Educational Transformation: A 'Skunk' Team Approach in Reshaping Business Bachelor's Programs in Spain

Abstract

The transformative impact of younger generations and the digitalization wave on traditional educational institutions, such as universities and business schools, is evident. This paper presents a Spanish case study focused on an innovative Business bachelor's program. It showcases the effectiveness of educational transformation achieved through the strategic assembly of a specialized group of faculty members, referred to as a "skunk" team, tasked with leading change in education.

The paper aims to expand the horizon of innovative educational practices by sharing insights garnered from this program. It highlights the program's role in equipping students with the knowledge, skills, and real-world experiences required to meet the evolving demands of socially responsible business leadership in an increasingly complex world.

Leveraging qualitative research, encompassing 39 personal semi-structured interviews, 3 co-creation workshops, and 3 board of trustees meetings, this paper delineates an innovation model tailored for navigating change within Higher Education (HE). Additionally, it encourages HE institutions to strike a harmonious balance between efficient daily management and the systematic cultivation of new opportunities through ideation.

Keywords: Educational Innovation, Higher Education, student experience, skunk team, multidisciplinary programme.

1. INTRODUCTION: WHY LEADERS DON'T INVENT THE BIG THINK

Why good organizations are not able to give birth to new ventures adapted to changing circumstances? Levitt & March (1998) defined the "competence trap", as the phenomenon by which organizations focus all energy to those activities where they were excellent in the past, in an inertial behavior that lead to obsolescence in the long run.

When the environment changes, internal structures require adaptations: resources and capacities that were once valuable are no longer so and must be replaced by others that better respond to the new external demands or to new technological capacities. Organizations that best adapt to external changes are those able to generate new capabilities, and dynamically substitute the previous ones (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000).

Yet maintaining the balance between maximizing efficiency with their current processes, *and* dynamically exploring new opportunities is not easy. Both dynamics are contradictory in nature: experimentation harms productivity (Benner & Tushman, 2003). March (1991) defined the dilemma between the short term and the long term as a conflict between two opposing forces, called "exploitation" and "exploration". Exploitation consists in the fine-tuning of current processes and the re-use of existing knowledge, while exploration is about experimentation and learning in uncertain arenas to develop new competencies. The organizational ability to do both activities at the same time

(ambidexterity) has become one of the main challenges in modern management (Duncan, 1976; Burgelman, 2002; O'Reilly & Tushman, 2004; Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004; Gupta et *al*, 2006; Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008; Chen, 2017).

The resolution of the ambidexterity conflict has been the subject of extensive research, in management literature, with no unique solution yet (Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996; He & Wong, 2004; Auh & Menguc, 2005; Raisch and Birkinshaw, 2008; Raisch et *al.*, 2009). Efficient exploitation is performed through mechanistic processes, with top-down control, central planning and elimination of all variability through standardization, whilst exploration needs fluid and organic structures with more flexibility, learning capacity, process adaptation and entrepreneurial leadership. Specialized organizational units to carry out each function is a good approach to solve the dilemma, in the so-called "structural ambidexterity" (De Visser et *al*, 2010; Chen, 2017), though separating the exploration units from the exploitation ones may generate disconnection and strategic incoherence (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004). O'Reilly and Tushman (2004) point out the need to maintain the same common values; and establish strong linkage mechanisms between exploitative and explorative units through the top management to maintain the strategic coherence. In any case, the sponsorship of senior management is decisive for the maintenance of the exploratory units, which will be questioned by the core of the organization at the slightest opportunity.

1.1. Innovating through skunk works

Skunk teams are "flexible groups empowered to work rapidly with minimal management constraints", which constitute a solution to structural ambidexterity (Biron et *a*l, 2021). Radical innovation requires flexible and autonomous teams which allow exploring radical innovation ideas with freedom and without interference from the core business. (Gwynne, 1997; Kelley & Peters, 2009; Hoang & Rothaemel, 2010; Menguc & Auh, 2010). Since the inception of the new jet engine by Lockheed Martin, many companies adopted the skunk approach to develop new radical projects, mainly in high tech industries (David, 2017).

Skunks are "special teams of passionate intrapreneurs, who are isolated from the rest of their business, given resources and relatively free reign to innovate and develop" (Brown, 2004). These teams work with autonomy and "a general lack of management control and few formal rules and procedures", with urgency, secrecy and direct sponsorship and protection of the top management (Donada et *al*, 2021). They constitute a solution for structural ambidexterity, which, furthermore, enhances radical innovation in traditional organizations (Wilson, 1999; Fosfuri & Ronde, 2009).

