Developing a Modern Capstone Course for Technology Management Executive Education Programs: An Evolutionary Process

By Nina D. Ziv
Polytechnic University

International Journal of Technology and Innovation Management Education, Volume 1, Spring 2007

ABSTRACT

The Capstone course in technology management executive education programs plays a key role in bringing together various aspects of the curriculum and providing students with a framework for developing their final projects. This article details the evolution of the Capstone course at Polytechnic University in New York City over a six year period. During this time, the faculty teaching the course constantly recalibrated their thinking about the purpose, structure, and content of the course. They introduced a series of innovations in the course including the development of themes which would give the course an overall context, a bi-modal structure which focused on the individual as well as on team projects, and a laboratory-like environment which enabled both faculty, participants and industry professionals to engage in a continual dialogue about the major challenges confronting technology managers in the current business environment.

I. Background

For the participants in Polytechnic University's Executive Masters Programs, the Capstone course is the culmination of a year and a half of Master's level studies. Polytechnic offers two Executive Programs focusing on technology management: a Management of Technology [MOT] program which offers participants a curriculum which blends business concepts and the study of technology management and innovation and a Telecommunications and Information Management [TIM] program which enables participants to explore the intersection between information management and the telecommunications industry. The participants in the Programs are working professionals. For the most part, the MOT participants

The writer wishes to acknowledge the contribution to the development of the Capstone courses in the Executive Master's Programs by Professor Mel Horwitch, Chair of the Department of Management at Polytechnic University.

have broad backgrounds in the fields of finance, retail, and aerospace while the TIM participants tend to have more hands-on experience in the technology industries or are users of technology in such diverse industries as media and insurance. Both Executive Programs take place in at the University's Lower Manhattan campus, are fifteen months in length, and are conducted in cohort fashion, that is, all participants enter the Programs together and go through the same sequence of courses until graduation.

New York State requires that all Master's degree programs have a Capstone course as part of the curriculum and the original design of the Programs, which were started in the mid-1980s, included this curricular obligation. These Capstone courses reflected the business environment in which the Programs took place and the overall structure of the Programs. The MOT and TIM programs were originally held in Hawthorne, New York, a suburban town located north of New York City in Westchester County and drew on the executives who worked in large corporations in the area such as IBM, Pepsico and NYNEX (now Verizon) for their student bodies. Given the homogeneous nature of the student population and the stability of the corporate business environment at the time, the Capstone courses were focused somewhat narrowly on the specific industries and companies in which the students worked. Thus, for the Capstone project, each student would focus on an aspect of the firm in which he or she was employed with the outcome being a document which the student could use to perhaps effect some change in the company's technology management practices.

Following the traditional Master's degree structure, the Executive Programs consisted of four semesters which took place over a two year period. The Capstone courses were designed to reflect this structure. Thus, during the Spring semester of the first year and over the Summer break between the first and second years, the groundwork was laid for the Capstone individual

projects which would be developed during the final Fall Semester. Also, because the MOT and TIM programs had completely different curricula, the Capstone courses were taught separately to the Management of Technology [MOT] and Telecommunications and Information Management [TIM] students.

II. The Capstone Courses Are Redesigned

- **A New Approach is Needed**

In the Fall of 1998, a decision was made to move the Executive Programs to Lower Manhattan, which was experiencing a renaissance fueled in large part by the dot com boom. It seemed appropriate to locate the Programs in Silicon Alley where there were large numbers of potential students who were benefiting from the economic boom and where a considerable amount of ferment was being generated about the future of technological innovation in New York City. After relocating the Programs, we began to attract a more diverse student body which included people from small entrepreneurial firms who were developing content and tools for the new Internet platform and from firms in the various sectors which defined New York City such as the media industry and the financial services industry.

