

1. Enterprise Systems for Management Instructor's Manual – Motiwalla & Thompson

<https://www.pearsonhighered.com/product/Motiwalla-Instructor-s-Manual-Download-only-for-Enterprise-Systems-for-Management-2nd-Edition/9780132146517.html>

Once the vendor is selected, it's best to stick with as 'vanilla' of a solution as possible. It will keep costs down and allow easier support and upgrades. But it will require changes in employee habits. The resistance that will come from employees forced to change how they work is absolutely unavoidable, so with a vanilla implementation, managers must be prepared to deal with the resistance and have the confidence to coach employees through the changes.

2. Challenges in Implementing Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system in Large Organizations:

Similarities and Differences Between Corporate and University Environment

<http://ic3.mit.edu/ResearchSamples/2013-07.pdf>

Working Paper CISL# 2013-07

May 2013

Goeun Seo

... Furthermore, the literature indicates that ERP implementations have sometimes failed to achieve the organization's targets and desired outcomes. Much of the research reported that the failure of ERP implementations was not caused by the ERP software itself, but rather by a high degree of complexity from the massive changes ERP causes in organizations (Scott & Vessey, 2000; Helo et al., 2008; Maditinos, Chatzoudes & Tsairidis, 2012).

These failures can be explained by the fact that ERP implementation forced companies to follow the principle of 'best practices' in most successful organizations and form appropriate reference models. (Zornada & Velkavrh, 2005) According to Helo et al., (2008), "Unlike other information systems, the major problems of ERP implementation are not technologically related issues such as technological complexity, compatibility, standardization, etc. but mostly [about] organization and human related issues like resistance to change, organizational culture, incompatible business processes, project mismanagement, top management commitment, etc.". Huang, Chang, Li and Lin (2004) presented the top ten risk factors causing ERP implementation failure (See Table 1-1 below).

Table 1-1. Top ten risk factors of ERP risk (Huang et al., 2004)

- 1 Lack of senior manager commitment
- 2 Ineffective communications with users
- 3 Insufficient training of end-users
- 4 Failure to get user support
- 5 Lack of effective project management methodology
- 6 Attempts to build bridges to legacy applications

- 7 Conflicts between user departments
- 8 Composition of project team members
- 9 Failure to redesign business process
- 10 Misunderstanding of change requirements

3. METIRI GROUP's identification of CCSD IT management failure

<http://ccsd.net/resources/technology-information-systems-services/ccsd-tech-plan-2012.pdf>

Gap Analysis

The gap in the business of education in CCSD is the lack of Districtwide integration of operational and educational systems, which results in a lack of automated business intelligence. The following list represents evidence of the gap:

System of Governance. *There is a lack of a system of governance to provide guidance, prioritization, communication, collaboration, cost/benefit analysis, training, etc., with respect to business/IT solutions.*

Enterprise Architecture. *There is a lack of cohesive enterprise architecture, evidenced by siloed system implementations, lack of integration among systems, and resistance to change.*

4. Information Capsule Research Services

MAJORITY OF ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING (ERP) PROJECTS FAIL - M-DCPS IS A RARE EXCEPTION

<http://drs.dadeschools.net/InformationCapsules/IC1108.pdf>

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Office of Assessment, Research, and Data Analysis

Vol. 1108 - March 2012

Christie Blazer, Supervisor

Many studies have found that when ERP systems are first installed, employees actively resist the changes and try to continue doing their jobs the old, comfortable way. Employee resistance to change is often caused by unfamiliarity with the rationale for implementing the ERP system in the first place; lack of user involvement in decisions relating to implementation; lack of visible top management support and commitment; and insufficient user training and education (Bhagwani, 2007; Wong et al., 2005; Ligus, 2004; Benchmarking Partners, 1998).

5. Science Direct

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212017313002120>

Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System Implementation: A case for User participation

Samwel Matende1 and Patrick Ogao

Abstract

The introduction of an information system such as Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system in an organization brings with it changes on how users work. An ERP system cuts across the different functional units of an organization and therefore if not properly managed during its implementation may lead to resistance from the users. The different streams of research on ERP systems have mainly been on ERP adoption, success measurement, and critical success factors (CSFs). There is a paucity of studies on user participation and the contribution of users towards the successful implementation of ERP systems. This paper reviews literature on ERP implementation with an aim of building a case for involving users in this implementation.

6. The Business Impact of Change Management

By Natalie Petouhoff, PhD, Tamra Chandler and Beth Montag-Schmaltz

Graziadio Business Review, Graziadio School of Business and Management

Pepperdine University

<http://gbr.pepperdine.edu/index.php/issues/?issue=2006%20Volume%209%20Issue%203>

...

A study done by ProSci, a recognized leader in change management research, again pointed to the ability of the organization to efficiently and effectively manage the changes the project was bringing about in the organization.[9] The ProSci results showed that a project's greatest success factors are the following:

1. Effective and strong executive sponsorship
2. Buy-in from front line managers and employees
3. Exceptional teams
4. Continuous and targeted communication
5. Planned and organized approach

The ProSci study results also showed that a project's greatest obstacle factors are:

1. *Employee resistance at all levels (Surprisingly, the effectiveness or correctness of the actual business solution, process, or system changes was cited only 5 times in over 200 responses.)*
2. *Middle-management resistance*
3. *Poor executive sponsorship*
4. *Limited time, budget, and resources*
5. *Corporate inertia and politics*

Another study by AMR Research, a firm whose analysts focus on independent, leading-edge research that bridges the gap between business and their technology solutions, found companies that had successful software implementations spent 10 to 15 percent of their project budget on OCM.[10] All of the success criteria found in each of these studies is what comprises an OCM program that increases a project's ROI.

Organizational Change Management (OCM)

These studies show that many different analysts and research companies have found very similar results. Clearly, continuing to deploy projects without change management is not a profitable way to do business. The purpose of OCM is to mitigate the risks of a project, including costs, scheduling, and performance. OCM does this by facilitating greater economic value faster by effectively developing, deploying, and aligning the company's assets for a given project.

7. Lessons learned from a government ERP failure

Panorama Consulting Solutions

http://go.panorama-consulting.com/LessonsLearnedFromaGovernmentERPFailure_Download.html

... **Poor business requirements and system design.** As mentioned previously, our State client identified more than 400 gaps between its business requirements and the capabilities of its chosen financial ERP system. This is partially due to the fact that it was trying to forcefit a solution that wasn't necessarily a good fit for the organization. *Other contributing factors included organizational resistance to the functionality of the new software and the embedded business processes*, as well as poor management of scope and project controls. These three factors led the State to customize more of the software than it should have.