

BUSMHR 7223 – STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Gerlach 355;

INSTRUCTOR

Kannan Srikanth <https://fisher.osu.edu/people/srikanth.18>
Srikanth.18@osu.edu

Fisher Hall 842

Office Hours: By appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Most large companies, and many quite small ones, are not single businesses but ‘multi-business groups’: i.e., a portfolio of more or less separate strategic business units (SBU) under a single corporate umbrella. Strategy formulation and implementation tends to be more complex for such firms when compared to single business entities. The primary aim of this course is to help students gain an **organization design** perspective on challenges in strategy formulation and implementation, especially in multi-business firms.

This course builds on the foundations of the core strategy course and significantly extends it. It is likely to be a useful complement to courses on corporate finance by providing insights from a strategic perspective. The course is particularly useful for those intending to advise, work in and eventually lead corporate headquarters (business development managers; management consulting) as well as those who intend to evaluate said strategies (analysts and investment bankers).

COURSE POLICIES

Standards of Integrity and Conduct

Each student in this course is expected to be familiar with and abide by the principles and standards set forth in The Ohio State University’s code of student conduct and code of academic conduct. You can view these documents or download pdf versions at:

http://studentaffairs.osu.edu/resource_csc.asp and
<http://www.gradsch.osu.edu/Content.aspx?Content=10&itemid=1>.

It is also expected that each student will behave in a manner that is consistent with the Fisher Honor Statement, which reads as follows:

As a member of the Fisher College of Business Community, I am personally committed to the highest standards of behavior. Honesty and integrity are the foundations from which I will measure my actions. I will hold myself accountable to adhere to those standards. As a future leader in the community and business environment, I pledge to live by these principles and celebrate those who share these ideals.

While most students have high standards and behave honorably, like every academic institution we sometimes encounter cases of academic misconduct. It is the obligation of students and faculty to report suspected cases of academic and student misconduct. Students can report suspected violations of academic integrity or student misconduct to faculty or to a program's leadership. All reported cases of academic misconduct are actively pursued and confidentiality is maintained.

Students with Disabilities

Any student who feels s/he may need an accommodation based on the impact of a disability should contact me privately to discuss your specific needs. Please contact the Office for Disability Services at 614-292-3307 in room 150 Pomerene Hall to coordinate reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities.

Individual Consultations/Office Hours

I am available to discuss any issues of concern to you on an individual basis either after class or in my office. E-mail me to make an appointment for an office visit. So that I can be better prepared for your visit, please give me a general idea of the topic you'd like to discuss. I typically schedule 15 minute appointments; if you believe you will require more time, request a longer appointment.

GRADING

Grading Components

Sometimes alleged cases of academic misconduct arise due to apparent confusion over the degree of collaboration allowed on assignments. University policy clearly states that it is each student's responsibility to resolve issues that appear ambiguous directly with the faculty member. However, to help create clarity and avoid potential misunderstanding, we use the following letters to indicate the degree of collaboration allowed on each assignment:

N: No Collaboration of Any Kind Allowed

T: Collaboration with Teammates Only Allowed

A: Collaboration with All Fellow Students Allowed

U: Unlimited Collaboration with All Fellow Students and Other Parties Allowed

Class Participation	30%	In-class	Individual	N
Case Presentation	20%	In-Class	Group	T
Final Project (Due date: TBD)	45%	Online submission	Group	A
Teammate survey (Due date: TBD)	5%	online	Individual	N

Grading Policies

With the objective of establishing as dynamic and effective a learning environment as possible, the course requires a commitment on your part not only to attend all classes, but to prepare fully and to participate. We will work together to create an environment in which open, rigorous discourse is the standard. Thus, each of you must be willing not only to share your ideas and analysis with your colleagues, but be open to challenges of those ideas.