As we reflected on the new student body and the very exciting business environment in which we found ourselves, it was clear that a new more dynamic approach was needed for the Capstone course. Indeed, rather than just fulfilling a curricular obligation, the Capstone experience represented an opportunity to develop a unique set of courses which would not only tie together the disparate course offerings that students were required to take during the Programs but would also provide the students with a framework that would enable them to develop a

thesis-like final project. Because of the short term nature of the courses, we also wanted to ensure that the 'half-life' of these courses was extended and that they would augment our students' professional lives as well as contribute to the development of the intellectual life of the Department of Management. We decided that their final projects could in effect be a high tech business card which they could use to enhance their resumes or to explore other career opportunities. The Department of Management had recently opened up the Institute for Technology and Enterprise [ITE], a research and learning hub for technology management in the same building and it now seemed possible to enrich the Executive programs in general as well as the Capstone courses in particular by fostering a close relationship with ITE and the set of activities in which it was engaged. The students would benefit as well as members of the Department who could tap into the resources of the Executive Program for research projects, case studies and curriculum development. Moreover, the Silicon Alley community was thriving and industry professionals were readily available as guest speakers for both the Capstone courses and ITE.

A byproduct of the development of the Executive Programs and the Capstone course was the development of a community made up of the students, industry professionals from the New York City metropolitan area and faculty. We called our Executive Program attendees participants rather than students because we encouraged them to participate throughout their educational experience in a continual dialogue with faculty and industry professionals about the major challenges confronting technology managers in the current business environment.

- **An Integrative Design**

The goal at this stage of the evolution of the Capstone courses was to provide a more integrative experience for the Capstone participants. It was therefore important to reassess the

purposes of the courses, their structure and the context in which they were taught. In contrast to the original Capstone structure, we wanted this new structure to harness the intellectual horsepower of the entire class and get everyone involved in the learning process. One immediate decision we made was to combine the MOT and TIM classes for the Capstone courses and therefore bring together participants who had a wide range of viewpoints and experiences.

Along with the structure, the course needed an overall context which would make it more meaningful in the current economic environment. In 2000, when we started to redesign the course, we had already witnessed the birth of the so-called New Economy in which entrepreneurial companies which were purely digital-based or hybrid (both digital and physical) appeared out of nowhere to challenge established companies which had always been successful in producing and selling physical goods. Our Programs were based at 55 Broad Street, which was at the lower end of New York's Silicon Alley and in the middle of the financial district, both hotbeds of technological innovation. Our first redesigned Capstone course had as its overarching theme how large companies and established industries were incorporating digital-based innovations into their businesses and responding to the new competitive threats.

In keeping with the overall thrust of both Programs which was technology management and innovation, we designed the course so it would emphasize the challenges facing managers in this new environment such as creating new types of organizations, hiring talent which would be conversant in both digital and physical spaces, reaching new customers, and recognizing and creating new markets. We decided to focus on several industries which were undergoing significant transformations as a result of the advent of digital-based innovation such as the automobile industry, the financial services industry and the publishing industry. In addition to

assigning relevant readings for discussion which included a book on the e-business revolution[1], case studies, and a set of articles many of which were downloaded from the Internet, we also invited a series of guest speakers to provide the participants with some first-hand insights into how these industries were coping with the changes. Our guest speakers included a Chief Knowledge Officer of one of the major consulting firms, an expert in the publishing business and a former director for telecommunications for General Electric.

This theme-based context became the foundation on which we built the rest of the course. We structured the course so that there were opportunities for general discussions of the entire MOT and TIM cohort, class meetings for the two cohorts, and time for individuals to pursue their own interests and ideas. Thus, MOT and TIM classes were together for the guest speakers and some overall discussions, and met separately to delve more deeply into the issues raised by the speakers and the assigned readings. It was also essential for individuals to develop and present their own ideas and projects. For their final project, each participant had to choose a company, develop a case study and present their findings to the class at the end of the semester.

