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ISA 616 LexisNexis Project Analysis

The Dream Team created a well thought out and easily reproducible project with tangible and implementable solutions to LexisNexis to use. Throughout their report, they stayed clear and focused on the solutions bullet pointed and outlined by the company in the project description. Not only did the team provide solutions to managing customer feedback work stream data, a binning process, a dashboard visualization, and analysis relating customer feedback to the NPS, they also discovered insights about the types of companies that are best fit to use the Lexis Nexis services that are provided. In their conclusions and recommendations they stated that companies of the larger scale have a higher sentiment score, and not only did they state that but also provided tangible actions to take because of that fact e.g. “Continue to market heavily to larger firms with potentially larger contracts and approximately 41% operational income growth”. The statistic here gives Lexis Nexis something concrete to go off of and a way to take marketing actions moving forward.

The flowchart at the end of their report clearly organizes their workflow and processes taken to arrive at their conclusions, and would easily allow a LexisNexis employee to repeat their process at a later time after implementing some of their initial suggestions with binning and adding dropdown options to the survey.

The Prestige Worldwide team provided a less complicated but also a far less detailed and comprehensive report. After reading through the Dream Team report I was left searching for details left out but always ended up finding the answer right in front of me, or from a previous section that had gone un noticed before I was able to fully understand the depth of what they were talking about early on in the report (obviously, for an employee of LexisNexis, that would not be an issue as they are more familiar with the context of the report). While Prestige did answer all the questions and address everything listed on the project description by using the NPS data, customer emails, and categorizing the customer phone call complaints, the delivery and organization of the report was far less clear, detailed, or reproducible than the Dream Team’s report.

Prestige appears to have done all the legwork for a good solid project, and the team seems knowledgeable enough and very capable of delivering insights, however, there was no clear section in the report that made clear recommendations or new processes to implement. There was certainly no new, clear insights gained from reading the report that the audience would not have known before. They provided a lot of information in the appendix, however some of it was difficult to read or look at, and should not be included in a final report or presentation such as Appendix 4. In Appendix 4 there are tValues and Pstats that when shown to executives or managers are usually not fully understood, as well as the parameter names being unclear and in a coding format rather than a final report view. Something like this should be left out of a final report.

Based on our in class discussion from Monday knowledge must include three key ingredients, belief, truth, and justification. I think the dream team does a good job at justifying and backing up each of their statements and recommendations, making them truth (assuming all data manipulation processes are sound, and the data was accurate to begin with), and they do believe what they are communicating to be truth as well, otherwise they would not be delivering it to a high profile client. Thus, the Dream Team includes all aspects of knowledge and communicates their processes clearly and efficiently in their well thought out report. Prestige Worldwide team covers the belief and truth aspects of knowledge however they do not provide much of a suggestion or insight to justify. Based on our discussions in class, their report did not do well in translating the data to information, then to knowledge, and then into business intelligence that could be easily implemented for LexisNexis.

With the key stakeholders being Kevin Clark, performance management and Simon Wierman, the product manager the Dream Team’s report was rather technical at times, but at the end they really pull their suggestions together with a simplified flowchart and a table of distinct recommendations. This is high level and easy to follow while being concise and clear about their suggestions, which is perfect for addressing performance management and product manager. After reading the Prestige report I was left with more questions than I had answers, as I would assume the client would be to. The packaging and distribution of their report was not as clear or concise and would not provide the best documentation of processes for reuse.

Based on the Table 1 of Markus (2001) this situation is best represented by the shared work practitioner relationship. There is a general shared understanding of the situation and context but here LexisNexis is asking the students to create a particular procedure of works and will need to know exactly how to reproduce it. The end users (LexisNexis) may not be fully aware of the technology used or the producers settings (students at Miami University with ISA background and specific access or exposure to specified software and programs), but they are both familiar with the technology industry as well as the contextual problem at hand. The relationship also presents itself as shared work practitioner because the client is looking to get advice about how to handle a particularly challenging or unusual situation that is new to their team, and also looking to gain access to observations that spur innovation.

The Dream Team did a great job of following the procedures to their specified audience and provided both an easily producible workflow along with new innovative ideas and insights. This is where Prestige fell the most short. Somewhere along the way Prestige was more involved or wrapped up in the process of what they had to do with the data that their delivery was not as strong. The reproducibility of their process does not lend itself well to what one would consider knowledge. In addition the Prestige team lacked general insight and thus did not provide as useful information from the data in comparison to the Dream Team. Insights are important to deliver especially when presenting to upper level management.