

# CORPORATE INNOVATION – ENTREPRENEURIAL STRATEGIES

**BUAN6378/ENTP6388/MIS6377/OPRE6358/SYSM6316 - FALL 2025**

<p><b>Class Meeting</b>  <b>Thursday: 7:00 - 9:45 PM, JSOM 2.102</b>  <b>Modality: Traditional/Classroom</b>  <b>Office Hours:</b> Wed 12:30 – 2:00 PM  <b>Preferred: By appointment</b></p>	<p><b>Dr. Rajiv R. Shah</b>          SOM 4.204  <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:rajiv.shah@utdallas.edu">rajiv.shah@utdallas.edu</a>  <b>Phone (UTD office):</b> (972) 883-5904</p>
--	---

## COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course explores various aspects of innovation and entrepreneurship in a corporate setting, as well as in other established organizations. Innovation and entrepreneurship is not confined to start-up ventures. With rapid technological, market and global changes, it has become increasingly important in established corporations, in order to survive and grow.. Intrapreneurs are the entrepreneurs who combine innovation, creativity, and leadership to develop and launch new products, new product lines, and new business units that grow revenues and profits from within.

The course seeks to equip students with the skills and perspectives required to initiate new ventures and create viable businesses in dynamic and uncertain environments in the face of organizational inertia and other sources of resistance to innovation. The course is structured along three dimensions – (1) building blocks for corporate entrepreneurship, (2) creating the entrepreneurial organization, and (3) achieving and sustaining entrepreneurial performance. Course topics include the elements of strategic analysis and positioning for competitive advantage in dynamic markets and the structuring, utilization, and mobilization of the internal resources. Course learning occurs through various means – class lectures, case discussions, couple of team-based cases studies of real-world situations, and a team-based project analyzing innovation and entrepreneurship in a chosen company.

## COURSE STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES (CSLOs)

**Upon successful completion of this course, students will:**

1. Through case analyses of established companies and class discussions, be able to apply concepts learned in class to analyze, assess and review real-world corporate innovation and entrepreneurial situations.
2. Understand how corporate innovation and entrepreneurship is similar to and different from external new ventures and will learn various ways to best organize and implement corporate innovation.
3. Gain an understanding of how to formulate corporate objectives and strategies that support entrepreneurial behavior, and how to achieve, sustain and measure entrepreneurial performance, as well as recognize and evaluate the ethical dimensions of corporate entrepreneurial behavior.

## COURSE MATERIALS: **REQUIRED**

*No textbook is required for this course. Class lecture materials will loosely draw from several textbooks and articles primarily from Harvard Business Review or MIT Sloan Management Review. The book it will follow most closely is the book, “Michael H. Morris, Donald F. Kuratko, and Jeffrey G. Covin, Corporate Entrepreneurship & Innovation, ISBN 978-0-324-25916-2, Thomson-Southwestern”.*

However, what **is required** are the following Case Packs from Harvard Business School Publishing:

- (a) Case Packet (**Ind. In-class Participation**): <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/import/1301447>  
(b) Case Packet (**Group Write-up & Pres.**): <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/import/1301453>

## LECTURE NOTES

The MS PowerPoint slides used in lectures and case discussions and other course-related materials will be posted on eLearning (<http://eLearning.utdallas.edu>) under course ID ENTP 6388.501. You should be able to access eLearning with your UTD UNIX ID and password. Call computer services at (972) 883-2911 if you need assistance.

## ABOUT THE INSTRUCTOR

Dr. Rajiv R. Shah is a Professor of Practice in the Innovation and Entrepreneurship area within Organizations, Strategy & International Management, at the Jindal School of Management, where he has been teaching since 2008, and has created and/or taught about a dozen different undergraduate and graduate courses. He is also the Founder and Director of the Systems Engineering and Management (SEM) Program, which he was primarily instrumental in creating and was launched in 2010. In 2015, he also published a book, *“Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and the Economy in the US, China and India: Historical Perspectives and Future Trends”*, by Rajiv Shah, Zhijie Gao and Harini Mittal, published by Elsevier, Academic Press.

He spent about 30 years in Corporate America, prior to joining UTD, and in his last corporate position, before embarking on a consulting career, he served as CTO for Alcatel North America, a \$ 2B subsidiary of Paris-based, \$ 15 B Alcatel Inc, as VP of Research and Network Strategy and was the VP in charge of the Corporate Center for Research & Innovation in the US for four years. Prior to that he held senior management positions at MCI Worldcom for five years and before that he was at Texas Instruments as Program Manager for seventeen years and Senior Member of Technical Staff. He has served as the General Chair for Globecom 2004 and chaired sessions at the Supercomm for the International Engineering Consortium (IEC) from 2001 through 2004. He has an MS and Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering, specializing in Applied Physics, from Rice University, was on the Faculty of the California Institute of Technology (Caltech) as Dr. Chaim Weizmann Post Doctoral Research Fellow for 2 years, has over 50 publications, and 25 issued patents, and also has an Executive MBA from SMU. He got his B.Sc. in physics, mathematics and statistics from Pune University in India.