Our first Capstone class in the Fall of 2000 was moderately successful in that the participants approved of the idea of an overarching theme, the class discussions and also enjoyed the guest lecturers who contributed to their understanding of the transformation of large established industries. The individual projects of the MOT class were equally divided among major industries such as publishing, financial services, aerospace and consulting. These projects reflected the thinking and learning that had gone on during the course of the semester on the overall theme of the course. Thus, there were several outstanding projects such as an analysis of Barnes and Noble's strategies in the digital and physical spaces; a discussion of how Progressive

[1] Grady Means and David Schneider (2000),*Metacapitalism: The E-business Revolution and the Design of 21st century markets*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Insurance company was trying to gain competitive advantage in a very traditional industry by providing online services for its clients; and a project on a 'pureplay' Internet company, Petsmart, which was exclusively selling their products online.

Two of the projects - Simon and Schuster's attempts to 'reinvent' itself in the newly defined publishing landscape and the evolution of Bertelsmann, a media conglomerate which was investing heavily in online businesses - also triggered our thinking about a possible Round Table on the transformation of the print media business. Accordingly, in January 2001, we held a Round Table on the topic at ITE in which we not only featured guest speakers from the industry, but also the research of a faculty member who had conducted research on the print media business as well as the findings of two of our Executive Program participants who had done their individual projects in this sector. This was the first time that we fully understood that the symbiotic relationship between the Executive Program and ITE. This Round Table made it obvious that we could use the Capstone course as a jumping-off point for further research and for the development of programs which would inform members of the ITE community.

As we mulled over the course and reflected on what was happening in many firms, we realized that team-oriented activities were increasingly being used in these firms for fostering a more collaborative atmosphere and as a way of encouraging a healthy exchange of ideas. Since this was a significant trend in innovative corporations, we decided to incorporate this idea in the next Capstone course. As such, we suggested a set of industry sectors and let the class 'self-organize' into sectoral teams. Each team was responsible for researching the trends and major players in their respective sectors and then creating a presentation for the rest of the class on their findings as they related to the overarching theme of the course. In this new iteration of the course, a typical four and a half hour class had four major sections: A guest speaker, general

discussions with the entire MOT and TIM cohorts, group discussions by class, and team-based discussions. This multi-level approach enabled us to tap into various modes of thinking and also gave the participants a series of different experiences which enriched their understanding of the material as well as a mechanism where they could try out their ideas on particular topics within a supportive environment, i.e., their teams.

While we were somewhat satisfied with the basic structure and had incorporated enough flexibility within the course to accommodate individual participants' academic needs, the Capstone course became a project of sorts in which we constantly recalibrated our thinking and in turn engineered a series of innovations which would reflect these changes. In general, these innovations focused on developing new and relevant overarching themes, restructuring the course to provide a more conducive learning experience for the participants, and creating a laboratory-like environment which showcased not only the relationship between ITE and the Executive Programs but also our ability to create new value on the fly and 'practice what we preached'. In the following sections, each of these innovations will be discussed.

- **Evolution of Overarching Themes**

The determination of the overarching theme for the course was indeed one of the most important exercises which we engaged in prior to the start of each semester. We thought through what would be most meaningful to the participants and also what theme would encourage them to produce ideas and research which might be repurposed for ITE events or used in other classroom settings. Crucial to our thinking were changes that were taking place in the business environment. In the Fall of 2001 for example, after the dot com bubble burst and there was a movement of firms towards retrenchment and away from embracing innovation, the theme of the course was "The Day After: The Emerging state of Technology, Innovation and Information

Management in 2001" and the assigned readings reflected this theme. We discussed Porter's seminal article, 'Strategy and the Internet'[2] which denigrated the Internet as a viable business platform and called for a return to the traditional ways of conducting business, and Don Tapscott's counterattack about one of the major legacies of the Internet companies which was the notion of business networks[3]. In 2002, after the World Trade Center disaster, we focused on New York City where we were based, and created a Capstone course on the reinvention of high tech New York. We challenged the participants to identify the key parameters of technology, innovation, and information strategy in the New York City region in light of the NASDAQ crash and the 9/11 event. At the time, it was unclear as to what firms and sectors would ultimately form the backbone of the economy of Lower Manhattan. One idea which was getting a lot of attention was that the biotechnology sector could be a possible substitute for the financial services industry that had always been an economic mainstay of the area. In addition, the whole nature of cities was being scrutinized as firms moved large numbers of employees out of the city and used the burgeoning telecommunications infrastructure to connect their organizations.