Larsson (2019) described seven dimensions that characterizes the skunk team: (1) Isolation: the team is physically secluded from the main organisation, (2) Customer needs: The team seeks to analyze the needs of the potential customers, (3) Focus: The team seeks to direct attention towards the mission at hand, (4) Planning: The team seeks to devote attention to up-front planning efforts, (5) Trusted project manager, (6) Cross-functional teams, and (7) Leveraging overlaps: The team seeks to ensure that potential project overlap are used to optimal capacity.

In our research, we explore the use of skunk teams in mature industry: Higher Education.

1.2. Innovation in Higher Education

Higher Education (HE) is a low velocity industry, where incumbents show high organizational inertia. They are subjected to formal and well-established processes. They are often dependent on public administration constraints, consolidated faculty

profiles and rigid accreditation rules. In fact, HE has enjoyed high entry barriers to competition, and thus, low strategic pressure to innovate even in a fast-changing environment. The best HE institutions have modern campuses, with huge capital investment requirements, difficult to assume by new entrants (Ahmad et *al,* 2015). Furthermore, there is a considerable alumni loyalty to successful university brands and programs (Bulotaite, 2003; Chapleo, 2010). For these reasons the industry has been relatively stable, even while the world economy and the labor markets are undergoing a profound transformation. The world is subject to disruptive forces, including technological change, climate change, global aging or migration crises. But the basic approach to HE has not changed substantially: the industry continues showing a slow pace of internal change, the dominant design of a university program is still based on the professor-in-classroom paradigm, and the product lifecycle is long, especially if it has to be accredited by third parties (certification agencies and public administrations). The relevant indicators for evaluating university institutions haven't change significantly in recent decades. Academic rankings such as The Times Ranking, The QS World University Ranking, or the Shanghai Ranking, assess factors such as research excellence, academic reputation, employer reputation, faculty / student ratio, international faculty ratio and international student ratio, but in few cases, the metrics score innovation, adaptation or institutional transformation to new social or economic contexts.

Business Education (BE) is a subset of HE, which is even more sensible to social and economic changes. The new global environment is driven by rapid technological change and the emergence of disruptive digital technologies which are literally rewriting the operative system of the world's society and economy. Among them, artificial intelligence, the internet of things or advanced robotics (Manyika et *al*, 2013; McKinsey, 2018; 2019). Digital transformation has accelerated well above expectations with the Covid-19 pandemic. Big tech companies are taking over the world's economy. The emergence of China and its fit in the world economy have given way to a new cold war. Massive investments in R&D are taking place by corporations and nations. Political instability has increased, even before the global pandemic. And there is a global demand for sustainability and social responsibility. All these factors strongly influence the new profiles of managers and leaders and so, they influence the educational technologies, methodologies, and purposes in BE. Park (2021), in a study of 304 research articles published in 4 "top-tier" BE journals, finds that the main innovation agendas of BE go through the creation of programs that emphasize teamwork and leadership, with "student-led or centered" approaches. There is an increasing importance of the education on competencies (as opposed to the classical delivery of content). The World Economic Forum (2020) identifies 10 critical skills for the labor market of 2025: analytical thinking and innovation, active learning, complex problem-solving, critical thinking, creativity, leadership, technology use, programming, resilience, and reasoning the merging of business disciplines with data and technology contents, and the growing sensitivity to issues of social and environmental impact to respond to new social and economic scenarios. Business disciplines are increasingly including contents on technology management, data and new information systems (like AI). David Schmittelein, MIT Sloan dean talks about a "tsunami of interest" in data analytics (De Novellis, 2018). Ethics, sustainability and social responsibility. should be embedded throughout business school curricula, beyond classical business concepts (Morovate & Mofateh, 2020). There is also an increasing demand for on-line education, skyrocketed by the Covid-19 pandemic (OECD, 2021). The global e-learning market surpassed USD 250 billion in 2020 and is anticipated to grow at an exponential CAGR of 21% until 2027 (Global Market Insights, 2021). Nikita & Lapina (2017), in another exhaustive analysis of the literature, detect new key success factors in BE. They found seven innovation trends in BE: 1) Partnerships (cooperation between business schools, institutions and industries, collaborative research), 2) competency-based education (cognitive skills and entrepreneurial education), 3) project-based learning, 4) ethical leadership, 5) online

education, 6) financing (new business models), and 7) others (cross-cultural classrooms, corporate social responsibility, lifelong learning skills).

