

## **Digital Transformation - 95-722 M21**

Carnegie Mellon University

Master of Information Systems Management Program

Summer 2021, Mini 6

Canvas Website: <https://canvas.cmu.edu/>

### **Instructor:**

J. David Riel

2107E Hamburg Hall

djriel@cmu.edu

Office Hours: By appointment (in person or teleconference), e-mail me to make an appointment.

### **Teaching Assistant(s):**

TBD

Office Hours: By appointment (in person or teleconference), e-mail to make an appointment.

Weekly meetings will be scheduled.

### **Course Administrator:**

Sean Beggs

Hamburg Hall 1104E

412.268.5488

sbeggs@andrew.cmu.edu

### **Course Information:**

Section M21-6, Room HBH A301

Class Times: Tuesday/Thursday 2-3:20PM EST. All are recorded for those that cannot attend.

### **Course Duration:**

July 6th – August 15th, 2021

A detailed weekly course schedule and summary of course activities are posted in a separate document to Canvas.

### **Course Prerequisites:**

Students should have taken graduate courses that cover both information technology (Core IT Design/Development/Management/Analytics, etc.) and business/managerial topics (Financial management, business analytics, economic analysis, etc.).

**Course Description:**

This course serves as a capstone course integrating technological and managerial aspects of information technology. We will take the culmination of your previous learning of technological and managerial subjects and apply it to real-world scenarios. Each section will consider the information and communication technologies that play multiple roles within an organizational context through two perspectives:

- From a technological perspective, these define the information and communication infrastructures of the firm and they enable new ways to digitize business processes.
- From a managerial perspective, these facilitate new coordination and communication within and across entities, enable new organizational forms, change the information environment underlying the business, and permit new incentive structures.

Successful efforts at digitization must keep both technological and managerial perspectives in mind. Using a collection of cases and current industry scenarios, this course will study how the deployment of information technology changes interactions and processes within organizations, across organizations, within industries, and across society.

The analyses of the different organizations and industries will require students to engage in both technical and managerial problem-solving. The technical component of the analysis requires students to propose IT architectures for the problems highlighted in the case. The managerial component of the analysis requires students to analyze the business value of the proposed solution and address the change management issues that arise in implementing any digital transformation initiative.

**High-Level Learning Objectives and Outcomes:**

Analyze and interpret transformations of IT in the four areas of competitive advantage, org structure, industry structure, and institutional policy.

Analyze and interpret methods of productivity growth through modern interpretations of digitized input and output drivers.

Distinguish between and systematically assessing components of change through sustaining and disruptive technologies with proper management of demand and supply-side drivers.

Identify and examine key technological challenges and rewards from systems innovations, first-mover advantages and disadvantages, and the potential disruptions or opportunities to culture, cross-industry collaborations, design thinking, and trust.

**Reading Materials:**

A “digital” reading packet containing most of the cases and readings for this course is available from HBS Publishing. Details and a link to a set of HBS case studies is listed on Canvas.

Supplemental readings are available on Canvas and/or will be distributed in class. There is no textbook requirement.

**Attendance Policy:**

Students are expected to attend all scheduled mandatory class times. As most classes involve team-based work including live presentations, it is imperative that students are a part of each discussion. Any meeting not deemed as mandatory are optional attendance.

**Cheating, Plagiarism, and Academic Integrity:**

Students at CMU are engaged in preparation for professional activity of the highest standards. Each profession constrains its members with both ethical responsibilities and disciplinary limits. To assure the validity of the learning experience Carnegie Mellon establishes clear standards for student work. You are required to be familiar with all university policies on this subject (see <http://www.cmu.edu/policies/documents/Cheating.html>). An extract of these policies is reproduced here:

In any presentation, creative, artistic, or research, it is the ethical responsibility of each student to identify the conceptual sources of the work submitted. Failure to do so is dishonest and is the basis for a charge of cheating or plagiarism, which is subject to disciplinary action.