The assigned readings for that semester dealt with the dual themes of rebuilding New York City and discerning the challenges facing managers in a 'deconstructed' organizational environment. It is significant to note that an overwhelming number of MOT participants chose some aspect of the financial services industry to study for their individual projects. The topics that were researched included the evolution of stock exchanges into electronic-based institutions, the issues facing old established retail financial services firms as they grappled with new entrants who were using the Internet to conduct business, and the role of investment banking in this

[2] Michael Porter (2001), "Strategy and the Internet*" Harvard Business Review.*
[3] Don Tapscott (2001), "Rethinking Strategy in a Networked World or Why Michael Porter is Wrong about the Internet", *Strategy and Business*.

environment. In addition, for the first time, a number of participants chose to write about the Not-for-profit sector which is an important part of the New York City economy and the retail business which was beginning to emerge as sector where significant innovation was occurring.

Two other overarching themes are worth noting as they again reflect the changes in the nature of technological innovation and the concomitant changes in managerial imperatives. In March 2003, Nicholas Carr published a controversial article on the value of IT and its role in providing companies with a competitive advantage[4]. The subsequent discussion in the academic community generated much food for thought and became the basis of the Capstone course as we focused on the impact of IT on the emerging enterprise. Undoubtedly, this theme had a direct impact on many of our participants who were managers of technology within their corporations. In addition, as a result of 9/11, the Department of Homeland Security had been established and there was suddenly an increase in spending on technological innovations in defense and security. In May of 2003, a Round Table had been held at ITE on this topic which generated discussion and a videotape of significant players debating the issues surrounding homeland security. In contrast to the Capstone being the impetus for developing a Round Table, in this case, the Round Table became the impetus for further discussion and research in the Executive Programs as we devoted part of the Capstone course to a discussion of the impact of the newly created Department of Homeland Security on innovation in the United States. In order to stimulate thinking about this issue, we designed an exercise in which we asked the participants from the perspective of their particular industry sectors to develop a presentation of how they might organize and structure a strategy for dealing with the re-emergence of the homeland security arena and the managerial challenges that this new market and new sources of funding would create.

[4] Nicholas G. Carr (2003), " IT Doesn't Matter" *Harvard Business Review*.

The other theme which we have used most recently in the Capstone course dealt with the emergence of a services-based economy and the implications of this 'new' economy on firms and industry sectors. Was there something to be learned about innovation from studying the hospitality sector for example? We assigned readings on the hotel business[5] and discussed how services innovation was evolving in this sector. In addition, companies such as IBM were beginning to move beyond being technology providers toward offering a comprehensive package of both technology and services. We also assigned readings about these companies[6] and held in-depth discussions about them.

While the mix of sectors which the participants chose to research was similar in makeup to previous years, the sectoral presentations focused on how technological innovations were changing the nature of services in such areas as healthcare, education, and entertainment. One presentation in particular was on the evolving nature of the so-called 'digital' hospital and how technology was rapidly changing the way healthcare was delivered, the innovative tools being developed by users in the healthcare field and the accompanying managerial challenges of hiring appropriate talent, developing optimal organizational structures, and encouraging healthcare professionals who were notoriously slow to adopt technology to incorporate these innovations into their practices. In addition, the participants' final projects reflected the changing emphasis on a services-based economy with many of them choosing to study companies in the real estate, biopharma, and healthcare sectors.

