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## 1. Annotation

### Course Description
The successful development of innovative technology ventures depends substantially on how well their intellectual property (IP) assets are protected, managed and leveraged. For technology entrepreneurs, skill in the management of IP is at least as important as skill in managing technology, people, organizations and business.

It is almost impossible for engineers or scientists to avoid confronting issues related to intellectual property. These issues include: the risk of violating the IP rights of others; an obligation to respect the IP policies of one's employer; the need to obtain IP protection for one's own inventions and creative works; the obligation to become involved in the management of the IP belonging to one's employer; generating strategies for extracting value from one's intellectual assets; and the challenge of ensuring that one's own IP rights are not infringed by others, including by one's own employer or one's clients. In addition, given that such a large amount of contemporary business—in both the private sector and government— involves outsourcing and inter-organizational collaboration, expertise in the licensing of intellectual property rights is in high demand.

The management of intellectual property may often also involve artfully connecting proprietary strategies with open innovation strategies. This course will survey basic concepts of intellectual property and provide an introduction to a variety of types of intellectual property and IP-related rights, such as patents, copyright, trade secrets, trademarks, design rights, database rights, domain names, and demarcations of origin. The course will also examine the strategic management of IP in the process of technology commercialization, and the resolution of IP-related conflicts between technology-based enterprises. It will place special attention on the IP challenges faced by entrepreneurial technology ventures.
# 2. Structure and Content

## Course Prerequisites
Admission to Masters status at Skoltech.

## 2. Structure and Content

### Course Academic Level
Master-level

### Number of ECTS credits
6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary of Topic</th>
<th>Lectures (# of hours)</th>
<th>Seminars (# of hours)</th>
<th>Labs (# of hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: IP, technological innovation and the IP commercialization process</td>
<td>Introduction: Intellectual property, innovation and technology entrepreneurship. Lecture and organization of coursework and teams.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents: Concepts</td>
<td>Patents: Concepts. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents: Practice</td>
<td>Patents: Practice. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright and Digital Rights Management</td>
<td>Copyright and Digital Rights Management. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management of Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Strategic Management of Intellectual Property. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case. IP Management and University Science.</td>
<td>IP Management and University Science. Classroom case discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing IP data for decision-making (A)</td>
<td>Analyzing IP data for decision-making (A). Training in patent analytics.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing IP data for decision-making (B)</td>
<td>Analyzing IP data for decision-making (B). Training in patent analytics.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case. IP and Software Development.</td>
<td>Case. IP and Software Development. Classroom case discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trademarks</td>
<td>Trademarks. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Secrets; Design Rights</td>
<td>Trade Secrets; Design Rights. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case. IP Issues Facing Students.</td>
<td>Case. IP Issues Facing Students. Classroom case discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts and the licensing of IP rights</td>
<td>Contracts and the licensing of IP rights. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology commercialization &amp; universities</td>
<td>Technology commercialization &amp; universities. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical standards, IP and entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Technical standards, IP and entrepreneurship. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case. IP issues in complex IT development projects.</td>
<td>Case. IP issues in complex IT development projects. Classroom case discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic management of IP in complex technology organizations</td>
<td>Strategic management of IP in complex technology organizations. Lecture and discussion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology License Negotiation Exercise</td>
<td>Two-day team-based technology licensing negotiation game.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Assignments
Written Analyses of Three Assigned IP-related Case Studies.

All students must submit an individually prepared written analysis of three case studies out of four of IP management in technological innovation that will be discussed during the course. Each assessed case analysis assignment will be worth 10% of the total marks for the course. Each written analysis should be about 1,000 words in length (but certainly no more than 2,000 words) and must be submitted before the beginning of the classroom session when it will be discussed. Late submissions will not be accepted. Student may choose any three of these four cases for their assessment.

Intellectual Property Strategy Project

The second assessment in this course will be the Intellectual Property Strategy Project, conducted as a team activity and worth 40% of the total course grade. The primary purpose of the project will be to help students gain competence in the use of IP analytics to conduct strategic analysis of technological innovation and, in particular, to find potential solutions to strategy problems related to the business of technology. To assist in this work, Skoltech has obtained a license to the Cipher IP data and analytics service, which all students will need to learn how to use, and then employ, as part of the project.