## THE CASE BASED METHOD

This course is intended to help equip students with the insights, tools, and mindset needed to develop, and critically evaluate, and understand the process of Corporate Innovation and Entrepreneurship. As such, it **relies heavily on case-based** learning. Before each case-based class, students are expected to thoroughly read and prepare the case and its supplements (if applicable). Preparation includes: (1) being well-versed in the general facts of the case (e.g., the firm, the key actors, and so on); (2) identifying the central decision to be made by the actors; (3) how frameworks and concepts discussed in the course can help make that central decision; and (4) identifying preliminary responses to the discussion questions provided. Students should, therefore, be prepared at any point of time in class to provide their opinions and any supporting evidence. It is important to deeply consider the decisions made and provide a constructive evaluation or critique. The purposes of the cases are to provide a practice environment that can mirror future professional contexts.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS & GRADING

Student evaluation and grades will be based upon individual and group assignments – active class participation in case discussions, group case presentations, group project, and peer evaluation. The break-out of items that will be used in evaluation and grading is summarized below:

<i>Component:</i>	<i>% Total Grade</i>
1. Class Attendance, and <b><i>Active &amp; Constructive</i></b> Case Discussion Participation	30 %
2. Group Case Presentation & Write-up - 1 <sup>st</sup> Assignment	15 % (*)
3. Group Case Presentation & Write-up - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Assignment	20 % (*)
4. Group Project – A Specific Company, Corporate Inno. & Ent. Assessment	35 % (*)
<b>(*) → Peer Evaluations will impact grades on all Group Assignments</b>	100 %

<b>GRADE SCALE:</b>	<b>A - = 90 to 92%</b>	<b>A = 93% or greater</b>	
	<b>B - = 80 to 82%</b>	<b>B = 83 to 86%</b>	<b>B+ = 87 to 89%</b>
	<b>C - = 70 to 72%</b>	<b>C = 73 to 76%</b>	<b>C+ = 77 to 79%</b>
	<b>D - = 60 to 62%</b>	<b>D = 63 to 66%</b>	<b>D+ = 67 to 69%</b>

***Peer Evaluation*** - A peer evaluation process will be utilized to adjust individual grades on all group assignments. The peer evaluation form (Guidelines are provided on the eLearning Discussion page) should be completed individually and submitted via dropbox created for it before last day of classes.

**Further elaboration of how course grades will be assessed follows:**

### **1. Class Participation (30%)**

**Active and constructive** engagement in the course plays an integral role in the learning process for you and your peers and can be achieved through participation in class and in your assignment groups. Class participation will be evaluated as a function of the following:

- **Contribution to class and case discussions:** A critical component of the course experience will be rigorous and spirited discussion. I expect all students to be well prepared for each class, having studied the required pre-class material and analyzed assigned cases. Students who make consistent, meaningful contributions to class discussions will receive better class participation grades. The quality of comments is evaluated based on the clarity and coherence of arguments, application of theoretical frameworks, and the ability to support claims with quantitative or qualitative evidence from the course materials (e.g., slides, cases, readings).
- **Consistent and high-quality contributions to class and case discussions are required throughout the semester** in order to receive full participation points. Sporadic contributions, contributions regurgitating case facts rather than opinions, or contributions without evidence will merit a few but not full participation points.
- **Important:** Please bring name tents (i.e., prominent sign with your full name on it) to every session. This is critical for making sure you accurately receive your participation points.

- **Regular attendance in class:** Though not individually graded, attendance is your obligation, and you are responsible for all the work, including tests and written work, of all class meetings. No right or privilege exists that permits you to be absent from any class meetings except for excused absences for authorized University activities or Religious Holy Days. **Regular absence from class will severely impact your class participation score.**
- **Late arrival in class:** Arriving in class past the start time will be marked as late. Excessive late arrival in class will result in a reduction of participation points.

### **Group Assignments**

- **Group Formation:** Early in the semester, by the start of the 3<sup>rd</sup> session, the class will be divided into roughly equal-sized groups. Group size will be communicated by session-2, and students will be able to choose their group members.
- **Group Assignments:** Two class activities will be performed in groups – (a) Group Case Assignments – Case Analysis, Write-up and Presentations, twice in the semester – once in the 1<sup>st</sup> - half and the other in the 2<sup>nd</sup>- half, and (b) Group Project about Corporate Innovation and Entrepreneurship Assessment in a specific company, which will begin early in the semester and will be due towards the end of the semester.
- **Group Peer Evaluation:** At the end of the semester, students will be required to submit peer evaluations for their group assignments. These will have an impact on each student's grade for that specific group assignment.

### **2. Group Case Assignments (35%)**

- **Group Case Assignments:** Case Analysis, Write-up and Presentations, ***twice in the semester – once in the 1<sup>st</sup> - half (15%) and the other in the 2<sup>nd</sup> – half (20%).***
- **Group Case Choices:** All cases are in the course pack, and specific case choices for each group will be discussed in class early in the semester. Case discussions will be presented on the date discussed in class. Additional details to guide group case analysis and presentation will be provided in class or via e-mail.
- **Group Case Analysis:** Students must demonstrate (i) their understanding of the key frameworks, perspectives, concepts, ideas and tools introduced in the course, (ii) their ability to relate these frameworks, perspectives, concepts, ideas and tools to one another, and (iii) their ability to creatively apply these frameworks, perspectives, concepts, ideas and tools in differing contexts. Group case analysis will be evaluated based on the clarity and coherence of arguments, application of theoretical frameworks, and the ability to support claims with quantitative or qualitative evidence from the course materials (e.g., slides, cases, readings).

### **3. Group Project (35%):**

- **Assignment:** In this assignment, you will work in your group to – (a) early in the semester identify an established publicly-held company, that has been in business for at least 5 years, and has at least 500 employees, and (b) by the end of the semester provide an Assessment of

Corporate Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the company utilizing frameworks, perspectives, concepts, ideas and tools introduced in the course.