- **Restructuring the Capstone course**

[5] "The Ritz Carlton Hotel Company" (2001), *Harvard Business School* Case #9-601-163. See also Roger Hallowell, David Bowen and Carin-Isabel Knoop (2002), "Four Seasons Goes to Paris" *Academy of Management Executive,* Vol. 16, No 4.
[6] "The New IBM in 2004" (2004), *European Case Clearing House*, #304-592-1.

When we moved the Executive Programs to Lower Manhattan, we decided to restructure them in order to offer an educational program that was in line with the fast-paced business environment of the mid-1990s. Thus, we 'collapsed' the two year program into fifteen months and in effect had a trimester program format in which the Spring and Summer semesters were concentrated between January and mid-July. This new structure affected the Capstone course because no longer would participants be able to focus on their individual projects over several months.

At first, we tried to develop a course which would optimally use the time we had in the Fall semester for studying how the overarching theme we had chosen was manifested on both the sectoral level and the firm level. This entailed having a very intense program schedule in which often there were multiple presentations on both levels on a single day. This schedule did not give the participants ample time to reflect on what they had learned on the sectoral level and apply this to their individual projects. In fact, we were giving extensions to the participants for the completion of their individual projects after the course was officially over in order to give the participants time to develop quality projects.

After receiving feedback from the participants about the concentrated nature of the course and thinking about the goals of the course and the need to create value in an optimal manner, we restructured the course into two half-semesters with the first half taking place in our 'Summer' semester and focusing on the sectoral level and the second half of the course taking place in the latter half of the Fall Semester and focusing on the individual level. Our challenge in dividing the course up was to make sure that the momentum was kept up from one semester to the next and that there was a way to bridge the intellectual gap that inevitably occurred when participants were away from the Program from mid-July until mid-September. One way we attempted to

address this issue was to ask participants to provide us with their final project selections by mid-July so that they could begin thinking about their topics over the summer. Another way was to meet with the classes to discuss issues regarding their individual projects before the class actually started and to suggest that participants send us an outline of their individual project early in the semester so that we could give them continual feedback to them as their thinking developed.

These strategies were somewhat successful in that we still had to jump-start the course in the Fall when the participants returned from the Summer break and also had to spend time helping them to focus on their projects before the second half of the course was actually held. In the previous one semester structure, participants who desired feedback on their projects usually received it during the class sessions when we could take individuals aside and discuss their projects with them. With this new structure, participants had to arrange times to discuss their projects with us or alternatively conduct email dialogues with us which was not always a satisfactory way of providing feedback.

- **Creating a Laboratory for 'Learning by doing'**

As we developed the Capstone course, it became apparent that this endeavor was not just about creating a learning experience for our participants but that in many ways, it was about the nature of innovation itself. Indeed, throughout the development of the course, we tried to 'practice what we preached' by continually reassessing the environment, experimenting and taking risks, and co-creating with the participants. By doing so, we were able to make the experience more valuable for the participants as well as create a laboratory-like environment in which we could try out new ideas which ultimately could be used either in the classroom or in a larger context, that is, in the ITE community of scholars and industry professionals.

One example of a set of learning experiences that albeit did not happen by choice was our response to the events of 9/11. Since 55 Broad Street, the location at which we held classes, was less than six blocks away from Ground Zero, it was impossible after September 11 to hold classes at our usual location and therefore we immediately postponed holding the Executive program for several weeks. Many of our participants had been in the World Trade Center buildings, or were working to restore services to the downtown area and some of them had lost friends or relatives in the disaster. When we finally reconvened at another location in midtown Manhattan, we realized that we could not discuss the topics that we had originally planned for the Capstone class for that day which focused on the downturn in the New Economy and how companies like Yahoo! and eBay were rethinking their strategies.

