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Abstract

In this paper we will address certain issues that happened in the first case study between The staff members and their decision making on choosing a new CMS for their university. This paper will address certain struggles between group members and the credibility of the members who that were involved We will break down the effects and the conflicts between the group members as well as any common interests that were built. We will be discussing common ground affective and cognitive conflicts in much more as to why there was a social imbalance to the group members that were chosen to pick this CMS.
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Case Study on the Course Management System Part 2

 Throughout this case you get to read and understand the positions of the nine members in this group. It is evident from reading and comprehending the case that there was conflict among individuals who had to make decisions due to a power struggle that existed inside the group. Numerous group members engaged in conflict, and at times there was weak leadership that caused the conflict to persist. Bill and Addie frequently disagreed when talking about the new course management system. Bill arrived with a prototype and was prepared to launch it without consulting the group or receiving instructions from the group leader. I would look at it as moving ahead, but I would also urge him to consult the group to go over all of the alternatives. Jenny chose not to do this; instead, she led with the perspective of a teacher, allowing the team to behave in an immature manner.

 As the group advanced, there was also conflict between other members. Because Kelly always sided with Bill, she ran afoul of the entire group and ultimately lost Mindy as well. After the initial meeting, Addie begins to form a sub-group with the other faculty members that will compete with what Bill and the IT group say and do, despite the fact that the group's goal is to collaborate to get the greatest outcome. Some of the conflict may have been caused by differences in the standing and credibility of the group's various members. Bill believed that he had the most authority because he considered the course management system to be an IT problem that should be handled by the IT department. Since Addie was the Dean of Distance Education and had experience in both education and information technology and design, the bulk of the group turned to her for guidance. Although Bill is familiar with the website's layout, Addie is more knowledgeable with the demands of the user. She has higher respect and position among the group. Jenny refrained from resolving conflicts that emerged in the group by using her position as provost or as the group's leader. She only threatened to use her rank to go to the Dean and make a separate decision.

 Looking at the members of the group and their behaviors, one could notice that some members may have a “gated community of the mind”. Bill works harder than everybody else and doesn't listen to their advice because he believes his field to be the best at the institution. He responds that IT students are among the brightest and greatest students when asked why it was not examined by all five of the university's colleges. He is perceived by other members as being narcissistic. Some of the faculty are steadfast in their methods, and habit heavily influences their judgment. Each of them follows a specified procedure for using their system and teaching classes. Because they feel at ease with what they are doing, they are unwilling to compromise on what they want in the system.

 Age disparities contributed to some of the fighting. In reference to Kelly and Mindy's age, Juan said that he did not want a course management system created by kids. No one in the group ever responds to this, but it demonstrates that Juan has not treated these two as equals from the group's founding, which can lead to a lot of friction. Given that it was directed at the individuals involved and had nothing to do with the organization, this particular situation would be considered affective conflict. The IT department's failure to comprehend the needs of the faculty is a major source of friction between the faculty and IT department. Given the problems the group is having, this is cognitive conflict. There was trust among some of the committee members as a result of the grouping that was taking place. The IT department initially had confidence between itself, but Mindy betrayed it to demonstrate that there were problems that were not being discussed. It is said that it is against departmental policy for the IT department to share information with outside parties. By cooperating with Addie, Mindy betrayed that trust.

The faculty trusted one another because they were all striving for the finest course management method. They had confidence in Addie because she frequently represented the faculty's interests. In order to sway members in one direction or another, the group engaged in extensive political maneuvering outside of meetings. Addie met with Mindy to discuss the project outside of scheduled meetings, Bill met with Sid separately to show him how successful his IT team is. In each of these situations, they sought to find points of agreement. Bill changed Sid's perceptions so that he could see that his IT department could complete the tasks required to create the course management system. In order for them to better comprehend difficulties from each perspective, Addie found common ground with Mindy.

Juan and Bill have found a point of agreement that will allow them to produce a reliable cost-benefit analysis before the Greenboard contract expires. The crew has occasionally come together and functioned successfully, but such occasions were also hampered by ongoing arguments and squabbles. Effective integration of each discipline would have improved the team's performance, which might have began with Jenny's capable leadership. Teams were divided in her initial grouping, with academic members and IT staff in each of the three groups. The group dismissed her as the team's leader and Bill in particular, along with Addie, went their separate ways. They may share knowledge in their groups while they discussed the existing system, a new system, and other systems. The teams Jenny suggested breaking up would have worked perfectly for their assignments. Given that money is the primary concern, Jenny, Bill, and Addie would have examined the current system and determined whether they should keep it.

Given their positions within the university, they are best qualified to make these judgments. Kelly, Charlotte, and Jean-Pierre would investigate other current systems. When comparing the compatibility to what they are already running, Kelly's excellent IT skills would be very helpful, and Charlotte and Jean-Pierre will be aware of what they need as professors. The cost and efficiency of creating a new system would have been considered by Mindy, Juan, and Sid. Along with Sid, who has teaching expertise, Juan would create the cost-benefits analysis. Mindy has IT skills. The team was made up of a solid bunch of people, in my opinion, who might have used more direction or a stronger leader. For the team to function more cohesively, Jenny may have exercised more authority and involvement. The project's results fulfilled the university's requirements. They were looking for a new course management system, and they found it. It was challenging for the group to come to a consensus because of internal dispute, but with the help of each person's participation, a workable solution was found. The group's initial failures led to extra work being produced when the president got involved and assembled the team to repair it themselves. The ties that were forged between the various departments should lead to more fruitful work the following time interdisciplinary groups are formed at this university.
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