With all these inputs, BS will need to take a multi-disciplinary approach if they are to help solve big world challenges. BS are having a positive impact on society and the environment, but "we need people who can not only innovate, but who also care about the human implications and possible unintended consequences" (Find MBA, 2020).

2. THE CASE OF A 65-YEAR-OLD SPANISH BUSINESS SCHOOL

ESADE (*Escuela Superior de Administración y Dirección de Empresas*), is a top business school accredited by AMBA, AACSB, and EQUIS, ranked 13th of Europe (Financial Times, 2021). It was founded in 1958 in Barcelona (Spain) by a group of business leaders and the Society of Jesus, at a time when Spanish universities (which offered studies in economic sciences or industrial engineering, but not in management) did not respond to the growing demands of professional managers, necessary in a country that was in a rapid industrialization process. ESADE's Bachelor in Business Administration (BBA) was prestigious and widely recognized private title, issued by ESADE without initial official recognition by the public authorities. When Spain joint the European Higher Education Area, this private degree became officially accredited by Spanish university authorities, following the Bologna agreements (1999). During the last two decades, ESADE's priority was focused on academic excellence and internationalization, with an increasing in the ratio of international students and a high level of international faculty. Yet the BBA is still ESADE's university flagship program, with a current in-take of about 450 students per year.

In 2018, a new Director General was appointed. With his arrival, a new strategic plan was approved (*ESADE 2019-2023 Strategic Plan)*. This plan contemplated as a strategic priority the renewal of the undergraduate program portfolio with the launch of a new degree that had to respond to the demand of education of a new leadership profile, socially committed and prepared for the challenges of the 21st century. ESADE, according its original Jesuit values, had the mission of training "competent, conscientious, compassionate and committed leaders". Recovering this legacy, the goal was to devise and design a radical program that would also serve as an experiment, a learning experience, and a model to be scaled, transferred and/ or replicated to other degrees. This program had to test state-of-the-art methodologies and technologies and respond to the new demands of a socially responsible business leader for a better world.

2.1. The process: Selecting a skunk team to develop a new degree in business

As of December 2018, Mr Echebarria selected the "skunk team" responsible for carrying out a conceptual prototype of the new degree, in just 6 months, with a complete open mind. A limited budget was allocated to the first phase, for the diagnosis and the "ideation". Direct and permanent communication with the General Manager was maintained.

The project was developed in three phases:

Phase 1 – Ideation (benchmark+ qualitative research + open innovation)

35 university programs from around the world were analyzed (see the attached table). 39 in-depth interviews were conducted (16 with students from foreign universities, 15

with ESADE students, and 8 with opinion leaders and experts on education and leadership). Based on the initial conclusions, a map of competencies was made and a framework of the fields of knowledge and subjects that the new degree had to incorporate was drawn. All this information was contrasted in three focus groups: one with 4 ESADE students, another with 11 professors, and finally, with a group of 16 external professionals and specialists in HE. This was a “divergent” process, without creativity limitations. The goal was to accumulate knowledge to detect the most innovative trends in BE. With this aim, the skunk team interviewed top opinion leaders, and asked demanding students about the paint points and improvement opportunities (both in methodology and contents) of their university degrees. Books, articles and reports on challenges and trends in pedagogy, leadership, talent, skills were consulted. The team met with headhunters, company executives, and with colleagues from the ESADE Faculty and outside of ESADE; experts in human resources, philosophy, psychology, anthropology and sociology. It was also time to attend international conferences and visit other institutions. All the information consulted was deposited and ordered in a Slack platform. In addition, new players in the sector were identified with whom potentially establish alliances.

Based on this clear diagnosis, a design that incorporated several radical innovations was developed: the new bachelor had to be a multidisciplinary university degree supported on three fields of knowledge: Business (60%), Technology (15%) and Humanities (25%). Subjects had to be taught under three methodological approaches: a) project-based learning (teamwork), b) cognitive skills; and c) Socratic dialogue. The subjects would not be taught in a conventional classroom, but rather the students had to work in projects in a coworking space within a real business park, or in specific facilities (like digital fabrication labs, media rooms or creativity rooms). All projects developed had to have a social impact. Cognitive skills for entrepreneurship would be taught trough a state-of-the-art on-line platform, provided by Minerva, an American university specialized in the “science of learning”, with whom ESADE had to reach a strategic agreement.