We decided to take a risk and create an exercise that might divert the attention of the participants away from the human tragedy and channel their energies into an objective discussion about the impact of 9/11 on technology management and innovation. Accordingly, we assembled a set of articles on the state of certain industries and firms in New York City in the post 9/11 environment and asked the participants to first discern the major issues confronting these firms and industries in both the short and long terms. We also asked them to consider the impact of September 11 on Silicon Alley and high tech New York, Wall Street as a financial center, New York as the premier commercial, media and financial hub of the United States and the future role of IT and innovation in New York City. In addition, we broke the class into small groups representing important industrial and Not-for-profit players which had been seriously affected by the September 11 event. We asked each group to 'role' play these organizations and present their ideas on the strategies such organizations should embrace in the post-September 11 environment.

Out of this discussion of how to lead and shape the post-September 11 corporation came the seed of an idea to hold a Round Table at ITE. This idea gained further momentum after we attended a series of meetings in downtown Manhattan which were designed to help affected businesses get back on their feet and realized that we too could make a contribution from our own perspective at ITE. With two ITE research fellows, we wrote four case studies on companies affected by the 9/11 event[7] and then held a Round Table in December 2001 in which we used the case studies as starting points for discussion of the issues that various firms and organizations in New York City faced and the ramifications for companies in the region and globally. Later we wrote an article on our response to 9/11 which documented the Capstone course activity, the Round table and the research we conducted. The article [8] along with the case studies and a video of highlights from the Round Table became an instructional module which has been used in other courses in the Executive Program.

Another example of how the Capstone course was a catalyst for learning was the introduction of another element into the educational process. We decided that it was important for the participants to take their learning experience to a more abstract level and asked them to devise what we called a learning context for their sector. Our thinking was that not only should the participants understand and present the key trends and ideas that were driving innovation in their sectors but also they should develop a way to educate others about their findings. Therefore, as part of their assignment for developing an industry sector presentation, participants had to create a learning context framework and present it to the rest of the class. We instituted this

[7] Nina.D. Ziv, Mel Horwitch, Nisa Lewites, & Doug Stearns (2001), "Leading and Shaping the Post-September Corporation: Observations and Three Firms as Cases in Point", *Institute for Technology and Enterprise Working Paper*.
[8] Nina D. Ziv and Mel Horwitch (2002), "9/11 Montage: Professors Remember", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 2002, Vol.1, No. 1, 14-37.

innovation in the Fall of 2003 and the result was an impressive set of frameworks for learning about various industry sectors.

Some representative learning contexts included a full semester course on the key issues facing technology managers in the financial services industry; a short course for executives on the evolution of the videogame industry; a Round Table on international technology standards which could be a program at ITE; and a Round Table on the challenges facing managers in the biopharma industry. For the courses, the participants developed comprehensive syllabi and for the Round Tables, there were detailed agendas with speakers and discussion topics that were carefully thought out. The learning context assignment enabled our participants to think beyond the facts and figures of their industry sectors and exhibit their understanding of the material they had gathered on a deeper level. For us, the learning context became another vehicle for further discussion about ITE events as well as a source of ideas for new courses in the Executive programs.

A final example of how the Capstone course became an exercise in co-creation with our participants occurred when we designed the course for MOT programs that were taking place at particular company site instead of our home location at 55 Broad Street. In this case, the participants were all managers of the particular companies at which the Programs were held. These participants took the same sequence of courses as the MOT program that was held in New York City.

For these onsite programs, the usual Capstone course which we had structured for the diverse set of participants in New York did not seem to be as meaningful or relevant for the participants. Our solution was to design a Capstone course in which we directly involved the

participants in the creation of the course. Instead of sectoral overviews and individual projects, the outcome of the course would be an analysis of the participants' own company.

