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**Mission Statement**

Waco's mission is to supply high-quality custom-machined car parts at the best price.

**The Problem**

A performance review of Monk Barber, a manager at one of the engineering plants, identifies the issue. Monique Saltz, the performance auditor/area manager, is upset that they are behind schedule on their designs. Barber replies that he has met with the project's three engineers (Frank, McCoy and Gogan) several times to highlight the project's necessity, but to no avail. She says she's "at a loss for words" with the engineers. When Saltz hears this from Barber, he meets with McCoy, Frank, and Gogan to discuss the situation. When approached, Gogan claims that they had no clue the project was so crucial, claiming that he couldn't recall ever meeting with Barber, which McCoy and Frank agreed with. Saltz then meets with Shelly Tomaso, the plant manager, and the two of them go over the employees' records using the plant's transceivers. Barber, McCoy, Frank, and Gogan have not been in the same room since the new transceiver system was introduced, according to the documents. With all of this in mind, Waco has a few issues to deal with. To begin with, either the engineering manager or the workforce are dishonest.

In any event, the designs must be brought back on track, which is a more indirect issue with the scenario. If Barber is lying, necessary steps must be taken to either correct his behavior or replace him. If he didn't meet with the engineers to emphasize the significance of the designs while knowing how critical they were, he isn't doing his job and should be replaced. If the engineers are lying, they must face the same punishment. However, if the engineers are lying and the four have met, the tracking device is not working properly.

**Stakeholders**

**McCoy, Frank, and Gogan:** These three engineers are stakeholders since they are meant to be in charge of creating the designs that are creating Ms. Saltz's problems. They could easily be fired if they are unable to deliver the drawings on time.

**Monk Barber:** If Barbers' staff fail to produce the plant's required deliverables, he could be accused of being a poor boss. There are various management methods available, but just passing the blame onto your employees is not a good strategy (Morgan).

**Monique Saltz:** Monique Saltz is a stakeholder because these designs may be critical to a project they are working on, and if she does not receive them, she will be unable to finish her project on schedule.

**Car manufacturer:** The car manufacturer is a stakeholder because if they do not receive their materials, they will be unable to build their cars in the time frame that they desire, thus causing a delay in the launching of a new car.

**Generic Strategy**

The generic strategy Waco uses is differentiation. They specialize in custom-machined parts that meet the requirements of this specific market. Differentiation is a broad market strategy that involves the creation of a product or service that is viewed as unique throughout its industry. (Porter)

**Organizational Structure**

Because there is just one division described in the case, Waco Manufacturing's organizational structure is functional. Because the performance of an organization is dependent on all functions working together, the functional structure requires extensive information sharing among functions. (Cash)

**Porter’s Five Forces Model**

1. *Threat of Substitutes (High):* Waco isn't the only company that makes vehicle parts. Customers can go to another established firm in the industry if they are displeased with Waco's services and products, despite the fact that it is an industry leader.
2. *Supplier Power (Med):* When it comes to supplier negotiating power, the threat is moderate because, despite that Waco relies mainly on raw materials from suppliers to manufacture these customized car parts, they could always find an alternative supplier if their current one threatens to stop working with them.
3. *Competitive Rivalry (High):* Waco competes with other companies that make similar products. Waco's services are relatively simple to duplicate once you have the necessary blueprints for the vehicles. As a result, any other firm that makes similar products could figure out a method to cut costs and steal Waco's business.
4. *Buyer Power (High):* Customers of Waco Manufacturing are a high threat since they can simply change companies or hire somebody else to do what Waco Manufacturing provided for them.
5. *Threat of New Entry (Low):* Because competing organizations "must focus on acquiring appropriate technology that will advance the firm's competitive position, and doing this properly requires a dedicated effort,"(Fried) the threat of new entrants is low. In other words, they'd need a lot of machinery and production equipment to contend with Waco and possibly steal their business.

**Occam’s Razor**

The principle of Occam's razor is to rule out the most improbable of possible explanations, and as a result, the simplest explanation is frequently the most accurate (Hiroshi). Barber has indicated that he has frequently told the three engineers assigned to the project how critical it is to complete the designs for the 1987 plan, despite the fact that evidence shows the four members of the project team had never been in the same room at the same time for the whole year. Three engineers claim they were unaware of the project, but one engineering manager claims he tried his hardest. The information provided by the transceiver system indicating that they had never communicated as a project team is clearly the most likely explanation.