Each team will be required to place itself in the hypothetical position of a founding leadership team of a new venture aiming to build a viable business in a contemporary field of technology of interest to one or more members of the team. Each team will need to produce an intellectual property strategy for the entrepreneurial venture, drawing upon its analysis of the chosen technological field using data and analytical tools from the Cipher database and service.

Each individual student will receive a mark for his or her team-based activities based on the team grades, weighted by a confidential peer-review assessment of his or her individual contribution to the team’s work.

Technology License Negotiation Exercise.

The learning experiences of the course will be applied in a Technology License Negotiation Exercise in the form of a game played over two days at the end of the term. During the afternoon of second day of the negotiations each team will make a live classroom presentation reviewing the process and results of its licensing negotiations and of the rationale for its approach adopted during the game. Each team will also be required to submit a written report covering the same subject matter as the classroom presentation and also including a discussion of its members’ new insights about the overall subject matter of the course as a result of playing the game and their reflections about the lessons learnt from playing the game.

Each individual student will receive a mark for his or her team-based activities based on the team grades, weighted by a confidential peer-review assessment of his or her individual contribution to the team’s work.

4. Grading

Type of Assessment | Graded
## Grade Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Activity weight, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Project</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Project</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Grading Scale

- **A:** 80
- **B:** 70
- **C:** 60
- **D:** 50
- **E:** 40
- **F:** 0

**Attendance Requirements:** Mandatory

## 5. Basic Information

### Maximum Number of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Group (for seminars and labs)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course Stream
- **Entrepreneurship and Innovation (E&I)**

### Course Term (in context of Academic Year)
- **Term 4**

### Course Delivery Frequency
- Every year

### Students of Which Programs do You Recommend to Consider this Course as an Elective?

- **Masters Programs:** All Master Programs
- **PhD Programs:**
### 6. Textbooks and Internet Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Textbooks</th>
<th>ISBN-13 (or ISBN-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four published case studies of IP management issues in entrepreneurial technology settings. To be allocated by the instructor each term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Textbooks</th>
<th>ISBN-13 (or ISBN-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web-resources (links)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.wipo.int/">http://www.wipo.int/</a></td>
<td>World Intellectual Property Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.epo.org/">http://www.epo.org/</a></td>
<td>European Patent Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.euro.ipo.org/searching/free/espacenet.html">http://www.euro.ipo.org/searching/free/espacenet.html</a></td>
<td>Espacenet (worldwide patent search portal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.lesi.org/">http://www.lesi.org/</a></td>
<td>Licensing Executives Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www2.lib.uchicago.edu/~llou/intlip.html">http://www2.lib.uchicago.edu/~llou/intlip.html</a></td>
<td>International Intellectual Property Law, Library Portal (Univ. of Chicago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.miplc.de/links/">http://www.miplc.de/links/</a></td>
<td>Munich IP Law Center, Research Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.dpma.de/english/index.html">http://www.dpma.de/english/index.html</a></td>
<td>German Patent and Trademark Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laptop and Internet access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cipher, patent data analytics service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify, differentiate and understand the various of types of intellectual property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulate and explain a variety of ways in which intellectual property plays a role in technology commercialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligently discuss the integration of intellectual property with the innovation strategies of technology organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the fundamentals of accumulating, managing, implementing and enforcing IP rights, as well as appropriating value from IP assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify intellectual property risks associated with technology commercialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know the fundamentals of designing and negotiating IP licenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate approaches to resolving IP-related conflicts between organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think critically about the international dimension of IP management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and analyze ethical and social issues associated with intellectual property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply IP data and IP analytics intelligently to the development of IP strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate technology license agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in teams to achieve project outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Assessment Criteria

Input or Upload Example(s) of Assignment 1:

Select Assignment 1 Type

Case Study

Input Example(s) of Assignment 1 (preferable)

Assessment One: Written Analysis of Three Assigned Cases (30% of marks)

All students must submit an individually prepared written analysis of three case studies out of four that will be discussed during the course: The
CRISPR-Cas9 Quarrel, Black Duck Software, Mak vs. Canadian Corn Hybrid Research Institute and ARM Holdings: IP Licensing to Internet of Things. Each assessed case analysis assignment will be worth 10% of the total marks for the course. Each written analysis should be about 1,000 words in length (but certainly no more than 2,000 words) and must be submitted before the beginning of the classroom session when it will be discussed. Late submissions will not be accepted. Student may choose any three of these four cases for their assessment.