Cheating includes but is not necessarily limited to:

- Plagiarism, explained below.
- Submission of work that is not the student's own for papers, assignments or exams.
- Submission or use of falsified data.
- Theft of or unauthorized access to an exam or quiz.
- Use of an alternate, stand-in or proxy during an examination.
- Use of unauthorized material including textbooks, notes or computer programs in the preparation of an assignment or during an examination.
- Supplying or communicating in any way unauthorized information to another student for the preparation of an assignment or during an examination.
- Collaboration in the preparation of an assignment. Unless specifically permitted or required by the instructor, collaboration will usually be viewed by the university as cheating. Each student, therefore, is responsible for understanding the policies of the department offering any course as they refer to the amount of help and collaboration permitted in preparation of assignments.

- Submission of the same work for credit in two courses without obtaining the permission of the instructors beforehand.

Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, failure to indicate the source with quotation marks or footnotes where appropriate if any of the following are reproduced in the work submitted by a student:

- A phrase, written or musical.
- A graphic element.
- A proof.
- Specific language.
- An idea derived from the work, published or unpublished, of another person.

Regarding plagiarism, you should also familiarize yourself with the content of the separate handout entitled “A Note on Plagiarism and Citing Sources.”

*One application of this plagiarism policy for our class is that you may not provide or receive information on case write-ups or class discussions from students outside of your section. This includes both students from prior semesters and students from other sections in this semester.*

### **A Note Regarding Case “Solutions” on the Web:**

Because these cases are used at a variety of schools, there may be slides and other materials available for them on the web. I am asking you not to use these materials for the following reasons:

1. Presumably you are here to learn how to best design, implement, and manage corporate IT systems. The best way to do that is to struggle with these issues yourself and with your teammates and classmates. Anything less and you are wasting your time and money as a student and short-changing your long-term growth as an IT professional. Making (and learning from) mistakes today is a very low-cost way to improve your skills. Once you hit the corporate world, the mistakes become very costly.
2. Case analysis is not like algebra where there is a particular answer that the grader is looking for. These cases are typically written with multiple possible recommendations. Don't assume that just because someone in some business school says you should do X, that X is the “correct” way (or even a good way) to approach a particular case.
3. You run the risk that others in the class will come across the same materials, make the same recommendation as you (possibly using very similar words) — which raises huge red flags regarding plagiarism.
4. It damages our classroom discussion. If everyone gives the same recommendation, we don't have the opportunity to fully explore other options — and exploring and learning from other options is part of the joy and excitement of case work.

5. It makes you subservient to the recommendations of others — who may or may not know anything about the underlying technology, IT project management, etc. One of the premises of the MISM/MSIT program is that people with a strong IT background will be able to do a better job managing IT projects than others who don't have a tech background. I'm assuming that's why you are here and not somewhere else.

So, for the sake of your professional development, our classroom discussion, your academic integrity, and your pride in your degree program, using someone else's case “solutions” is a bad idea. However, if you insist on using these resources, you must cite your sources in the body of your report and on your slides, whether you use direct quotes from them or not. You are, of course, perfectly free (and encouraged) to research any of the companies or issues that we discuss in class. I am just asking that you not use outside discussions of the cases themselves.

### **Course Web Site:**

Web: <http://canvas.cmu.edu>

We will use the Canvas site for course information and announcements. If you are registered in the class, you should already have access. Your login id is your andrew id and password.

If you are on the wait list, you should still be able to access the site with your Andrew login (apart from the student's resources section). If this does not work, please e-mail any of us to obtain temporary access.

The web site has an up-to-date copy of the syllabus, schedule, pertinent documentation, A/V, and any class announcements. While I will try to make announcements both in class and on the web site, it is a good idea for you to check the web site regularly. Additionally, the web site has links to class readings and relevant sites mentioned in class and more extensive background material.

### **Grading and Course Requirements:**

You will be evaluated on the basis of your case analyses, participation in discussions, case presentations, assessments, and an individual final assessment handed out at the end of the mini. Your case analyses will be graded as group work. Your grades for the final assessment and discussion forum participation will be your own.

The final grade for the course is distributed among various assignments and activities as follows:

1. Case Analysis & Virtual Case Presentations: 50%
2. Peer Evaluations of Case/Presentations: 10%
3. Class Discussions and Participation (Forum/Chat/Intro Profile/Individual Effort): 28%
4. Individual Final: 12%

In this course, you are not given grades for work you perform, rather, you are paid in dtBucks which will be redeemed at the end for your final grade. The breakdown for payments for your work is as follows:

<b>Consultant Tasks:</b>	<b>Total # of Tasks</b>	<b>Earning Potential</b>
Profile/Surveys	5	\$200.00
Piazza Participation	5	\$2,100.00
Peer Evaluations	5	\$1,000.00
Class Participation	10	\$500.00
Written/Presented Cases	5	\$5,000.00
Final Assessment	1	\$1,200.00
	28	\$10,000.00

Earning potential equates to the max you can earn for the total number of that specific task (EP/TT=Single Value).