This phase lasted 3 months and concluded with this clear draft of the new degree. Furthermore, market research was conducted to seek the best name for the program. It resulted in the name “Bachelor in Transformational Business and Social Impact (BITBASI)”. Once the proposal was approved by the General Manager, it was submitted to the formal pipeline of approval of internal committees, in an “stage-gate” process. By July 2020, the project had been presented and approved by the Portfolio Committee (to evaluate the coherence of the program with the strategic mix of programs at ESADE), the Curriculum Committee (to evaluate ESADE’s capacities to deliver the specific subjects), the CEX (ESADE’s Executive Committee, which had to approve the budget for the launching), the Strategy Committee of the Board of Trustees, the Board of Trustees, and the Ramon Llull University (University to which ESADE belongs), with unanimous acceptance. Everything was ready to land the concept to the real world, using ESADE’s capacities and facilities.

Phase 2 – Innovation phase: Implementing the idea

Once the design was approved, it was time about putting the new design into practice, with the limitations of the original organization, interacting with the core business processes (among them, Admissions, Marketing, Academic Planning, and IT), adapting them to new needs and thus inducing new organizational learning. At the same time, internal capacities had to be expanded with new partnerships that would respond to these new needs when internal processes were not able to do so. The new phase was a "convergence" one. It was time to land ideas pragmatically using the organization's resources, or complementing them with external partnerships. In parallel with the academic design and with the arrangement of the facilities, the program begun to be commercialized internationally. To lead this more executive phase, the skunk team was completed with a “learning experience” designer, who was specialist in digital fabrication

(part of the degree was developed in a digital manufacturing laboratory), a philosophy professor, and the manager of ESADE Creapolis (ESADE innovation park, annexed to the academic facilities, where the co-working space had to be built). To teach cognitive skills, a strategic agreement was signed with an education innovator start-up specialized in the science of active learning. The multidisciplinary team worked concurrently, in several fields. The core academic management team were in charge of detailing the academic contents, preparing the official accreditation reports for the new degree and delivering the informative sessions and open days to potential students. Furthermore, each member of the skunk team was in charge or his/her main expertise.

Phase 3- Execution & Scaling up

On September 6, 2021, the skunk team welcomed the first BITBASI intake. 44 selected students, from 27 nationalities. The students had passed the ESADE conventional admission test, but they were also required to have a personal interview and a personal skills test (to measure growth mindset, curiosity and social impact). The goal for the first intake (minimum of 40 students) had been widely reached. In fact, ESADE received 180 applications, 44 students were accepted and 38 students more remained in the waiting list.

It was time to transfer the ownership of the project from the skunk team from to the core organization of the Business School, as a part of the official portfolio, and becoming under the responsibility of the Dean. Continuous improvement and cost reduction programs were initiated. From a phase of product innovation, a new phase of process innovation came, where the challenge was to maximize productivity and operational excellence, and scale it up to a higher number of students and potential new sections.

Finally, in October 2021 arrived the official accreditation approval by the university public authorities. BITBASI was, this way, included in the framework of the European Higher Education Area.

3. INSIGHTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The lessons learned were exported to other programs: some of the new designed courses, such as the digital fabrication project, began to be partially incorporated into traditional programs in the 2021-2022 academic year. The methodology and technology provided by Minerva was also transferred to the Executive Education area, which started to offer new programs in partnership with this university. Finally, the learnings of the skunk team enabled the BS to develop the Esade Innovation model (see Table I), which was followed for the development of a new bachelor, launched the following academic year.

Table 1. Esade Innovation Model. Source: Authors' own work.