1A: Instructions for the CRISPR-Cas9 Quarrel Assignment (due 16 April before 4.00pm):
Study the case and write an analysis of the case addressing the following four questions:
(i) Please explain the situation (at the time at the end of the case) with the CRISPR-Cas9 patent litigation, and provide your analysis of how the parties involved got to that point.
(ii) Why did the Broad Institute submit its patent application under an Accelerated Examination Request?
(iii) How do you explain the significant investments made in start-ups that have licensed IP from the parties involved in the CRISPR-Cas9 patent dispute while the litigation was still ongoing?
(iv) Does this case suggest that the U.S. patent system is functioning well for the biotechnology industry, or is it in need of reform? Explain the reasons for your opinion.

1B: Instructions for the Black Duck Software Assignment (due 23 April before 4.00pm):
Study the case and write an analysis of the case addressing the following four questions:
(i) What factors should a major software firm take in to account when deciding whether to use open source software? Are the factors the same for all large technology companies? Are the factors any different for start-ups?
(ii) If you were the CEO of Intel, would you want to know whether your code complies with applicable open-source licenses? If you were a venture capitalist, would you want to know whether a portfolio company’s software was in compliance?
(iii) What is the international market for Black Duck’s products?
(iv) Should Black Duck certify its customers’ copyright compliance? What are the arguments for and against such a certification?

1C: Instructions for the Mak vs. Canadian Corn Hybrid Research Institute Assignment (due 30 April before 4.00pm):
Study the case and write an analysis of the case addressing the following four questions:
(i) What is the invention that Librowicz is attempting to patent?
(ii) Who is the true owner of the invention? Why do Mak and Gravelle have different beliefs as to the ownership of the invention?
(iii) Why did Mak not assert his rights as owner of the invention (as opposed to enquiring what CCHRI would pay him in royalties) prior to agreeing to meet with B3?
(iv) Should Mak be entitled to claim loss of licensing revenues? Explain your position?

1D: Instructions for the ARM Holdings: IP Licensing to Internet of Things Assignment (due 19 May before 4.00pm):
Study the case and write an analysis of the case addressing the following four questions:
(i) What was the main logic behind the decision to establish ARM as a separate company, independent of Acorn?
(ii) Why did ARM choose to focus on IP licensing as its preferred business model?
(iii) What strategies did ARM adopt to maximize the success of its practice of IP licensing?
(iv) Should ARM continue with IP licensing as its primary source of revenue generation after acquisition by Softbank? Explain your position.

Evaluation Criteria for Assignments 1A, 1B, 1C and 1D:
The following scoring system will be used to evaluate all three case-analysis assignments:
1. Depth of analysis and quality of thinking in addressing the first question (10%)
2. Depth of analysis and quality of thinking in addressing the second question (10%)
3. Depth of analysis and quality of thinking in addressing the third question (10%)
4. Depth of analysis and quality of thinking in addressing the fourth question (10%)
5. Structure, overall logic and coherence of analysis (10%)
6. Conceptual richness and intellectual contribution of analysis (10%)
7. Presentation of evidence from the case to justify arguments (10%)
8. Rigor and depth of arguments, strength & elegance of logic (10%)
9. Grammar, spelling, syntax, writing style and presentation of document (10%)
10. Evidence of distinctive excellence (10%)

Each assignment will be graded on a 100-point scale.

Input or Upload Example(s) of Assignment 2:

Select Assignment 2 Type
Team Project

Input Example(s) of Assignment 2 (preferable)

Assessment Two: Intellectual Property Strategy Project (40% of marks)

The second assessment in this course will be the Intellectual Property Strategy Project, conducted as a team activity and worth 40% of the total course grade. The primary purpose of the project will be to help students gain competence in the use of IP analytics to conduct strategic analysis of technological innovation and, in particular, to find potential solutions to strategy problems related to the business of technology. To assist in this work, Skoltech has obtained a license to the Cipher IP data and analytics service, which all students will need to learn how to use, and then employ, as part of the project. Two sessions of the course (19 & 21 April) will be devoted to understanding IP analytics (especially patent analytics) and its potential role in innovation strategy and to learning how to use Cipher as a research and decision-making tool. Those sessions will be led by Mr. Marcus Malek, the Head of Strategy, Aistemos Limited, the London-based organization responsible for the Cipher database, software and service.