Piazza Discussion Participation: The quality of our learning environment is contingent on effective and informed participation of each class member. The goal here is not to dazzle us with your individual brilliance or with the number of comments you make, but rather to help make the class smarter. Note that, in addition to providing new insights to the discussion, it is possible to make the class smarter by asking the right question or by assimilating comments from other students or sources.

The piazza analyses are designed to help you participate in an effective manner outside of class. The quality of your comments and your ability to build on and respond to threads in a conversation about all issues will be considered in assigning your participation grade.

It is important to note that piazza contribution is assessed on an individual basis. This is inherently a subjective assessment but will take the following factors into account:

Grading Rubric (25% per criteria below):

- Preparation, original thought/contribution (reflects a perspective building from discussions in class), contributed to original scenario/question.
- Ability to coherently present arguments and to contribute to a discussion (vs. creating new threads), development of thought (Full explanation, details, insights).
- Ability to influence and persuade others in class to agree with your opinion, or to provide a thoughtful critique to another thought (beyond general agreements) with elaboration.
- Meets deadlines, is error free, contains references, and meets or exceeds required length.

Case Analysis: You case analysis grade is based on a 2-page write-up (1 to 1.5-spacing, 12-point Time New Roman font, 1-inch margins) + up to 3 exhibit pages. You case submission is ***due to Canvas by midnight the day before the case is discussed in class.***

I will also assign groups to present their recommendations to class. Your write-up and presentation should address the issues raised in the case narrative and associated discussion

questions. However, you are encouraged to go beyond the set of questions that I give you to seed the discussion and to use additional resources to research the background of the firms as you see fit. Case analysis documents are group work and should adopt the following perspective:

- a. What are the business/strategic drivers of process digitization in the particular environment being analyzed?
- b. What is the role of IT architecture in either enabling or inhibiting process digitization?
- c. Given your knowledge of technologies to date, do you agree with the choice of technologies and the manner in which the technologies were deployed in process digitization?
- d. Did the case describe the organizational challenges encountered in process digitization? Do you agree with the manner in which the organizational challenges were dealt with? If the case did not describe organizational challenges, what do anticipate them to be and what are your recommendations for overcoming them?

The format for the case write-up is contained in a handout that will be provided in class. For the presentations, you should target 15 minutes of prepared comments, but with enough backup slides/information to answer any questions that might arise about your recommendations.

*Grading Rubric:*

**Analysis (60%)** - understanding of the case and the issues highlighted, and solid reasoning for your argument/recommendation based on the research questions presented. Addresses all Q&A clearly with grounded information (real-time and on Canvas).

LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY	Exemplary (9.8-10)	Accomplished (8-9.7)	Developing (5-7.9)	Needs work (1-4.9)
<b>Problem Scoping</b>	Clearly defines the problem, its boundaries and the project's scope.	Defines the problem, with an understanding of its boundaries and the project's scope.	Sometimes makes contributions to defining the project's scope, but ideas are vague.	Does not make contributions to define the project's scope.
<b>Problem Solving</b>	Reviews multiple approaches for solving the problem that identifies a grounded approach within the specific context.	Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context.	Identifies only a single approach without other considerations for solving the problem but that applies within the specific context.	Identifies one or more approaches to solving the problem but that do not apply within the specific context.
<b>Technology and Managerial Implementation (strength, testing, evaluation, quality)</b>	Clear knowledge and know-how to research and implement appropriate technologies for the project. This could include areas out of scope that add value and were approved.  Business and	Some knowledge and understanding of the technology to incorporate within the project are displayed. Technical needs are mostly met to provide adequate project delivery and a solution to the problem area identified by the case problem.	Vague incorporations or directions of technical research and implementations. Technical needs are still in development but show signs of creating a solution to the client problem but may not be met within the project.	No knowledge or understanding of the technology to be incorporated within the project, technical needs are not met, or do not work.  No cohesiveness between business and technical constraints.