- **Group Project Presentation**: These will be presented on the date discussed in class, towards the end of the semester, and will consist of a write-up, and a slide presentation in class.
  - Section-1: Should begin with a brief history of the enterprise including its founding, owners and ownership structure, structural form, locations, expansion (both in terms of facilities/locations and in terms of products/markets), and so forth. This background should be about two to three pages.
  - Section-2: The body of the paper should follow, and this should be the actual assessment and critique. This section should be about ten to fifteen pages (including figures, graphs, charts, etc.)
  - Section-3: Should then close with a section of about two to three pages of specific, tangible recommendations for change.
  - So, the whole report should be about 15 – 20 pages, written in Outline Format. Example of Outline Format posted on eLearning, in the instructions folder.
- The project should be well-researched and based on an extensive review of publicly-available information as well as additional databases available via UTD's libraries. Students should also deeply consider relevant concepts and frameworks from class.
- Each group will first provide a 2-page proposal that would be evaluated for suitability and provided with initial feedback. Please submit your proposal in PDF format via an email to me. **Only one submission is needed per group** but make sure to include all group members' names in the document. The proposal should include the following:
  - Project motivation
  - Brief overview of chosen company
  - Brief overview of how you plan to analyze I&E in the company
  - What areas of the company I&E you plan to make recommendations
  - General list of sources of data that the group expects to use
- There are two core deliverables.
  - First, each group will submit a **slide deck** with about 20-25 slides. Students will present their analysis to the class during the assigned class session. Each group will have 30 minutes to present (20 mins for slides; 10 mins for Q&A in class). The slides should be readable (i.e., font should not be too small, or too much material should not be packed into each slide). If visuals are used, ensure they are appropriate for a professional audience. Make sure to provide appropriate attribution for any third-party images that are used. Students will be graded primarily on answering the above items, but a portion of the grade will be allocated to the quality and cohesiveness of their presentation delivery. Students groups are encouraged to practice the delivery of their presentation at least 3-4 times prior to the final presentation in class. Student presenters should be clear and engaging while also delivering the material at an appropriate pace without rushing or speaking too slowly. High-quality delivery also includes good engagement with the audience during Q&A and finishing within the allocated time. Slides should be submitted on eLearning prior to the session in which the group will present.

- Second, each group will submit a 15–20-page **report**. Report should be submitted on eLearning prior to the session in which the group will present.
- The breakdown of grades is as follows: 20% for material in presentation slides and written report; 10% for quality of slides, verbal delivery of presentation, and report formatting; and 5% for project proposal
- **Group Project Evaluation:** Projects will be evaluated based on the clarity and coherence of arguments, application of theoretical frameworks, and the ability to support claims with quantitative or qualitative evidence from the course materials (e.g., slides, cases, readings).
- Additional details, as needed, to guide group project write-up and presentation will be provided in class or via e-mail.

## OTHER CLASS POLICIES

### 1. The Use of Generative AI Tools in the Classroom:

- On some assignments, students may use generative AI platforms (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, or similar). When appropriate, they can be used to: brainstorm ideas, explore possible responses to questions, revise and edit your written work, fix citations, and so forth. When the use of generative AI is *not* permitted in an assignment, that will be indicated to you. If you are in doubt, please reach out to me.
- It is important to note that generative AI may occasionally generate incorrect or misleading information or produce offensive or biased content. As such, do not rely on them without doing your own independent research. You will be responsible (and graded accordingly) for any material that is AI-generated that you include in your submissions.
- When submitting work in which generative AI has been used in *any capacity*, students must cite the text generated by AI. If the above policies are violated, I reserve the right to prohibit the use of generative AI tools in any or all assignments. Should UT-Dallas' official policy on the use of generative AI change over the course of the semester, we will defer to it immediately.

**2. The Use of Smart Devices in the Classroom:** The use of electronic devices can disrupt learning for everyone in the classroom. Devices must be turned off and put away, except in cases of personal emergency. Laptops and tablets can be used for note-taking and referring to the case contingent on them not becoming a distraction to the class. In the event that appropriate use is not followed, the student's participation points will be reduced.

**3. University Course Policies:** Information contained in the following link constitutes additional University's policies and procedures. Please go to UT Dallas Syllabus Policies webpage for these policies (<https://go.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies>).

**4. Honor Code:** As members of the UT Dallas community, all students are expected to uphold the Comet Creed: "*As a Comet, I pledge honesty, integrity, and service in all that I do.*" Severe implications will exist for plagiarism in any capacity, unethical academic behavior, or violations

of UT Dallas’ official [student code of conduct](#). In the event of a violation of the honor code, we will follow UT Dallas’ official reporting process for investigation.

5. **Accommodations for Students with Disabilities:** The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities. The syllabus is available in alternate formats upon request. If you are seeking classroom accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (2008), you are required to register with the Accessibility Resource Center (ARC), located in the Administration Building, Suite 2.224. Their phone number is 972-883-2098, email: [studentaccess@utdallas.edu](mailto:studentaccess@utdallas.edu) and the website is <https://accessibility.utdallas.edu/>. To receive academic accommodations for this class, please register and request services by completing the Request for Services form with the proper documentation and meet with the Director of ARC at the beginning of the semester.
  
6. **Expectations for Learning Environment in the Classroom:** We encourage a learning environment where individual differences are understood, respected, appreciated, and recognized as sources of strength. It is critically important that every member of the class feels safe and welcome to participate, regardless of race, gender, national origin, sexuality, disability, mental health, class background, or anything else. I expect that students will respect differences and demonstrate diligence in understanding how classmates' perspectives, behaviors, and worldview may be different from their own.
  
7. **Syllabus:** We reserve the right to make any changes to the syllabus, including projects due dates, test dates, and course policies. These changes will be announced as early as possible and indicated on the syllabus with the latest version always posted on eLearning.