	Ideation	Innovation- Implementing the idea	Execution – Program deployment & improvement
Programme Development			
Goal	Draft a Prototype	Build the prototype considering all dimensions	Start & scale up the program without incidences

		(technological, regulatory, faculty, spaces)	
Responsibility	General Management	Transfer from General Management to Dean	Dean
Key Success Factors	Freedom, think out of the box, not constrained by internal processes	Sponsorship from the General Management. Incentives to the Faculty to innovate.	Executive profiles. Good knowledge of the internal processes, but willingness to change routines
Interaction with the core business	Independent of the core business	Circular ambidexterity (training to some core business units). Co-creation of new processes with them. Communication	Aligning processes and KPIs, with less freedom to decide
Acceptance	No interest.	Rejection by some faculty/ managers. Mistrust. Fear to internal competition for resources or to business cannibalization	General acceptance and interest to participate.
Skunk Team features			
Isolation	A secluded office -lab- was prepared	The team went on working in the lab	Operations in a specifically adapted classroom, in the academic campus.
Customer needs	An exhaustive study of potential new customers and needs was conducted	Co-creation of services with some specific units to attract lead users (first students)	Maximizing student experience on campus.
Focus	Focus on external references: divergent phase. Idea from scratch.	Product innovation. Focus on overcoming internal constraints: convergent phase.	Process innovation. Focus on maximizing student experience, profitability and efficiency
Planning	Market research & benchmark	Overcoming internal constraints: technology, facilities, academic rules, faculty needs,	Academic calendar, faculty planning and

		commercialization, partnerships and alliances	budget allocation & control
Trusted Project Manager	Marketing professor, expert in market research and understanding	Innovation Professor, expert in Innovation Projects	Experienced professional manager
Cross Functional Team	External team (open innovation)	Internal cross-functional team (marketing, innovation, engineering, philosophy, facilities, administration…)	Internal cross-functional team (marketing, innovation, engineering, philosophy, facilities, administration…) reinforced with a Program Manager
Leveraging overlaps	No overlaps	Leveraging interactions with Admissions Department to attract the first intake, and with IT and facilities to prepare the BITBASI classroom (co-working space)	Leveraging interactions with all academic processes

The project demonstrated the ability of a HE institution to anticipate market needs and innovate in radical ways. Part of the success was due to the configuration and philosophy of the skunk team, within an organization that had not radically innovate in its bachelor portfolio in 60 years. The team was directly sponsored by the General Management, who made this project his flagship.

In the development process, we have identified the following key success factors:

Sponsorship and autonomy: The team worked under the principles of a skunk team: autonomy and little management constraints. The project was a personal initiative of the Director General, sponsored directly by him with the validation and support of the Board. Communication with the Director General was direct and fluid. The team worked with autonomy and independence from the hierarchy of the organization.

Stage-gate control and time pressure: The project had three different phases, and underwent specific milestones defined in time. The different steps were validated by the internal committees in a go-no-go process.

Leadership adapted to the different phases of the process. The first phase of ideation/divergence was led by a professor with a market-orientation profile. This phase allowed a process of incorporation of internal ideas and work with outsiders (open innovation). A second phase of innovation/convergence (practical application of new ideas) led by an expert professor in innovation, more executive and oriented to the resolution of problems with limited resources and with the restrictions of the core organization. And a third phase of implementation and scaling up, led by an experienced manager, who knew very well the detailed processes of the core business, and oriented

to process improvement. The responsible in charge were “institutional builders”, committed with the ESADE brand, experienced in management, and with generalist profiles not too biased towards research or teaching. Ownership of the project was smoothly transferred from one leader to the other in each phase, without the former leaders leaving the project.

Partnerships: With defined budgetary objectives, it was important to complement own capacities with external capacities. The team leveraged external capacities from the beginning, both in the open innovation phase or looking for appropriate partnerships in the innovation phase (as was the case of Minerva University).

Feedback and circular ambidexterity: The ability of the skunk team to train the different departments of the need to adapt / transform their internal processes for the new requirements. From Admissions to IT, different internal departments needed the knowledge and push of the skunk team to innovate in their regular tasks. New student profile, new role for teachers, new international and strategic alliances, new technological platforms, new space and type of classrooms, new system for allocating hours, new relationships with companies and professional careers were required. The skunk team worked concurrently with many internal departments to redesign processes for the new program, in a kind of feedback or “circular ambidexterity” from the exploring activities to the exploitation structures, generating this way new organizational learning.

Communication and coordination within the skunk team and across the organization: Especially in the initial phases, an intense internal communication exercise was carried out, inviting teachers and / or management team to participate in the project or to contribute ideas. The department directors were permanently informed of the evolution of the project. The skunk team established weekly internal coordination meetings. Especially in the initial phases, an intense internal communication exercise was carried out, inviting teachers and / or management team to participate in the project or to contribute ideas. The department directors were permanently informed of the evolution of the project. The skunk team established weekly internal coordination meetings. Specific coordination teams were established in the areas of marketing, infrastructures and faculty, led by members of the skunk team.