The following are the fundamental principles for grading in this course:

- The requirements of the course are identical for everyone. This means it is not possible to "make up" for poor performance through "extra credit" work.
- As required by school policy, grading will be based on relative rather than absolute standards.
- It is possible to earn any of the official OSU grades (from A to E) in this course.
- All members in a team will receive the same grade for team activities. *Your individual grade for all team activities may be adjusted downward if a majority of your team members evaluate your contribution unfavourably or upward if you have been a stellar contributor.*

Class Participation

It is important to appreciate that every student is an important part of class discussion, and that it is equally important that each of us listen carefully to one another and attempt to build on or constructively critique prior comments. Please resist the temptation to jump to topics that are not specifically open for discussion. It is also important to note that you are rewarded for your *contribution*, not just participation. Your contribution score will be based on how much you contribute to the class' learning, not just by how much you talk in class. Some of the specific things that will have an impact on *effective* class participation and on which you will be evaluated include:

- Is there a willingness to take intellectual risks and test new ideas, or are all comments “safe”? (Safe comments include repetition of case facts without analysis or conclusions or repeating comments that have already been made by someone else.)
- Are the points made relevant to the discussion? Are they linked to the comments of others and to the themes that the class is exploring together?
- Do the comments add to our understanding of the situation? Are they incisive? Do they cut to the core of the problem?
- Is there a willingness to challenge the ideas that are being expressed?
- Does the participant integrate material from past classes or the readings where appropriate? Do the comments reflect cumulative learning over the course and the MBA curriculum, or does the participant merely consider each case in isolation?
- Is theoretical material applied effectively and appropriately?
- When asked to take a position, do you stick to it or flexible depending on how the discussion progresses in class?

I will assign different class members to be reporters for each class period. These students will note the contributions of their classmates, I will use this record to supplement my own contribution records. Where there are substantial differences in assessment, the student will be given the benefit of the doubt.

Case Presentation

Pre-assigned groups will be presenting their analysis for the case to be discussed each week. In some cases, I will assign the groups selected points-of-view that they need to present. The presenting teams should spend no more than 10 minutes presenting (+5 min for Q&A) discussing the discussion questions assigned for the case.

Please note that the questions are a guide – you do not need to address every question in their order in your presentation, but you do need to address the most important concerns confronting the organization as described in the case. This should include a succinct overview of the issue and how to go about solving it. I highly recommend that you do not use more than 3 slides.

Class participants will be requested to provide feedback on the presentation including analysis depth, clarity of presentation, and quality of responses to questions from the audience.

Final Project

For your final project you will be analysing a strategy implementation plan (such as diversification, acquisition, reorganization, change in incentive structure, outsourcing, strategic alliance, etc) by an organization that you are familiar with. Ideally, the organization you choose will be small enough to be tractable for analysis in limited time (for example, you may wish to choose a specific business unit or geographic unit rather than the entire firm). Please inform me by email of your project choice by the end of the 2nd week. Duplicate projects will not allowed. Companies will be allocated on a FCFS basis.

Written report: Each team should submit one term report. The report should contain the following: (1) A cover page listing team members; (2) Table of contents; (3) Executive Summary;

- Section I: Description of the strategy action: (4) Company Background/History; (5) strategic action (6) stated reasons for this action. You may wish to include reactions to this move by stakeholders, such as the stock markets, analysts, employees, the government, society at large etc., as applicable.
- Section II: Analysis: (7) In your analysis, do you believe this effectively addresses the problem at hand, (8) How would you implement this to maximize value;
- Section III: Supporting Material: (9) List of references; (10) Exhibits (Tables and charts).

The term project report should be type written, double line-spaced, using 12-point size font, and should not exceed 16 pages (excluding cover page, table of contents, references, exhibits, and endnotes). The cover page should provide the complete name of the team members, student ID number, and course code. The deadline will be communicated later. Please submit a softcopy on turn-it-in. Additional information on the term project will be provided in class. Please only submit WORD documents (no PDFs).

Teammate Survey

Each group member will evaluate the contribution of other group members in Carmen on three evaluation criteria on a scale of 1(poor) to 5 (excellent) :

(a) Hygiene: Did member attend meetings, was prepared, was on time, put in effort, worked collaboratively in getting things done, etc.

(b) Contribution: Did member contribute to your understanding of the material, provided food for thought, provide alternative perspectives, played devil’s advocate constrictively, “pulled their weight” intellectually, etc.

(c) Climate: Open to discussion, not opinionated, actively managed conflict rather than perpetuate it, pleasant, helpful, a ‘good person to have around’ vibe, did not waste time or fool around, did not hog airtime, etc.

Please provide comments on each of these criteria that can be shared anonymously with the team member. The objective here is to help your team member understand their strengths and where they may need some work.

Though the overall objective here is to be developmental, scores here will also be used for evaluation purposes; your contribution to these group activities will be used to weigh your score for team based grading components (see last bullet point under grading policies).