Course Outline		
Date	Topic	Assignments
<b>SECTION-I : BUILDING BLOCKS FOR CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP</b>		
<b>Session 01</b> 08/28	Introduction and What it Means to be Entrepreneurial?	(1) Post Self-Intro on eLearning (2) Read Case: Global Innovation at EY – Jeff Wong (3) Read Article: Intrapreneurship: Leading Innovation Efforts in Organizations
<b>Session 02</b> 09/04	Levels of Entrep. in Org. – Ent. Int. (EI), Forms of Corp. Entrep.	(1) Read Case: Malenti Strings: Intrapreneurship within FLG, Inc. (2) Groups formed (3) Groups select cases for analysis, write-up and presentations in S04 or S05
<b>Session 03</b> 09/11	Entrep. in Other Contexts: Non-profit and Government; Why Strategic Innovators Need a Different Approach	(1) Read Case: Plug and Play: Matching Corporates with Start-ups to Accelerate Open Innovation (2) Read Article: How Corporations Can Work Better With Startups

<b>SECTION-II: CREATING THE ENTREPRENEURIAL ORGANIZATION</b>		
<b>Session 04</b> 09/18	Human Resources and the Ent. Org.: The Creative Individual	(1) Read Articles: (a) Why You Should Become an “Intrapreneur”, (b) Why There is No Such Thing as a Corporate Entrepreneur (2) <b><u>Group 1<sup>st</sup> Case Analysis, Write-up and Presentation</u></b>
<b>Session 05</b> 09/25	Human Resources and the Ent. Org.: The Org. Perspective	(1) Read Articles: (a) The Myth of the Intrapreneur (b) When Your Moonshots Don’t Take Off (2) <b><u>Group 1<sup>st</sup> Case Analysis, Write-up and Presentation</u></b>
<b>Session 06</b> 10/02	Corporate Strategy and Entrepreneurship	(1) Read Case: Unilever: Opportunities in the White Spaces (2) <b><u>Group Project Proposal Submission</u></b>
<b>Session 07</b> 10/09	Structuring the Company for Entrepreneurship	(1) Read Case: HCL Technologies: Driving Innovation through Ecosystem Innovation Platform
<b>Session 08</b> 10/16	Developing an Entrepreneurial Culture	(1) Read Case: Intrapreneurship@ Nokia Software: Instilling Culture Change
<b>SECTION-III: ACHIEVING &amp; SUSTAINING ENTREPRENEURIAL PERFORMANCE</b>		
<b>Session 09</b> 10/23	Constraints on Entrepreneurial Performance	(1) Read Case: Intrapreneurship at Alcatel-Lucent
<b>Session 10</b> 10/30	Leading the Entrepreneurial Organization	(1) Read Case: Nicole M. Jones and The Hangar: Delta Air Lines’ Global Innovation Center
<b>Session 11</b> 11/06	Assessing Entrepreneurial Performance	(1) Read Case: X: The Foghorn Decision (2) <b><u>Group 2<sup>nd</sup> Case Analysis, Write-up and Presentation</u></b>
<b>Session 12</b> 11/13	Control and Entrepreneurial Activity	(1) Read Case: Global Innovation at L. Marks (2) Read Article: Missing Link Between Strategy and Innovation (3) <b><u>Group 2<sup>nd</sup> Case Analysis, Write-up and Presentation</u></b>
<b>Session 13</b> 11/20	What about the Ethics of the Corp. Entrepreneur?	<u>Last 3 Readings in Case Pack</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Just How Unethical is American Bus.</li> <li>2. The CEO’s Private Investigation</li> <li>3. The Parable of the Sadhu</li> </ol>
11/27	<b>Thanksgiving Break</b>	
<b>Session 14</b> 12/04	<b><u>Group Project Reports and Presentations</u></b>	
	<b>Peer Evaluations Due via eLearning Dropbox</b>	
<b>This course schedule is not absolute. While every effort will be made to follow the schedule as listed, changes may be made as needed. It is the student’s responsibility to track changes that are announced.</b>		

**DESCRIPTION OF CASES : FOR INDIVIDUAL CLASS PARTICIPATION****Introduction: What it Means to be Entrepreneurial?****(1) Case: Leading Global Innovation at EY - Jeff Wong**

At EY, Jeff Wong served as chief innovation officer beginning in 2015. In this role, he was responsible for driving innovation and inoculating EY against potential threats to its \$45 billion revenue global business. Wong's role advanced and grew with his success in launching initiatives for EY around artificial intelligence, blockchain, Web3, and automation among others. Through it all, Wong built the Global Innovation team at EY from a \$5 million budget to hundreds of millions of dollars, returning \$5 to \$6 to EY for every \$1 invested-within a year from when the investment was made.

**Section I: Building Blocks for Corporate Entrepreneurship****2. Levels of Entrepreneurship in Organizations****(2) Brief Case: Malenti Strings: Intrapreneurship within FLG, Inc.**

This case follows Jenica Fletcher as she rebuilds her company's guitar strings division from the ground up. Convinced that she could turn the division around if given complete independence from corporate headquarters, Fletcher relocated the group, rebranded it as Malenti Strings, repositioned the guitar strings as high-performance products, and transformed Malenti into a fast-growing, profitable business. The case traces Fletcher's key steps in rebuilding the organization, including the development of a team of committed, interdependent employees. Students learn about Fletcher's values and unique management philosophy, as well as her managerial practices and daily activities. The case also discusses the role and development of the partnerships that helped solidify and grow the business. Coming off its high-end success, Malenti must now decide whether to move into the mid-priced market with a new line of electric guitar strings called True.

**3. Entrepreneurship in Other Contexts: Non-profit and Government; Why Strategic Innovators Need a Different Approach****(3) Case: Plug and Play: Matching Corporates with Start-ups to Accelerate Open Innovation**

Plug and Play, a Silicon Valley-based investor in start-ups including PayPal and Dropbox, introduces a match-making model to engage corporates with start-ups. The case discusses the rationale behind the model and the challenges involved in simultaneously facilitating start-up development and corporate entrepreneurship. It looks at the expansion of the model beyond the US and describes how its match-making efforts fared in France and Italy.