We first had the participants read a book on 'action learning'[9] which delineated different approaches to understanding how an organization learns and then had them do a preliminary analysis of their company in relation to the concepts on organizational learning they had studied. The participants then defined several major challenges facing their company and over the course of the semester, researched these problems and periodically presented their findings to their classmates for criticism and feedback. Several documents were produced by the end of the course which served in effect as a blueprint for the company's senior management to reassess their organization's health and rethink its future. Both of the onsite programs were held at companies which were leaders in the defense industry. The Capstone course participants' efforts included an analysis of the entire defense industry business environment which was undergoing significant change and a series of discussions about specific issues that in the participants' views were holding back their company from achieving its goals. In one case, the materials were actually presented to the senior management of the company which reviewed the suggestions of the participants and implemented some of them.

This Capstone course variation enabled us to think about the purpose of this course in a very different light and use the course as a laboratory for learning about organizational change. Because we had redesigned this course for a unique student population, we were able to gain a deeper understanding of the field of technology management and innovation and then use this knowledge for our home-based Capstone course as well as in other courses we were teaching in the Executive Program.

---

[9] David A. Garvin (2000) *Learning in Action: A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to Work,* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

III. Lessons Learned

Our experience in developing the Capstone course was instructive and was a case study in 'learning by doing', a central tenet of the innovative process. Throughout the process, we needed to be agile, flexible and adaptable as we assessed the changing environment around us and redesigned the courses to reflect what we saw. Our students also were changing as more and more of their jobs were service related rather than strictly focusing on technology. In developing the Capstone courses, reading materials, guest speakers, and entire modules needed to be continually revised in order for these courses to remain relevant to our participants.

At the outset of the course, we told the participants that the Capstone course was student-driven, i.e., our job as faculty was to facilitate their learning, but we still had to provide a structure that enabled such learning to take place. Using our resources in the community (faculty and industry professionals) helped us to develop a structure that encouraged independent thinking but at the same time provided guidance to the participants as they explored their own interests.

The process of creating a Capstone course for our Executive programs is ongoing. Feedback from the last two courses suggests that our participants not only want to write final projects on issues or companies that interest them but that they also want to engage in field work and 'action learning' in order to enrich their Capstone experience. Some of the participants have suggested that the Capstone course be structured so that teams take on particular problems or issues that a company or sector is grappling with and develop strategic plans to address such issues. In addition, the Capstone course as presently structured, does not tap into the considerable talents of the faculty of our Department who each have an area of specialization in

the technology management arena. Further exploration as to how to incorporate more of the faculty in the Capstone course is needed.

Overall, the evolution of the Capstone course for the Executive Masters' programs at Polytechnic University that has been described in this article has been an important experience for the faculty involved and for the participants who have benefited from and contributed to the process in various ways. For all concerned, it is essential to develop the Capstone course within the context of the Executive Programs and the overall business environment so that the course remains vibrant, relevant, and innovative.

References

Carr, N. G. (2003)," IT Doesn't Matter" *Harvard Business Review.*

Garvin, D. A. (2000), *Learning in Action: A Guide to Putting the Learning Organization to Work,* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

Hallowell, R. D. Bowen and C. Knoop (2002), "Four Seasons Goes to Paris" *Academy of Management Executive,* Vol. 16, No 4.

Means, G. and D. Schneider (2000), *Metacapitalism: The E-business Revolution and the Design of 21st century markets*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Porter, M. (2001), "Strategy and the Internet*" Harvard Business Review.*

Tapscott, D.(2001), "Rethinking Strategy in a Networked World or Why Michael Porter is Wrong about the Internet", *Strategy and Business*.

"The New IBM in 2004"(2004), *European Case Clearing House*, #304-592-1.

"The Ritz Carlton Hotel Company"(2001), *Harvard Business School* Case #9-601-163.

Ziv, N.D., M. Horwitch, N. Lewites, & D. Stearns (2001), "Leading and Shaping the Post-September Corporation: Observations and Three Firms as Cases in Point", *Institute for Technology and Enterprise Working Paper*.

Ziv, N.D. and M. Horwitch (2002), "9/11 Montage: Professors Remember", *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, Vol.1, No. 1, 14-37.