare an Effective Case Analysis
Readings:	Henderson, B.D. 1989. "The Origin of Strategy", <u>Harvard Business Review</u> , Nov/Dec, pp. 139-143. Porter, M.E. 1996. "What is Strategy?", <u>Harvard Business Review</u> , Nov/Dec, pp. Porter, M.E. 1996. "What is Strategy?", <u>Harvard Business Review</u> , Nov/Dec, pp. 61-78. Campbell, A. & M. Alexander 1997. "What's Wrong with Strategy", <u>Harvard Business Review</u> , Nov/Dec, pp. 42-51. Freeman, Edward R. 2010. "Managing for Stakeholders: Trade-offs or Value Creation" <u>Journal of Business Ethics</u> , Vol. 96: 7 - 9 Chapter 1: What is Strategy?
Issues:	Establish a solid working definition that will serve as a foundation for the semester. We'll spend the semester examining concepts, models and cases that are important derivatives of this fundamental idea.
Assignment:	WSJ Review

Week 2- September 8

Topic:	Understanding the external environment
Readings:	<i>HBR articles TBD</i> Chapter 3: The External Environment (Opportunities and Threats) Preparing an Effective Case Analysis (see outline below)
Issues:	Explore the importance and impact of the general environment and the industry on firm performance. The success of a firm's strategies is dependent upon the forces surrounding it. Examine the general environmental factors that indirectly impact all firms and Porter's Five Forces that directly impact all firms within the industry.
To Do:	Case Assignment Lottery
Assignment:	WSJ Review

Week 3- September 15

Topic:	Strategic Leadership
Readings:	Chapter 2 Strategic Leadership Heifetz, Ronald A.; Laurie, Donald L. 2001. "The Work of Leadership" <u>HBR</u> , 79(11): 131-141
Topic:	Internal Analysis of the Firm
Readings:	Chapter 4: The Internal Environment (Strengths and Weaknesses)

Issues: Firms differ because of the resources and capabilities they possess. Determine how to examine the firm's strengths and weaknesses.

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 4- September 22

Topic: Business Level Strategy (Cost Leadership and Differentiation)
Corporate Level Strategy (Related and Unrelated Diversification)

Readings: HBR Articles TBD
Chapter 5: Business Level Strategy
Chapter 7 Corporate Level Strategy

Issues: Business level strategies focus around customers. Examine two broad business level strategies – low cost leadership and differentiation.

Corporate level strategies involve looking at the corporation as a portfolio of businesses. The goal of corporate level strategy analysis is to determine the most appropriate portfolio of businesses and how to manage them.

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 5- September 29

Topic: Competitive Rivalry and Competitive Dynamics
Acquisition and Restructuring Strategies

Readings: Chapter 6: Competitive Rivalry and Competitive Dynamics
Chapter 8: Acquisition and Restructuring Strategies
HBR Articles TBD

Burgelman, R. A. 2006. "Managing the Strategic Dynamics of Acquisition Integration: LESSONS FROM HP AND COMPAQ". California Management Review, 48(3): 5-27.

Issues: How can organizations derive the most from growth strategies?

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 6- October 6

Topic: Strategic Alliances

Readings: Chapter 7: Cooperative Strategy

Gomes-Casseres, B. 1994. "Group Versus Group: How Alliance Networks Compete." Harvard Business Review, July-August: 62-74.

Ibarra, H. & Hunter, M. 2007 "How Leaders Create and Use Networks." Harvard Business Review, 85 (1): 40 – 47.

Inkpen, A. & Ross, J. 2001. "Why do some strategic alliances persist beyond their useful life?" California Management Review, 44 (1):132-148.

Issues: Corporations are increasingly lining up with both competitors and complementary resource providers in order to compete. When and with whom should companies cooperate?

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 7 – October 13

Assignments: MidTerm Due

Week 8 – October 20

Topic: Corporate Governance

Readings: Chapter 11 Corporate Governance

Drucker, P. F. 2006. "What Executives Should Remember". Harvard Business Review, 84(2): 144 – 152.

Nohria, N. 2006. "Risk, Uncertainty, and Doubt". Harvard Business Review, 84 (2): 39-40.

Brugmann, J. & Prahalad, C.K. 2007. "Co-creating Business's New Social Compact". Harvard Business Review, 85 (2) :80-90.

Cohn, J.M., Khurana, R. & Reeves, L. 2005. "Growing Talent as if your Business Depended on It." Harvard Business Review, 83(10):62-70.

Parker, J., Volokh, E. & Halloran, J. 2006. "The Reign of Zero Tolerance". Harvard Business Review, 84(11) 39-52.

Kotter, J.P. 2001. "What Leaders Really Do", HBR, 79(11) 85-96

Useem, M. 2006. "How Well-Run Boards Make Decisions." Harvard Business Review; 84 (11): 130-138.

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 10 – October 27

Assignments: Corporate Governance - Continued

Topic: Measuring Performance

Readings: Christensen, C.M.; Kaufman, S.P.; Shih, Willy C. 2008. Innovation Killers. HBR, Jan2008, 86(1) 98-105

Miller, G.S. 2008. How to Talk to Investors -- Through the Press. HBR, Jan2008, 86 (1)26-26 5/6p

Kaplan, R.S., Norton, D.P. 2008. Mastering the Management System. HBR, Jan2008, 86 (1) 62-77

Rappaport, A. 2006. "10 Ways to Create Shareholder Value". Harvard Business Review, 84 (9):66-77.