**Section II: Creating the Entrepreneurial Organization****4. Human Resources and the Entrepreneurial Organization: The Creative Individual****5. Human Resources and the Entrepreneurial Organization: The Organization Perspective**

## 6. Corporate Strategy and Entrepreneurship

### **(4) Case: Unilever: Opportunities in the White Spaces**

May 2016, Singapore. Umesh Shah, the head of Unilever International (UI), was pleased with what his team had been able to achieve since the business unit was created at the beginning of 2012 by merging the operating companies' export units with the purpose to better exploit the "white spaces," i.e. business opportunities created by new global trends and marginal areas not given proper focus and support by Unilever operating companies (OpCos) because they did not belong to key core brands, consumers, channels and geographies. By late 2015 UI had grown into a very profitable business, doubling the turnover it had inherited in 2012, by pushing the envelope of Unilever sales and filling some cracks within its existing markets and channels. This included, for example, growing Unilever's presence in smaller markets like the Pacific Islands, increasing the sales of non-core brands in fringe markets, targeting original subgroups of consumers (such as immigrants, religious and other ethnic categories) in traditional markets or focusing on non-traditional channels such as airports and tax-free outfits. UI faced strong resistance from the OpCos initially but gradually won them over. He still faced critical questions about UI's future. Would its ambition to almost double turnover by 2020 require making bigger bets and accepting more risk? What was the optimal scale of UI business in the long term? Should it review the working arrangements with the OpCos to remain mutually beneficial? Would the next generation of UI leaders come from within or outside the business? Were changes in the way staff were evaluated and compensated required?

## 7. Structuring the Company for Entrepreneurship

### **(5) Case: HCL Technologies: Driving Innovation Through Ecosystem Innovation Platform**

HCL Technologies Ltd., one of the big four information technology companies in India, had established a corporate entrepreneurship function within its enterprise technology office (ETO). As part of its aspiration to scale up its corporate entrepreneurship activities, the ETO adopted an ecosystem innovation strategy, and in 2020, the ETO team was deliberating how to standardize and institutionalize its corporate entrepreneurship practices, enhance the platform technology, and build a culture of innovation to leverage the newly adopted ecosystem innovation strategy.

## 8. Developing an Entrepreneurial Culture

### **(6) Case: Intrapreneurship @ Nokia Software: Instilling Culture Change**

Intrapreneurship @ Nokia Software, or I@NS, was a program created in 2017 to give Nokia Software's 10,000 employees the opportunity to submit ideas for products, services, or solutions that delivered new capabilities, solved tough challenges faced by customers, or opened new markets. I@NS was intended to mimic the experience of founding a start-up, getting it funded, building a product, and taking it to market, with all the potential risk and reward this entailed. Except, of course, this particular start-up experience would occur within Nokia Corporation, a 150-year-old global company with 103,000 employees working in more than 100 countries—a company that described its mission as "creating the technology to connect the world." Given this rather unusual "start-up" environment, the creators of the program had no idea how it would all unfold. But, they went ahead and established it, evangelized it to Nokia Software employees around the world, judged the first round, and then launched a second round, which was still underway at the time this case was written. In the process of creating, I@NS, its founders learned many important lessons about encouraging and supporting innovation and a start-up mentality within an established corporation. The case covers many elements of the design and implementation of an innovation program including: Strategic objectives of innovation processes; Defining success; Determining the scale and scope of new ventures; The staging of the innovation process; The gating and funding decision making process; The definition of the strategic objectives behind the innovation process; Communicating the process to the wide organization; Communicating (the go/no go)

gating decisions; Identifying and allocation resources; Recruiting evangelists and mentors; Team formation and composition; How the process interacts with and impacts the culture in the organization; Incentives for innovation; Career development paths for innovators; Attitudes to risk.

## Section III: Achieving & Sustaining Entrepreneurial Performance

### 9. Constraints on Entrepreneurial Performance

#### **(7) Case: Intrapreneurship at Alcatel-Lucent**

Since 2006, Alcatel-Lucent, an international telecommunications equipment manufacturer based in Paris, France, has been conducting boot camps for its employees to provide business training and help them monetize their innovative ideas with a view to creating value for the company. The program has led to 32 projects of which two have been commercialized, three transferred to business units within Alcatel-Lucent and one spun off. In 2012, however, the boot camps were discontinued due to a cost reduction program aimed at making the company cash-flow positive. Now, in June 2014, after a change in top management and a desire to regain the innovative edge against its competition has revived the idea, the company's director of Open Innovation & Intrapreneurship is facing three dilemmas: how to reconcile the big business intolerance for failure with failure-prone intrapreneurship, how to design a forward-looking component into intrapreneurship and how to change the design and architecture of the boot camp in its new edition.

### 10. Leading the Entrepreneurial Organization

#### **(8) Case: Nicole M. Jones and The Hangar: Delta Air Lines' Global Innovation Center**

In 2016, Nicole M. Jones was hired to lead The Hangar, Delta Air Lines' new innovation center in Atlanta, Georgia. Delta's leadership had intended for The Hangar to catalyze a new approach to innovation at the company. After conducting three months of research on existing corporate innovation lab and accelerator models, Jones learned that most fail to scale impact across the core business. Drawing on her learnings, she established the values, strategy, and methodology for The Hangar to ensure just the opposite. Over the next three years, Jones and The Hangar's diverse team of design thinkers, technologists, and strategists brought together partners from Delta's core business and Atlanta's start-up and academic communities to execute a number of breakthrough innovations. After Delta's debut at the 2020 Consumer Electronics Show, Jones was invited to share her experience of setting up a corporate innovation lab with a consortium of innovation leaders. In preparation, she and her team are conducting a post-mortem of their three-year journey and reflecting on the lessons learned from one of their earliest projects—a Biometric Boarding Pass prototype they executed with CLEAR, a biometrics identity start-up.