Faculty incentives: Attracting consolidated, well-recognized professors to the new program was not easy since they had to be trained in the new methodologies and had to prepare specific content. To achieve this, specific financial incentives were agreed with the Faculty Vice-Dean.

Reason to believe: The project was aligned with ESADE's humanistic and Jesuit legacy. The project not only represented an inspirational innovation challenge for ESADE, but also contributed to something transcendent: the generation of new humanist leaders and agents of change for a better world.

In conclusion, this case study illuminates the remarkable journey of educational innovation undertaken by the Spanish institution, exemplifying how higher education can not only respond to evolving market demands but also lead radical transformation within its academic offerings. The success of this endeavor was underscored by several pivotal factors. It was made possible by visionary sponsorship and autonomy, with unwavering support from our Director General, who embraced this project as his flagship initiative. The adoption of stage-gate control and a sense of time urgency propelled the project through distinct phases, each helmed by leaders adeptly suited to the task at hand. Collaboration and partnerships, both internal and external, augmented the skunk teams’ capabilities, ensuring a well-rounded approach to innovation. Circular ambidexterity ensured that our institutional processes evolved in tandem with our pedagogical

innovations, creating a dynamic learning ecosystem. Effective communication and coordination, both within the skunk team and throughout the organization, fostered a culture of shared purpose and commitment. Faculty incentives and a clear "reason to believe" in our mission further catalyzed our journey.

Furthermore, in embracing these key success factors, not only reimagined education was considered but also upheld the enduring values of the institution, producing a new generation of humanist leaders dedicated to positive change in the world.

Finally, this case study stands as a testament to the power of innovation in higher education and offers valuable insights for institutions seeking to chart a similar path of transformation and excellence. However, when changing the educational landscape and setting new standards for higher education, as change agents, Business Schools and universities cannot do this alone, and need to look for co-creating ecosystems, and the right climate of cooperation to move forward towards an aligned purpose.

4. AKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our gratitude to all the individuals, institutions, companies, professional experts who have directly or indirectly contributed through their opinions, experiences, insights, or feedback, dedicating their time and involvement to drive innovation in the university sector.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, I., Zafar, M. A., & Shahzad, K. (2015). Authentic leadership style and academia's creativity in higher education institutions: intrinsic motivation and mood as mediators. *Transylvanian review of administrative sciences*, *11*(46), 5-19.

Auh, S., & Menguc, B. (2005). Balancing exploration and exploitation: The moderating role of competitive intensity. *Journal of business research*, *58*(12), 1652-1661.

Benner, M. J., & Tushman, M. L. (2003). Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited. *Academy of management review*, *28*(2), 238-256.

Birkinshaw, C. B., & Gibson, J. (2004). Executive briefing: The ambidextrous organisation'AIM Stage 3.

Biron, M., De Cieri, H., Fulmer, I., Lin, C. H. V., Mayrhofer, W., Nyfoudi, M., ... & Sun, J. M. J. (2021). Structuring for innovative responses to human resource challenges: A skunk works approach. *Human Resource Management Review*, *31*(2), 100768..

Bulotaite, N. (2003). University heritage—an institutional tool for branding and marketing. *Higher Education in Europe, Vol. XXVIII, No. 4, December 2003*, *28*(4), 449-454.

Burgelman, R. A. (2002). Strategy as vector and the inertia of coevolutionary lock-in. *Administrative science quarterly*, *47*(2), 325-357.

Brown, T. E. (2004). Skunk works: A sign of failure, a sign of hope?. *Innovation, entrepreneurship and culture: The interaction between technology, progress and economic growth*, *130*.

Chapleo, C. (2010). What defines “successful” university brands?. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *23*(2), 169-183.

Chen, Y. (2017). Dynamic ambidexterity: How innovators manage exploration and exploitation. *Business Horizons*, *60*(3), 385-394.

David, H. (2017). Human-computer interaction: The elephant in the corner. In *Contemporary Ergonomics 2008* (pp. 257-263). Taylor & Francis.