	technological decisions are synergistic.	Business and/or technical decisions may show some minor lack of cohesiveness.	Business and/or technical decisions may show major lack of cohesiveness.	
<b>Generates valid conclusions/decisions and considers the audience</b>	Recommended solution is based on stated criteria, analysis and constraints and considers other options. Case expectations are fully met or exceeded. Considers not only current but future scope.	Solution/decision is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints defer different recommendations. Case expectations are mostly met.	Solution/decision is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints may have led to different recommendations. Case expectations are somewhat met.	Only one solution is considered, or other solutions were ignored or incompletely analyzed. Many constraints and criteria were ignored. Case analysis shows poor project outcomes.

**Content (30%)** - based on the use of assigned readings, other resources, and supporting examples.

<b>LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY</b>	<b>Exemplary (9.8-10)</b>	<b>Accomplished (8-9.7)</b>	<b>Developing (5-7.9)</b>	<b>Needs work (1-4.9)</b>
<b>Identifies relevant &amp; valid sources of information to support decision-making through research</b>	<p>All relevant information is obtained, and information sources are valid and accurate.</p> <p>Solutions are well supported by a deep and logical connection between research and conceptualizations.</p> <p>Alternatives exploring different facets of use are considered and are appropriately analyzed for feasibility.</p> <p>Identifies appropriate data for analysis and exceeds findings in an optimal methodology to address the problem.</p> <p>Sketches, prototypes, graphs and/or scenarios are used to bring opportunity areas to life.</p>	<p>Sufficient information is obtained, and most sources are valid.</p> <p>Solutions are mostly supported by the information gathered that create a connection between research and concept.</p> <p>Alternatives are considered but are not fully vetted.</p> <p>Identifies appropriate data for analysis and a methodology for addressing the problem.</p> <p>Sketches, prototypes, graphs and/or scenarios are sometimes used or may be slightly inconsistent.</p>	<p>Some relevant information is obtained but information sources are not always valid and accurate.</p> <p>Solutions are not well supported by the information gathered and doesn't show a connection between research and concept.</p> <p>Alternatives exploring different facets of use are rarely considered or are not appropriately analyzed for feasibility</p> <p>Attempts to identify data for analysis but may not understand or have an optimal methodology to solve the problem.</p> <p>Sketches, prototypes, graphs and/or scenarios are used but need a lot of explanation to bring opportunity areas to life or struggle to make the connection.</p>	<p>Insufficient information is obtained and/or sources lack validity and reliability.</p> <p>Solutions have no support by the evidence and nothing to show that the information gathered creates a connection between the research and concept.</p> <p>Alternatives are not considered or are not valid.</p> <p>Does not identify appropriate data for analysis.</p> <p>Sketches, prototypes, graphs and/or scenarios are not used and/or do not bring opportunity areas to life or only cause confusion.</p>

**Presentation (10%)** - clear structure and organization of the case write-up/presentation, following the format requirements, and staying within the page/time limit.

<b>LEVEL OF PROFICIENCY</b>	<b>Exemplary (9.8-10)</b>	<b>Accomplished (8-9.7)</b>	<b>Developing (5-7.9)</b>	<b>Needs work (1-4.9)</b>
<b>Client Skills</b>	Class interactions are professional and productive, eliminates jargon and	Class interactions are mostly professional and productive. Few miscommunications and	Class interactions are somewhat professional and productive. More	Class interactions are unprofessional and/or unproductive. Multiple