### 11. Assessing Entrepreneurial Performance

#### **(9) Case: X: The Foghorn Decision**

In February 2016, Kathy Hannun—a project leader at X, Alphabet Inc.'s so-called "moonshot factory"—had to prepare a recommendation for the senior leadership of X regarding the future of Foghorn, a project she was leading to develop a carbon-neutral process for converting sea water into fuel. Recognizing the blueprint for projects at X—(1) addressing a huge problem with a (2) radical solution using (3) breakthrough technology—Hannun had to decide whether to recommend killing the project. Despite the technical feasibility of the Foghorn process, its expected cost per gallon of fuel produced was significantly higher than the established "kill metric"—the maximum unit cost that Hannun and colleagues had set for continuing the project. The case provides an opportunity to examine the management of radical innovation and the challenges associated with assessing early-stage ideas. Topics covered include the importance of experimentation and failure as well as the management of opportunity costs in solving large problems.

## 12. Control and Entrepreneurial Activity

### (10) Case: Global Innovation at L Marks

L Marks (an innovation consultancy firm) has been hired by client Karitus (a global conglomerate) to help Karitus structure and launch Project Elite, an internal innovation program. One objective of Project Elite is to spur cultural change within Karitus by motivating and incentivizing as many employees as possible across the globe to come up with new business ideas. The case describes the process by which L Marks assists Karitus in establishing Project Elite—setting up the structures for Karitus to source ideas from across the company and to effectively screen those that seem the most promising. Project Elite is one manifestation of an "innovation funnel": an initiative that widely sources many ideas and whittles them down to the few most promising projects through a series of screening phases. The case dilemma centers around Demo Day, the final phase of Project Elite, where 11 ideas from across the company will be presented to global senior executives who will then select the final 4, which will receive prototype funding. The 11 ideas vary widely: They touch on many different topics; they each focus on different geographic markets; some are more incremental (safe) and others more radical (risky) in nature; and so forth. The L Marks team members need to consider whether they should provide senior executives with guidance around selection (especially considering the tension between investing in safer "wins" that could move the needle on corporate culture versus in riskier "bets" that have the potential to build new business), and, if so, what kind of guidance they should give.

## 13. What about the Ethics of the Corporate Entrepreneur?

### (11) Case: The CEO's Private Investigation

The case describes the ethical and moral dilemma faced by Cherly Tobin, on the first day of her new job as CEO of Hammond Aerospace.

### DESCRIPTION OF CASES TO CHOOSE FROM: GROUP ANALYSIS & PRESENTATION

#### 1<sup>st</sup> Half of the Semester

### (1) Case: Intrapreneurship at DaVita HealthCare Partners

Josh Golomb, president and general manager of DaVita Rx (Rx), was about to meet with Kent Thiry, CEO of Rx's corporate parent, DaVita Healthcare Partners Inc. (DaVita), in August 2013. The two would discuss whether Golomb should lead a new DaVita venture, Paladina Health (Paladina), which operates a network of primary care clinics. DaVita had launched Paladina in early 2011 and the startup was struggling to gain traction: Paladina had already used a significant amount of the \$40 million in funding committed by DaVita; the company's primary care clinics had not yet reached the number of patients necessary to sustain a profitable business; and it was in the midst of trying to integrate with another primary care clinic operator that it had acquired years earlier, but was just now merging into Paladina. Although the startup was young and still finding its way in an emerging industry, Thiry believed that Paladina would benefit from Golomb's experiences at Rx, which had also struggled in its early years. The situation at Rx became so precarious at one point that many of DaVita's senior leaders wanted to shut it down entirely. Rx made it through those challenging early years though and was expected to exceed \$600 million in revenues for 2013. However, Golomb wondered how relevant his Rx experience was to Paladina. Rx was closely tied to its parent company—DaVita provided dialysis services to patients with end-stage renal disease (ESRD) and Rx supplied medications to ESRD patients—while Paladina's connection to DaVita was less obvious. If Golomb took the job, what could he do to make Paladina's clinics as efficient as possible in terms of service and its economics, without compromising on its value

proposition? Was Paladina just too different of a business to be part of the DaVita family? This case offers an example of "intrapreneurship"-i.e. entrepreneurial ventures launched within large companies-at a Fortune 500 company. DaVita has already had a successful experience launching Rx (after some difficult early years), and the company is now even serving patients from some of DaVita's leading competitors.. However, Paladina is the company's first intrapreneurial venture outside of its core focus of serving end-stage renal disease (ESRD) patients-DaVita's main function is to provide dialysis services to ESRD patients and Rx provides medication to ESRD patients. Can Paladina succeed simply by following Rx's example, or will it face different challenges?

**(2) Case: How Corporates Co-innovate with Startups: The BMW Startup Garage**

At the BMW Group, Gregor Gimmy, a serial entrepreneur and former consultant, introduces the Venture Client (VCL) model to engage with start-ups and boost corporate innovation. The case discusses its initial success at BMW and the rationale that drove Gimmy to establish a new model of external corporate venturing (ECV). It also provides background information on the key forces shaping the auto industry today, the challenges faced by legacy automakers as technological developments accelerate, and the emergence of new rules and new players.

**(3) Case: Intel® GrowthX: Partnering with Entrepreneurs for Growth**

The case describes the process of Intel promoting an intrapreneurship program in China. The intrapreneurship platform called Ideas2Realty (later rebranded as GrowthX) was founded in 2015. After five years' development, GrowthX was improved step by step by introducing established entrepreneurship methodologies (e.g., the Lean Startup framework), partnering with an innovation accelerator, and inviting external startups. By the end of 2020, GrowthX had explored more than 400 business ideas, bringing Intel millions of dollars in incremental revenue. Why do companies like Intel need intrapreneurship? What challenges did Intel China overcome during the process? Going forward, for project leader Kapil Kane, several challenges remained. For example, how to leverage internal teams and external startups? How to achieve better synergies between different innovation programs? How to convince managers and employees that the program is of high long-term value and ask for more resources to develop?