This information is consistent with the three engineers' explanations and contradicts Barber's argument. The three engineers have told their superior that they do not recall meeting with Barber about the composite design project, despite the fact that the system shows they have never met in the same room at the same time for an entire year. There would have to be a complex reason as to why these stories don't add up.

**Alternatives**

**Do Nothing:**

If Saltz does nothing, the consequences could go both ways. It may be more costly to the organization because a project is already behind schedule but continuing to use the security and information system may allow the company to communicate more effectively. But they also won’t know if the information system is broke or not because they won’t look into it.

**Effect on Stakeholders:** If Saltz does not hold Barber accountable for missing deadlines, she may be viewed as excessively forgiving. She risks making mistakes in future decision-making if she does not assure the accuracy of her control system. If her employees miss deadlines, Saltz may be perceived as disorganized and unproductive. Barber will benefit from the fact that Saltz will not penalize him. Barber will also benefit from Saltz's assurance that the control system isn't functioning properly. If Saltz can uncover a flaw in the system, Barber will likely assume less responsibility for the project's delays. The engineers would bear some of the burden, but it is ultimately Barber's obligation to keep his team on track. Procedures and regulations that improve accountability will benefit Barber. Documentation of crucial meetings, for example, might be included in these regulations to guarantee that everyone who claims to be present is indeed present. There would be fewer situations like this when the team was unaware of the project's importance, and there would be less he said, she said because there would be record. The car manufacturer’s will not be happy if they have to push back the deadline.

**Fire Barber:**

You're assuming that when Monk Barber was questioned about the timetable delay, he didn't disclose the truth. This implies that Barber either opted not to communicate with the employees or spoke to the wrong personnel without realizing it, which neither of these actions should be tolerated by someone in his position. Replacing Monk Barber with a new management may cause the project to be delayed even longer, but hopefully the situation will not occur again.

**Effect on Stakeholders:** If Saltz fires Barber for the system's output, she may be seen as being overly harsh. She might have a hard time defending herself against Barber if he tries to fight the claim if she doesn't confirm the accuracy of her control system. Barber must accept his punishment if the system's output was accurate, and he could not verify that he met with his engineering staff to highlight the significance of the project. If the system's output was flawed, and he had spoken with the engineers, and the system had made an error, he might challenge the termination. In this situation, the three engineers would face dismissal for lying about not being aware of the project's importance. The car manufacturer would be upset to have to push the deadline back, but they can be assured that they are actively making sure that stuff like this doesn’t happen in the future.

**Create new controls:**

Create a set of official procedures for personnel to follow when working on projects. Produce meeting logs to track attendance and verify understanding of the project, as well as an accuracy policy, to document project requirements, clearly communicate deadlines, and create meeting logs to record attendance and ensure understanding of the project. They can also create a privacy policy that informs employees that they are being followed.

**Effect on Stakeholders:** The creation of new controls will benefit Saltz. Her employees will be aware of the policies governing them. She will encounter fewer situations like this one. The creation of action controls will benefit Barber. His team members will all be on the same page when it comes to tasks and how they should conduct themselves at work. The car manufacturer will benefit in the long run because, Waco will likely have less incidents like this in the future with the new controls in place.

**My Solution**

Barber should be fired for lying to management about meeting with his employees and for failing to finish a crucial job on time, in my opinion. Waco Manufacturing will need to find a qualified plant engineering manager or promote internally as a result of firing Barber**.** Waco Manufacturing would also have to spend more money than they had intended because of this choice, as the project would have to be delayed to give the new team an opportunity to finish it. The money invested by Waco Manufacturing to form a new crew to finish the project will be recovered quicker than it was spent because employees will ensure that the projects are completed by the deadline, and they will not have to pay additional money to postpone the deadline. “When we talk about culture, we are usually referring to the pattern of development reflected in a society’s system of knowledge, ideology, values, laws, and day-to-day ritual” (Morgan). Saltz will not set an example if she lets Barber get away with lying to her. Other workers will see that Barber got away with lying to his employer with no repercussions, leading them to believe that they, too, may lie without punishment.
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