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 11- November 3

Topic: Future directions

Readings: Christensen, C.M. & van Bever, D. 2014. The capitalist's dilemma. *Harvard Business Review*. 92(6):60 – 68.

Martin, R. L. 2014. The Big Lie of Strategic Planning. *Harvard Business Review* 92(1/2):78 – 84

Barton, D., & Mark Wiseman. 2014. Focusing capital on the long term. *Harvard Business Review* 92(1/2):44 – 51

Porter, M. E., & J. W. Rivkin. 2012. The looming challenge to U.S. competitiveness. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(3): 54 – 62.

Meyer, C., Kirby, J. 2012. Runaway Capitalism. *Harvard Business Review*. 90(1/2): 66-75

Assignment: WSJ Review

Week 12- November 10

Case: Cleveland Clinic

Consulting Groups: 1, 2

Management Team: 3

Board Team: 4

Week 13- November 17

Case: Apple

Consulting Groups: 3, 4

Management Team: 2

Board Team: 1

Week 14 – November 24

Case: Amgen

Consulting Groups: 1, 2

Management Team: 4

Board Team: 3

Week 15- December 1

Team Meetings

Week 15- December 8

Case: Bank of America

Consulting Groups: 3, 4

Management Team: 2

Board Team: 1

Seminal Readings in Strategy

- Bhide, A. 1986. Hustle as Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 64(5): 59-65.
- Bhide, A., & Stevenson, H. H. 1990. Why Be Honest If Honesty Doesn't Pay. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(5): 121-129.
- Campbell, A. & Alexander, M. 1997. What's wrong with strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 75(6): 42-51.
- Collis, D. J., & Montgomery, C. A. 1995. Competing on resources: Strategy in the 1990s. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(4): 118-128.
- Collis, D. J., & Montgomery, C. A. 1998. Creating corporate advantage. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(3): 70-83.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Sull, D. N. 2001. Strategy as simple rules. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(1): 107-116.
- Goold, M., & Campbell, A. 1998. Desperately seeking synergy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(5): 130-143.
- Gulati, R., & Garino, J. 2000. Get the right mix of bricks & clicks. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(3): 107-114.
- Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. 1985. Do You Really Have a Global Strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 63(4): 139-148.
- Hamel, G., & Prahalad, C. K. 1989. Strategic Intent. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(3): 63-76.
- Henderson, B. D. 1989. The Origin of Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(6): 139-143.
- Mintzberg, H. 1987. Crafting Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 65(4): 66-75.
- Mintzberg, H. 1994. The fall and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(1): 107-114.
- Mintzberg, H. 1996. Musings on management. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(4): 61-67.
- Porter, M. E. 1987. From Competitive Advantage to Corporate Strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, 65(3): 43-59.
- Porter, M. E. 1996. What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 74(6): 61-78.
- Porter, M. E. 2001. Strategy and the Internet. *Harvard Business Review*, March: 62-78.
- Porter, M. E., & Millar, V. E. 1985. How Information Gives You Competitive Advantage. *Harvard Business Review*, 63(4): 149-160.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. 1990. The Core Competence of the Corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3): 79-91.
- Yoffie, D. B., & Cusumano, M. A. 1999. Judo strategy: The competitive dynamics of Internet time. *Harvard Business Review*, 77(1): 70-81.

Seminal Books in Strategy

- Allison, G. 1971. *Essence of decision*. New York: Little, Brown, & Co.
- Arrow, K. J. 1974. *The limits of organization*. New York: W. W. Norton
- Barnard, C. I. 1938. *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chandler, A. D. 1962. *Strategy and Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Penrose, E. T. 1959. *The theory of the growth of the firm*. New York: Wiley.
- Porter, M.E. 1980 *Competitive strategy*. New York: Free Press.
- Porter, M.E. 1985. *Competitive advantage*. New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, R. P. 1974. *The diffusion of innovations*. (4th edition). New York: Free Press.
- Rumelt, R. P., Schendel, D.E., & Teece, D. J. 1994. *Fundamental issues in strategy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sun T. 1983. *The art of war*. Delacourt Press:New York.
- Williamson, O.E. 1975. *Markets and hierarchies*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Case Analysis Outline

- I. Introduction
- II. External Environment
 - A. General Environment (O/T) [15 points]
 - Political/Legal
 - Economy
 - Global
 - Demographics
 - Sociocultural
 - Technology
 - B. Porter's Five Forces Industry Environment (O/T) [15 points]
 - Threat of Buyers
 - Threat of Suppliers
 - Threat of New Entry
 - Threat of Rivalry
 - Threat of Substitutes
 - C. Overview of All O/T
- III. Internal Environment (S/W)
 - A. Internal Analysis [50 points]
 - Core Competence
 - Analyze Value Chain, Fit, VRIN for support
 - Business Level
 - Analyze Value Chain for one business unit
 - Corporate level
 - Analyze Value Chains across for multiple business units
 - B. Overview of S/W
- IV. SWOT and Stakeholder analysis [10 points]
 - Match previously identified (from II and III above) Opportunities and Threats (External Environment and Industry Analysis) with Strengths and Weaknesses (Internal Analysis)
 - SW = OT
- V. Evaluate viable Strategic Alternatives [10 points]
 - Present 3 viable strategic alternatives
 - Choose best option which optimizes returns and stakeholder value