**(4) Case: Westeron: Rallying "The Crowd" To Reboot Innovation**

Westeron, a well-known kitchen, bath and home products retailer, created the "Takeoff" program in 2015 to enhance its product pipeline by connecting emerging entrepreneurs-including college students-to Westeron's innovation team. The Takeoff program offered entrepreneurs powerful resources, including manufacturing, marketing, and legal support. Westeron seeks to capitalize on this corporate entrepreneurship program as it seeks to bolster its financial performance and brand after a bankruptcy.

**2nd Half of the Semester**

**(1) Case: ServiceMandi: Corporate Entrepreneurship at Ashok Leyland**

Ashok Leyland (AL) has been a good performer in the commercial vehicle (CV) industry in India, and has emerged as a leading player in the global CV industry. It has done well to survive and grow in a cyclical industry and has overcome many recessions and downturns in the nearly 70 years of its existence. The case describes the efforts of AL in conceptualizing and launching a new initiative called ServiceMandi to garner a greater share of the aftersales service part of the value chain, thus taking AL into a market that was historically dominated by the unorganized sector. The SM initiative comes with its own set of rewards and challenges and confronts AL with tradeoffs whose resolutions are not so obvious. This case presents an insight into the conceptualization of the SM initiative, the approach followed by AL in converting the SM concept into reality, and the progress made so far with this initiative. The case also presents the potential directions that this initiative can take in the future and provides an opportunity for students to think through the various options in terms of the pros and cons and recommend a course of action for AL

**(2) Case: Corporate Entrepreneurship at Enagas: Transforming from the Inside Out**

In September 2017, Fernando Impuesto, Commercial and Technical Services Director at Madrid-based natural gas infrastructure company Enagas, was offered the opportunity to transform the company's pilot intrapreneurship initiative into a robust corporate entrepreneurship program to support the company's new "decarbonization" strategy. Within two weeks, he needed to make a proposal about how to structure the program and focus his efforts in the first year, with the ultimate goal of generating a new portfolio worth €1 billion in five to ten years. Stepping into Impuesto's shoes, students will make recommendations for effectively addressing key corporate entrepreneurship tensions, including tight vs. loose control; internally focused vs. externally focused initiatives; and old versus new ownership and governance models and relationships.

**(3) Case: "Kickboxing" Around the World: An Intrapreneurship Revolution?**

Adobe's "Kickbox" system of grassroots innovation garnered headlines and then, through an open-source community, found its way into hundreds of companies and other organizations of all types. A group of Kickboxers from Swisscom are inspired to take the methods and technology to the next level, hoping to foster new waves of employee-led innovation. Their new venture, "rready," has gained the support of Kickbox's inventor and aims to productize the Kickbox innovation approaches. But can the founders prioritize growth and stay true to the open-source ethos of Kickbox? This case is a sequel to "Kickboxing" at Adobe Systems.

**(4) Case: Eastern Bank: Innovating Through Eastern Labs**

Eastern Bank is a 200-year-old New England mutual bank with a community focus. Eastern specializes in small business lending, having made strategic investments to become the top SBA lender in New England in the midst of the Great Recession, when other banks were pulling back. But with technology threatening to disrupt Eastern's relationship banking model, CEO Bob Rivers is getting worried. Looking to spur innovation at the bank, he set up meetings at MIT to talk with "fintech" entrepreneurs. In a deliberate quest for innovation talent, Rivers finds his way to Dan O'Malley, co-founder of the payments division at Capital One and, most recently, CEO of a failed online bank. O'Malley agrees to join the bank as Chief Digital Officer, leading product development, customer support, and "Eastern Labs"-a new office enclosed by glass walls and located in the middle of Eastern's main lobby. Rivers provides Labs with \$4 million annually-1% of gross revenues-to develop new banking technologies and promises to help O'Malley spin out his own company if he develops product that can be monetized. O'Malley conducts tests in insurance cross-selling and small business lending, eventually launching a completely automated small business lending product. Rivers keeps the promise by helping O'Malley spin out a bank technology company called Numerated and secures a 25% equity share for Eastern. But by the time of the spin out, Rivers is reassessing the success of the effort. Did Rivers have the right intrapreneurship model? Did he change the culture at Eastern? Did he make a mistake spinning off Numerated into a separate company? What lessons can he learn for "Labs 2.0"?

## UNIVERSITY POLICIES

**Off-campus Instruction and Course Activities**—Off-campus, out-of-state, and foreign instruction and activities are subject to state law and University policies and procedures regarding travel and risk-related activities. Information regarding these rules and regulations may be found at the website address [http://www.utdallas.edu/BusinessAffairs/Travel\\_Risk\\_Activities.htm](http://www.utdallas.edu/BusinessAffairs/Travel_Risk_Activities.htm). Additional information is available from the office of the school dean. Below is a description of any travel and/or risk-related activity associated with this course.

**Student Conduct & Discipline**— The University of Texas System and The University of Texas at Dallas have rules and regulations for the orderly and efficient conduct of their business. It is the responsibility of each student and each student organization to be knowledgeable about the rules and regulations which govern student conduct and activities. General information on student conduct and discipline is contained in the UTD publication, *A to Z Guide*, which is provided to all registered students each academic year.

The University of Texas at Dallas administers student discipline within the procedures of recognized and established due process. Procedures are defined and described in the *Rules and Regulations, Board of Regents, the University of Texas System, Part 1, Chapter VI, Section 3*, and in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities of the university's *Handbook of Operating Procedures*. Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations (SU 1.602, 972/883-6391).