COURSE MATERIAL

A course-pack containing the cases will be available for purchase from the university bookshop. Most after class readings are available online from the library.

Note: All after-class readings are NOT required. I do recommend that you read the readings that are not marked as optional. Readings marked optional provide a more extensive treatment of the material for those interested in a particular topic.

Week 1

Case: Reorganization at Cisco Systems-A

Discussion Questions:

1. Do you agree with Cisco's reorganization? (MONDAY)
2. What challenges (if any) do you anticipate with the reorganization? How would you solve them? (WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

1. Puranam and Goetting: Note on Analyzing organizational macrostructures (recommended)
2. Grant: chapter on Organization Structure and Management Systems. Contemporary Strategy Analysis. (optional)

Week 2

Case: WPP – Integrating icons to leverage knowledge (HBS Case 396249-PDF-ENG)

Discussion Questions:

1. What has been done so far to achieve Sorrell's vision? What more can be done? (MONDAY)
2. Is Sorrell's vision achievable? Should he change his vision? If yes, to what? (WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

Corporate Strategy: The Quest for Parenting Advantage, Campbell, Goold and Alexander, Harvard Business Review, March-April 1995 (recommended)

Week 3

Case: Tata Nano – The People's Car (HBSP Case # 710420-PDF-ENG)

Discussion Questions:

1. Was the Tata Nano a good idea? (MONDAY)
2. Do you agree with how Tata Motors implemented the Nano project? (MONDAY)
3. If not, how would you change it? (WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

Johnson and Christensen, 2008, "Reinventing Your Business Model, Harvard Business Review, December 2008 (recommended)

Week 4

Case: Nestle Rowntree (A+B) IMD 011 and 012 v16.12.2012

Discussion Questions:

1. Should Nestle buy Rowntree? Should Rowntree be bought by Nestle? (MONDAY)
2. How would you manage the acquisition? Given the respective positions, where should a compromise ideally be reached? (MONDAY AND WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

Don't integrate your acquisitions, partner with them, P. Kale, H. Singh and A. Raman, December 2009, *Harvard Business Review*. (recommended)

Puranam and Srikanth 2007 What they know vs. What they do: How acquirers leverage technology acquisitions *Strategic Management Journal*, (Optional)

Week 5

Case: Boeing 787 (to be distributed in class) (MONDAY)

Nightmare Liner (<http://www.economist.com/node/21528275>) (WEDNESDAY)

Discussion Questions:

1. Was building the 787 good strategy? (MONDAY)
2. Do you think Boeing should have involved as many suppliers in the 787? Which ones should not have been engaged? (MONDAY)
3. What should Boeing do to bring the 787 program back on track? (WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

Puranam and Srikanth, 2007, Seven Myths About Outsourcing, *MIT Sloan management review – Wall Street Journal Business Insight report* (recommended).

Kotha and Srikanth, 2013, Managing a global partnership model: lessons from the Boeing 787 'Dreamliner' program. *Global Strategy Journal* (recommended)

Teece and Chesbrough When is virtual virtuous? *Harvard Business Review* (Optional)

Week 6

Case: GEMS China (HBSP Case # 107003 PDF-ENG)

Discussion Questions:

1. Should GE Medical Systems adopt the "In-China For-China" policy? (MONDAY)
2. If you decide to go ahead, what complications do you foresee? How do you avoid/deal with them? If not, how do you deal with China? (WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

Ghemawat, P. 2007 'Managing Differences: The Central Challenge in Global Strategy', Harvard Business Review March: 58–68 (recommended)

Ghemawat, P. 2011 The cosmopolitan corporation Harvard Business Review. (optional)

Week 7

Case: Moser Baer & OM&T: Choosing a strategic partnership mode (PRODUCT #: ISB043-PDF-ENG)
(MONDAY)

<http://www.forbesindia.com/article/boardroom/moser-baer-has-all-but-shut-down/33432/1>

(WEDNESDAY)

Discussion Questions:

1. What is the most appropriate partnership model between Moser Baer and OM&T?
(MONDAY)
2. Was Mr. Puri unlucky or incompetent? (WEDNESDAY)

After class readings:

Sull, D. (2007). Closing the Gap between Strategy and Execution. *MIT Sloan Management Review*
(recommended)

Mankins and Steele. (2005). Turning Great strategy into great performance. *Harvard Business Review*
(optional)