	<p>explains ideas well.</p> <p>Demonstrates a high level of comfort and connection with the audience. Speakers respond accurately and appropriately to audience questions and comments.</p>	<p>disconnects with some jargon that may interfere with explanation of ideas. Demonstrates a decent level of comfort with the audience. Speakers respond to most questions accurately and appropriately but may be slow</p>	<p>miscommunications and disconnects with some jargon that may interfere with explanation of ideas.</p> <p>Demonstrates a slight discomfort with the audience. Speakers respond to questions less accurately and appropriately, and/or respond slowly.</p>	<p>miscommunications and disconnects, and full for jargon and misunderstandings of ideas.</p> <p>High degree of discomfort interacting with the audience. Speakers have difficulty responding clearly and accurately to audience questions or never responds.</p>
<b>Presentation Skills (visual, oral, written documentation) for telling the story</b>	<p>Slides are error-free and logically present the main components of the process and recommendations.</p> <p>Material is completely legible, and the graphics highlight and support all of the main ideas. Sentences are grammatical with no spelling errors present.</p> <p>Speakers are audible and fluent on their topic, and do not rely on notes to present or respond.</p> <p>Is an effective summary of the team's efforts and works visually and considers all audiences.</p> <p>Does not run over allotted time but stays within the ideal range (Within 1-2 minutes) or allotted page length.</p> <p>Report is well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic is clearly articulated and easy to follow. Diagrams or analyses enhance and clarify presentation of ideas. Sentences are grammatical and free from spelling errors.</p>	<p>Slides are mostly error-free and logically present the main components of the process and recommendations.</p> <p>Material is completely readable with some slight effort, and graphics reiterate most the main ideas. Sentences are grammatical with minimal spelling errors present that do not hinder the reader.</p> <p>Speakers are mostly audible and fluent on their topic and require minimal referral to notes.</p> <p>Is an effective summary of the team's efforts and is visually appealing and understandable for the audience.</p> <p>May slightly run over time or ends prematurely (2-4 minutes) or is over/under page length.</p> <p>Report is organized and clearly written. In all areas the logic or flow of ideas is clear to follow. Diagrams are consistent with the text.</p>	<p>Slides are not completely error-free and/or logically presenting the main components of the process and recommendations.</p> <p>Material is readable with some challenges, and graphics somewhat reiterate the main ideas. Sentences are seeing grammatical errors with more spelling errors present that start to hinder the reader.</p> <p>Speakers are somewhat audible and fluent on their topic and require continual referral to notes or read directly from slides.</p> <p>Is a slightly less effective summary of the team's efforts and is less visually appealing and understandable for the audience.</p> <p>May run over time (over 2 minutes) or ends prematurely (4-5 minutes), or grossly over or under page length.</p> <p>Report is organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic or flow of ideas is difficult to follow. Diagrams are somewhat consistent with the text.</p>	<p>Slides contain errors and lack a logical progression. Major aspects of the analysis or recommendations are absent. Diagrams or graphics are absent or confuse the audience.</p> <p>Sentences are seeing many grammatical errors with many spelling errors present that completely hinder the reader.</p> <p>Speakers are often inaudible or hesitant, often speaking in incomplete sentences. Speakers rely heavily on notes.</p> <p>Is not an effective summary and does not work visually.</p> <p>The full audience is not considered.</p> <p>Time is well under or over allotted time (5+ minutes) or is extremely over or under page length.</p> <p>Report lacks an overall organization. Reader has to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. Diagrams are absent or inconsistent with the text.</p>

**Final Assessment:** TBD. There will be a take home final assessment handed out in the last week of class and due towards the end of that week. The assessment will ask you to integrate information we have learned across the cases and readings we've covered during the semester.

Peer Review: Since the case analyses and the position paper are group work, I will use a peer review instrument to ensure that feedback from group members about team member contributions are considered in the determination of the final grade.

### **A Note on Regrade Requests:**

We make every effort to return graded assignments within 1 week of their submission. If you believe that your grade is inaccurate, you may request a regrade under the following conditions:

1. Regrade requests must be submitted within 1 week of the date when the grade was returned.
2. Regrade requests must be in writing and must include a copy of the original assignment.
3. Regrade requests must outline the reasons you deserve a higher grade. These will typically be that the grader misread or misunderstood your answer, or didn't take something into account that they should have. For this, you should use the written comments on the assignment as your reference point. Referencing another student's grade is inappropriate and irrelevant. While we do our best to apply an even standard across students, we can't discuss anyone else's grade with you, so we need to deal with the merits of your particular case.
4. I reserve the right to regrade the entire assignment and thus your grade may go up, down, or stay the same. This regrade is considered final.
5. Class participation grades are inherently subjective and not subject to a regrade request. I will make notes on participation at the end of each class and assign grades at the end of the semester based on these notes.