During the first week of the course students will be formed into teams. Each team will need to work together throughout the term on the Intellectual Property Strategy Project. Each team will need to prepare a team report about their project, due before midnight on Friday 4 June. In conducting research for the report all teams must make use of the Cipher database and service.

Detailed Instructions for the Intellectual Property Strategy Project

Imagine that your Skoltech team for this course is the founding leadership team of a new venture aiming to build a viable business in a contemporary field of technology of interest to one or more members of your team. Produce an intellectual property strategy for the venture, drawing upon your analysis of the chosen technological field using data and analytical tools from the Cipher database and service.
In conducting the research and analysis to develop the intellectual property strategy for your new venture make sure that your team does the following:

1. Clearly define and describe the general field of technology that will be the focal domain of your new venture. The chosen field must satisfy the following criteria:
   a. It must be a contemporary field of technology that has been either emerging or growing, as demonstrated by contemporary patenting activity;
   b. It must be a field in which there is significant international activity, as indicated by patenting in at least several countries;
   c. It must be a field in which multiple organizations or entities (i.e., companies, universities, institutes or other bodies) are active in the field, as evidenced by either patent applications or patent grants;
   d. It must be a field in which your team believes that there is credible evidence of viable product or market applications for the technology.
   [Note: These parameters represent the minimum threshold for the project. The technological activity may be represented by many organizations in many countries.]

2. Produce a technology landscape of the chosen field of technology, being sure to map constituent technology fields, and technological trends.

3. Produce a corporate landscape of the chosen field of technology, being sure to identify and map the key players (companies, universities, other organizations, and individuals) active in the field, including changes in their relative positions in the field over time. Identify what proportion of the players in the field is represented by the dominant players, and non-dominant players, including individuals.

4. Conduct a geographic analysis of patenting activity in the chosen field of technology, mapping the distribution of activity in the field between countries and/or geographic regions. Compare patenting activity by organizations in their home market compared to foreign markets, make sure to cover at least the top two organizations from each region (EU, US, APAC) or at least the top quartile of organizations responsible for current patenting in the field, whichever is the greatest.

5. Conduct a litigation analysis of the field, identifying which constituent fields of technology and which organizations are represented in litigation. Identify in which constituent field or fields the risk of litigation is likely to be the greatest in the near future. Identify if there are differences between technical fields where litigation is happening and the main technical fields where the organizations are operating (e.g., selling products, selling services or performing research).

6. Develop an intellectual property strategy for your new venture, and a justification for that strategy, that incorporates the results of the above pieces of research and analysis.

7. Address the following topics in your strategy:
   a. How broad will the technological scope of your venture be? Will it seek to cover the whole scope of the technological domain that you have chosen for your analysis, or will it focus on a sub-field or niche of the general technological domain? If it is a sub-field or niche, will the field be:
      - a major field or a minor field?
      - emergent, established-but growing, or maturing?
      - crowded or un-crowded with players?
   b. Will you seek to compete with major established players in the field, compete with emerging new players in the field, or seek to avoid competition?
   c. Will you seek to collaborate or partner with other players within the broader technological domain, or will you seek to operate entirely independently?
   d. In which countries or regions will you engage in patenting?
   e. How much money will your strategy require you to budget for patent costs each year for the next five years?
f. How will your venture generate revenue for its business?
   - Licensing your technology rights to other organizations?
   - Selling your technology rights to other organizations?
   - Operating a business utilizing your technology to produce products or services?
   - Engaging in litigation with other organizations that infringe your intellectual property rights?
   - A combination of the above modes of business?

g. What are the risks of your business being sued during the next five years by other parties?

h. Will you seek to license-in technology from other players in the field, or will you seek to develop all of your own technology independently? If you intend to license in technology from other players, who might those players be, and in what particular focus areas of technology would you seek to obtain in-licenses?

i. After considering all of the above topics and factors in your analysis, what special feature might you incorporate into your strategy to maximize the chances of success of your new venture? Make sure that you support the positions you adopt and arguments that you make in your proposed strategy with appropriate data and analysis from Cipher.

Each team will need to work out for itself how to allocate appropriate tasks to each of its members so that the total project is completed efficiently within the time allowed and so that a single, coherent, quality report is submitted by the deadline.