A student at the university neither loses the rights nor escapes the responsibilities of citizenship. He or she is expected to obey federal, state, and local laws as well as the Regents' Rules, university regulations, and administrative rules. Students are subject to discipline for violating the standards of conduct whether such conduct takes place on or off campus, or whether civil or criminal penalties are also imposed for such conduct.

**Academic Integrity**— The faculty expects from its students a high level of responsibility and academic honesty. Because the value of an academic degree depends upon the absolute integrity of the work done by the student for that degree, it is imperative that a student demonstrate a high standard of individual honor in his or her scholastic work.

Scholastic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, statements, acts or omissions related to applications for enrollment or the award of a degree, and/or the submission as one's own work or material that is not one's own. As a general rule, scholastic dishonesty involves one of the following acts: cheating, plagiarism, collusion and/or falsifying academic records. Students suspected of academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary proceedings.

Plagiarism, especially from the web, from portions of papers for other classes, and from any other source is unacceptable and will be dealt with under the university's policy on plagiarism (see general catalog for details). This course will use the resources of turnitin.com, which searches the web for possible plagiarism and is over 90% effective.

**Email Use**— The University of Texas at Dallas recognizes the value and efficiency of communication between faculty/staff and students through electronic mail. At the same time, email raises some issues concerning security and the identity of each individual in an email exchange. The university encourages all official student email correspondence be sent only to a student's U.T. Dallas email address and that faculty and staff consider email from students official only if it originates from a UTD student account. This allows the university to maintain a high degree of confidence in the identity of all individual corresponding and the security of the transmitted information. UTD furnishes each student with a free email account that is to be used in all communication with university personnel. The Department of Information Resources at U.T. Dallas provides a method for students to have their U.T. Dallas mail forwarded to other accounts.

**Withdrawal from Class**— The administration of this institution has set deadlines for withdrawal of any college-level courses. These dates and times are published in that semester's course catalog. Administration procedures must be followed. It is the student's responsibility to handle withdrawal requirements from any class. In other words, I cannot drop or withdraw any student. You must do the proper paperwork to ensure that you will not receive a final grade of "F" in a course if you choose not to attend the class once you are enrolled.

**Student Grievance Procedures**— Procedures for student grievances are found in Title V, Rules on Student Services and Activities, of the university's *Handbook of Operating Procedures*.

In attempting to resolve any student grievance regarding grades, evaluations, or other fulfillments of academic responsibility, it is the obligation of the student first to make a serious effort to resolve the matter with the instructor, supervisor, administrator, or committee with whom the grievance originates (hereafter called "the respondent"). Individual faculty members retain primary responsibility for assigning grades and evaluations. If the matter cannot be resolved at that level, the grievance must be submitted in writing to the respondent with a copy of the respondent's School Dean. If the matter is not resolved by the written response provided by the respondent, the student may submit a written appeal to the School Dean. If the grievance is not resolved by the School Dean's decision, the student may make a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate or Undergraduate Education, and the dean will appoint and convene an Academic Appeals

Panel. The decision of the Academic Appeals Panel is final. The results of the academic appeals process will be distributed to all involved parties.

Copies of these rules and regulations are available to students in the Office of the Dean of Students, where staff members are available to assist students in interpreting the rules and regulations.

***Incomplete Grade Policy-*** As per university policy, incomplete grades will be granted only for work unavoidably missed at the semester's end and only if 70% of the coursework has been completed. An incomplete grade must be resolved within eight (8) weeks from the first day of the subsequent long semester. If the required work to complete the course and to remove the incomplete grade is not submitted by the specified deadline, the incomplete grade is changed automatically to a grade of **F**.

***Disability Services-*** The goal of Disability Services is to provide students with disabilities educational opportunities equal to those of their non-disabled peers. Disability Services is located in room 1.610 in the Student Union. Office hours are Monday and Thursday, 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.; Tuesday and Wednesday, 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.; and Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

The contact information for the Office of Disability Services is:

The University of Texas at Dallas, SU 22, PO Box 830688, Richardson, Texas 75083-0688, (972) 883-2098 (voice or TTY)

Essentially, the law requires that colleges and universities make those reasonable adjustments necessary to eliminate discrimination on the basis of disability. For example, it may be necessary to remove classroom prohibitions against tape recorders or animals (in the case of dog guides) for students who are blind. Occasionally an assignment requirement may be substituted (for example, a research paper versus an oral presentation for a student who is hearing impaired). Classes enrolled students with mobility impairments may have to be rescheduled in accessible facilities. The college or university may need to provide special services such as registration, note-taking, or mobility assistance.

It is the student's responsibility to notify his or her professors of the need for such an accommodation. Disability Services provides students with letters to present to faculty members to verify that the student has a disability and needs accommodations. Individuals requiring special accommodation should contact the professor after class or during office hours.

***Religious Holy Days-*** The University of Texas at Dallas will excuse a student from class or other required activities for the travel to and observance of a religious holy day for a religion whose places of worship are exempt from property tax under Section 11.20, Tax Code, and Texas Code Annotated.

The student is encouraged to notify the instructor or activity sponsor as soon as possible regarding the absence, preferably in advance of the assignment. The student, so excused, will be allowed to take the exam or complete the assignment within a reasonable time after the absence: a period equal to the length of the absence, up to a maximum of one week. A student who notifies the instructor and completes any missed exam or assignment may not be penalized for the absence. A student who fails to complete the exam or assignment within the prescribed period may receive a failing grade for that exam or assignment.

If a student or an instructor disagrees about the nature of the absence [i.e., for the purpose of observing a religious holy day] or if there is similar disagreement about whether the student has been given a reasonable time to complete any missed assignments or examinations, either the student or the instructor may request a ruling from the chief executive officer of the institution, or his or her designee. The chief executive officer or designee must take into account the legislative intent of TEC 51.911(b), and the student and instructor will abide by the decision of the chief executive officer or designee.