### **Late Submission Policy:**

All late assignments are subject to a grade penalty of 10% per day past the due date/time, with a maximum of 4 days. Anything submitted beyond 4 days past the due date will receive an automatic 0. Teams and individual submissions are subject to the same policy. Any issue with meeting a deadline must be cleared through the instructor and/or TA prior to the submission date/time or will be subject to the penalty.

### **Student Health and Wellness:**

CMU and all classes, including this one, strive to accommodate students in all capacities by creating a learning environment that considers the health and well-being of all students. A review of the university policies regarding health and wellness can be reviewed at:

<https://www.cmu.edu/graduate/current-grad-students/health-and-wellness/index.html>

Graduate student policies can be reviewed at:

<https://www.cmu.edu/graduate/policies/index.html>

Support hotline for students. Lean On Me is an online community support hotline where CMU students can text in and talk anonymously to trained supporters, who are also CMU students:

(412) 530-4700 or send a message on Instagram @leanonme.cmu!

### **Diversity and Inclusion:**

It is my intent that students from all diverse backgrounds and perspectives be well served by this course, that students' learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity that students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength and benefit. It is my intent to present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity: gender, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, and culture. Your suggestions are encouraged and appreciated. Please let me know ways to improve the effectiveness of the course for you personally or for other students or student groups. In addition, if any of our class meetings conflict with your religious events, please let me know so we can make arrangements for you.

The topics that we're covering in this class can be difficult, not just intellectually but emotionally. While I expect there to be rigorous discussion and even disagreement during our class discussions, I ask that you engage in discussion with care and empathy for the other members in the classroom. Aim to disagree without becoming disagreeable. In this class we will not shy away from the uncomfortable. Critically examining and assessing our most basic assumptions and values is not just one of the tasks of philosophy but is an activity vital to living an authentic life. I urge you to have the courage to the uncomfortable in this class. In exchange for your courage, I will work to ensure a classroom environment that supports your taking these intellectual and emotional risks.

### **Course Schedule (subject to modification):**

Week #	Class Topics	Class Dates	Deliverable Submission	Due Dates
1	Intro to the course	6-Jul	Piazza Profile Post (Individual)	7-Jul
	Does IT Matter? / Pgh Smart Cities	8-Jul	Pre-Assessment and Intro to MDB	7-Jul
	Does IT Matter? / Pgh Smart Cities			
2	Debate and Review	13-Jul	Project 1	12-Jul
			Piazza Topic 1	14-Jul
			Peer Evaluation for Project 1 (Individual)	14-Jul
3	Data Adoption and Disruption / Coda Coffee	15-Jul	Project 2	19-Jul
	Data Adoption and Disruption / Coda Coffee			
	Data Adoption and Disruption / Coda Coffee Debate and Review	20-Jul	Piazza Topic 2	21-Jul
			Peer Evaluation for Project 2	21-Jul

			(Individual)	
4	Pipelines Vs. Platforms / DT in the Entertainment Industry	22-Jul	Project 3	26-Jul
	Pipelines Vs. Platforms / DT in the Entertainment Industry Debate and Review	27-Jul	Piazza Topic 3 Peer Evaluation for Project 3 (Individual)	28-Jul 28-Jul
	Disruptive Innovation / DT in Higher Education	29-Jul	Project 4	2-Aug
5	Disruptive Innovation / DT in Higher Education Debate and Review	3-Aug	Piazza Topic 4 Peer Evaluation for Project 4 (Individual)	4-Aug 4-Aug
	Data Privacy / Apple vs. FBI	5-Aug	Project 5	9-Aug
6	Data Privacy / Apple vs. FBI Debate and Review	10-Aug	Piazza Topic 5 Peer Evaluation for Project 5 (Individual)	11-Aug 11-Aug
	Final Exam	12-Aug	Final Exam (Individual) Post-Assessment and Engagement Surveys (Individual)	15-Aug 12-Aug

The second class of each week is pre-recorded and posted on the date listed

All class presentations are on Tuesdays

All class times for presentation days are mandatory (5 total)

All deliverable due date times are 11:59PM EST

Do not confuse due dates with available dates in Canvas

**Heinz Academic calendar:** <https://www.heinz.cmu.edu/heinz-shared/files/img/current-students/heinz-college-academic-calendar-2020-21.pdf>