The deadline for submitting the team report for the project, covering all the topics listed above, will be midnight on Friday 4 June. The maximum size of the report is 10,000 words (excluding appendices).
Peer Evaluation of Individual Contributions to the Team-Based Assessments

Each individual student will receive a mark for his or her team-based activities based on the team grades, weighted by a confidential peer-review assessment of his or her individual contribution to the team’s work. A special form on which the confidential peer-review scores may be indicated will be available for each student to download from Canvas. In other words, one single mark will be allocated to each team for each team activity, but the final mark that each individual team member will receive will be weighted according to peer evaluations from fellow team members. The information provided in the peer evaluations will be kept absolutely confidential.

Each student in the course will be required to evaluate each of his or her fellow team members for their contribution to the team activities. It is compulsory. Failure to submit a peer evaluation will lead to an F grade (“Fail”) grade for the course. The confidential peer evaluation scores, using the Peer Evaluation Form (soft copy to be provided on Canvas), will need to be submitted by each student before midnight on Saturday 5 June.


The following scoring system will be used to evaluate the team report:
1. Quality of Cipher Classifier and approach for your general field of technology (20%)
2. Quality of basic mapping of the corporate landscape of the technology (10%)
3. Depth of characterization of the corporate landscape of the technology (10%)
4. Quality of characterization of the geographic landscape of the technology (5%)
5. Quality of the litigation analysis in the field (5%)
6. Comprehensiveness, cogency and coherence of the proposed strategy (10%)
7. Demonstrated depth of understanding of intellectual property strategy (10%)
8. Degree to which the strategy is supported by appropriate analytics (10%)
9. Rigor, depth and elegance of logic of arguments in the strategy document (10%)
10. Grammar, spelling, syntax, writing style and presentation of document (10%)

Input or Upload Example(s) of Assignment 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select Assignment 3 Type</th>
<th>Final Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 3 Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Example(s) of Assignment 3 (preferable)</td>
<td>Assessment Three: Technology License Negotiation Exercise (30% of marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning experiences of the course will be applied in a Technology License Negotiation Exercise in the form of a game played over two days at the end of the term, Saturday 29 May (9:00am to 6:00pm) and Sunday 30 May (9:00am to 6:00pm). During the afternoon of second day of the negotiations each team will make a live classroom presentation reviewing the process and results of its licensing negotiations and of the rationale for its approach adopted during the game. Each team will also be required to submit a written report covering the same subject matter as the classroom presentation and also including a discussion of its
members’ new insights about the overall subject matter of the course as a result of playing the game and their reflections about the lessons learnt from playing the game. The team report on the Technology License Negotiation Exercise will be due before midnight on Friday 4 June.

Licensing game: Amicon-Jackson-Hemoglobal
Based on the Amicon Corporation case authored by Noel Capon and E. Raymond Corey.
HBS case product number: 9-579-093.

The written materials for the game—a case study of Amicon Corporation, Jackson Industries and Hemoglobal—plus detailed instructions for playing the game will be made available to students via Canvas. Students will be divided into several sets of three teams. Each team member must study the game materials before the game on 29-30 May.

Each team’s scores will be based on the quality of its presentation on Sunday 30 May and on the quality of the team report about the game submitted by Friday 4 June. Twenty five percent of the team grade for the activity will come from the classroom presentation and 75% will come from the submitted written report. Each student will receive an individual mark for his or her work in the Technology License Negotiation Exercise based on peer-review evaluations of his or her contribution to the teamwork. The Instructor will provide a grade to each team based on the quality of its work in the negotiation exercise as exhibited in its classroom presentation during the final session of the game and on the quality of the written team report about the Exercise.

Classroom Discussion of Negotiation Exercise

During the final session on Sunday 30 May each team will review the process and the results of the Licensing Negotiation Exercise, together with the lessons learnt.

Content of Live Classroom Presentation:
- report the results of the negotiation
- discuss whether and to what degree the results were successful (for your team)
- describe the process of the negotiation(s)
- review the strategy and tactics of your team.

Team Report on the Technology Licensing Game
Each team in the course is required to produce a written report based on the Licensing Game played on 29-30 May. The report should describe:
(i) What happened during the negotiation (i.e., describe the process of the game).
(ii) The results of the negotiation, no matter whether or not a successful deal was reached. (If a successful deal was reached, discuss the terms that were concluded in the agreement. If your team was unsuccessful in reaching a deal, please explain why, making sure to identify both the advantages and disadvantages of the outcome).
(iii) Lessons about the process of negotiating technology licenses that have been learnt from playing the game.
(iv) Discussion of fresh insights gained about the overall body of materials, ideas and principles covered during the course as a result reflecting about the process and results of the Negotiation Exercise.