De Novellis, M. (2018) Extracted from https://www.businessbecause.com/news/mba-jobs/6475/indian-school-of-business-dean-says-employers-are-fighting-over-mba-students?sponsored

De Visser, M., de Weerd-Nederhof, P., Faems, D., Song, M., Van Looy, B., & Visscher, K. (2010). Structural ambidexterity in NPD processes: A firm-level assessment of the impact of differentiated structures on innovation performance. *Technovation*, *30*(5-6), 291-299.

Donada, C., Mothe, C., & Alegre, J. (2021). Managing skunkworks to achieve ambidexterity: The Robinson Crusoe effect. *European Management Journal*, *39*(2), 214-225.

Duncan, R. B. (1976). The ambidextrous organization: Designing dual structures for innovation. *The management of organization*, *1*(1), 167-188.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they?. *Strategic management journal*, *21*(10-11), 1105-1121.

Fosfuri, A., & Rønde, T. (2009). Leveraging resistance to change and the skunk works model of innovation. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *72*(1), 274-289.

Gwynne, P. (1997). Skunk works, 1990s-style. *Research-Technology Management*, *40*(4), 18-23.

Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The interplay between exploration and exploitation. *Academy of management journal*, *49*(4), 693-706.

He, Z. L., & Wong, P. K. (2004). Exploration vs. exploitation: An empirical test of the ambidexterity hypothesis. *Organization science*, *15*(4), 481-494.

Hoang, H. A., & Rothaermel, F. T. (2010). Leveraging internal and external experience: exploration, exploitation, and R&D project performance. *Strategic management journal*, *31*(7), 734-758.

Kelley, D. J., Peters, L., & O'Connor, G. C. (2009). Intra-organizational networking for innovation-based corporate entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *24*(3), 221-235.

Larsson, A. (2019). The seven dimensions of skunk works: A new approach and what makes it unique. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, *21*(1), 37-54.

Levitt, B., & March, J. G. (1988). Organizational learning. *Annual review of sociology*, *14*(1), 319-338.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization science*, *2*(1), 71-87.

Manyika, J., Chui, M., Bughin, J., Dobbs, R., Bisson, P., & Marrs, A. (2013). Disruptive Technologies: Advances That Will Transform Life. *Business, and the Global Economy*, *180*, 17-21.

McKinsey Global Institute (2018). Notes from the AI frontier: Modelling the impact of AI on the world economy. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/artificial-intelligence/notes-from-the-ai-frontier-modeling-the-impact-of-ai-on-the-world-economy

McKinsey & Company (2019). Navigating a world of disruption. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/innovation-and-growth/navigating-a-world-of-disruption

Menguc, B., & Auh, S. (2010). Development and return on execution of product innovation capabilities: The role of organizational structure. *Industrial marketing management*, *39*(5), 820-831.

Morovati Sharifabadi, A., & Mofateh Zadeh, E. (2020). The evolution of university entrepreneurship over the past 20 years: A bibliometric analysis. *Entrepreneurship Education*, *3*, 457-488.

Nikitina, T., & Lapina, I. (2017, July). Overview of trends and developments in business education. In *Proceedings of The 21st World Multi-Conference on Systemic, Cybernetics and Informatics (WMSCI 2017)*.

O Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2004). The ambidextrous organization. *Harvard business review*, *82*(4), 74-83.

Park, Y. E. (2021). A data-driven approach for discovery of the latest research trends in higher education for business by leveraging advanced technology and big data. *Journal of Education for Business*, *96*(5), 291-298.

Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *Journal of management*, *34*(3), 375-409.

Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational ambidexterity: Balancing exploitation and exploration for sustained performance. *Organization science*, *20*(4), 685-695.

Tushman, M., & O'Reilly, C. (1996). Evolution and revolution: mastering the dynamics of innovation and change. *California Management Review*, *38*(4), 8-30.

Wilson, J. (1999). Skunk works magic. *Popular Mechanics*, *176*(9), 60-60.

Educational Transformation: A 'Skunk' Team Approach in Reshaping Business Bachelor's Programs in Spain

Dr. Mònica Casabayó
Associate Professor
Department of Marketing
monica.casabayo@esade.edu
ESADE-Business School- Universitat Ramon Llull
Av. Torreblanca, 59
E-08172 Sant Cugat
Tel: +34932806162

Dr. Xavier Ferràs
Associate Professor
Department of Operations, Innovation and Data Sciences
xavier.ferras@esade.edu
ESADE-Business School- Universitat Ramon Llull
Av. Torreblanca, 59
E-08172 Sant Cugat
Tel: +34932806162