The report should be written in prose, should be properly referenced and, while there is no minimum size for the report, it should be no longer than 5,000 words. Where appropriate, use may be made of pertinent reference materials other than those provided by the Instructor. A summary of preparations and planning conducted by the team prior to the
commencement of the actual game (including supporting materials) may be included, if wished, as an appendix or appendices (not included within the 5,000-word limit). There is no size limit for the appendices to the report.

Please ensure that a member of your team submits the final version of your report to Canvas using your team number and name before the deadline of 4 June before midnight (i.e., by 11.59pm). Only one person from each team needs to submit the report.
Evaluation Criteria for the Classroom Presentation on the Licensing Game

1. Depth and rigor of understanding of case material and issues (20%)
2. Depth of preparation for the negotiation revealed through the presentation (20%)
3. Quality of engagement in the game revealed through the presentation (20%)
4. Degree of group cooperation revealed through the presentation (20%)
5. Quality and depth of insights gained through playing the game (20%)

Evaluation Criteria for the Team Report on the Licensing Game

The following scoring system will be used to evaluate the team report:
1. Thoroughness of the team’s preparation for the game (10%)
2. Quality of description of the process of the game (10%)
3. Comprehensiveness of the license terms (either accepted or rejected) (10%)
4. Level of strategy exhibited in playing the game (10%)
5. Creativity exhibited during planning and negotiations (10%)
6. Quality of explanation of the outcome of the negotiations (10%)
7. Rationale for how the final result was valuable for the team (10%)
8. Lessons learned about the process of negotiating licenses (10%)
9. Quality of insights about course content from reflecting about the game (10%)
10. Overall quality, rigour and excellence of the report (10%)

Peer Evaluation of Individual Participation in the License Negotiation Exercise

In the same manner as for Assessment Two (the Intellectual Property Strategy Project, team assignment) each individual student will receive a mark for the Assessment Three (the Technology License Negotiation Exercise) based on the team grade, weighted by a confidential peer-review assessment of his or her individual contribution to the team’s work.

A special form on which the confidential peer-review scores may be indicated will be made available to each student by the Instructor (via Canvas). In other words, one single mark will be allocated to each team for each team activity, but the final mark that each individual team member will receive will be weighted according to peer evaluations from fellow team members. The information provided in the peer evaluations will be kept absolutely confidential.

Each student in the course will be required to evaluate each of his or her fellow team members for their contribution to the team activities. It is compulsory. Failure to submit a peer evaluation will lead to an F grade (“Fail”) grade for the course. The confidential peer evaluation scores, using the Peer Evaluation Form (soft copy to be provided on Canvas), will need to be submitted by each student before midnight on Saturday 5 June.
Recommended Allocation of Time to Learning Activities

Activity Time Allocation
Lectures, case discussions & other classroom activities 51 hours
Reading and preparatory analysis of first case 10 hours
Reading and preparatory analysis of second case 10 hours
Reading and preparatory analysis of third case 10 hours
Individual contribution to team intellectual property strategy project 30 hours
Presentation of results of team intellectual property strategy project 3 hours
Advanced preparation for licensing negotiation exercise 16 hours
Engaging in licensing negotiation exercise 13 hours
Classroom presentation of results of negotiation exercise 3 hours
Individual contribution to licensing negotiation team report 4 hours
Miscellaneous reading 12 hours
Total expected work time for the course 162 hours

Learning Activities
The learning in this course will take place through a combination of:

• classroom lectures
• study of readings and cases
• lively classroom discussions of lecture material
• classroom-discussion of cases
• a team-based negotiation game (to be played during the last week of the term)
• a team-based project learning and applying intellectual property analytic skills
• classroom presentation of team project results.

Team Activities
Team-based activities will play a substantial role in learning for this course. During the first week of the term all students will be divided into teams. Each team will typically consist of about half a dozen members. An individual grade will be allocated to each student for each team project or activity based on an individual weight applied to the team grade derived from confidential peer reviews of each student’s contribution to the team’s work. This is intended to provide an incentive for all students to contribute responsibly and adequately to team activities; and it will assist in ensuring that all team members receive a fair grade. Each team member will be expected to contribute equitably to his or her team’s work. All students will be required to participate in the formal peer-assessment process that will take place at the end of the term.
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