

Destinee Matsoumou

CIS 410

Prof Reinhardt

02 October 2022

Introduction/Problem

Symantec was founded in 1982, it was a software company that designed, delivered and supported a diversified line of software for the information management, productivity and software development needs of business users. The company grew exponentially in its first eight years. Revenues were booming, employment was growing, and the product line expanded. Symantec became a major player in the software industry, competing with big brands.

As the company continued to grow in size, the issue of information flow became a topic of concern among employees, as well as management. It was a challenge for management to discuss issues with the bulk of their employees. We know that there was not a clear line of communication at Symantec because "a method for getting information to flow among different departments was never set up at Symantec." and without an established method of communication, its importance was overlooked and not prioritized by employees.

Another reason groups did not communicate was because they each believed they knew the best way to do something and did not need to solicit information from others. Also groups claimed to not have the time to communicate- claiming fast paced, high pressure companies made it impossible to have time to discuss with other groups. These were just excuses for not prioritizing communicating with one another.

In 1987 Symantec obtained three more companies, these companies were all over the country. Symantec's president did not mind the distance as long as the product line was the best. They did not want to disturb the dynamic of the original development teams, so they did not concern themselves with relocating these companies where the products were being manufactured as well as because they feared it would affect the quality of the product. And When push came to shoves, they rather replaced the top managers at these locations than employees responsible for creation of products.

Symantec had five product groups: database management, project management, utilities, outlining and presentation, and language products. They were spread across multiple locations. Its products were marketed in 23 foreign countries among 41 independent distributors. Symantec had fifteen main software groups. Each team's product was solely their responsibility, conceived independently of the other product groups. After a team developed a product, they then would be in charge of educating the sales team, technical and customer

support staff, as they were the experts on the product. Product group manager oversaw everything during the product's life cycle.

There were issues with the sales representative not giving the engineering team enough feedback they received from customers who liked or disliked the current product. And with the customer service groups, they complained that the product groups did not inform them of any products with the problems so they heard it first hand from the customers. . Symantec's previous system was at capacity and could not handle ingesting any more information. So Dykes had to find a larger system to support the company's growth, so he chose HP 935. This system worked well until mid 1989 when Symantec began expanding again and the system could not process a lot of orders and would break down constantly.

Porter's five forces

Threat of New Entrants: High

The threat of new companies entering the software/technology industry is very high especially as technology continues to advance, the need for companies that help other organization managing their information system is growing so there will always be the fear of new entrants. With the success of Symantec, it becoming a "major player in the software industry,

Threat of Substitutes: High

The threat of substitutes is high as there are a lot of companies that provide the same service as Symantec. Like the text stated, Symantec was "competing with well-established companies Like Lotus and Ashton-Tate" so there was a fear that consumers may seek products and software from other companies.

Supplier Power:high

The supplier power was high because Symantec made its own products. They had companies all over the world and they produced from their original locations and with the same development teams. The managers believed so profoundly in the quality of original products and did not want to do anything that could alter it, like relocating.

Buyer Power: Low

For sales, key targets were measured in terms of "sell-through" not "sell in". Sales teams sold to distributors who sold to dealers and dealers sold directly to customers. Dealers bought products that reflected customer demand. Symantec priced its software at the market price.

Degree of Rivalry: High

The degree of rivalry was high and would only continue to grow as more companies saw how well Symantec was doing. And strived to keep up with them. Symantec had a whole system for

advertising their products and getting them into the hands of the consumers. They held press conferences, held shows, had newsletters, met with journalists and had customer workshops and seminars to help customers use their products. That is one of the reasons they did so well, their strategies were impeccable. And many other companies needed to up their marketing skills to keep up.

Stakeholders

Customers

Symantec Customers are affected by Symantec decisions and the service they will take on. It's customer line consists of distributors, retailers and end-users.

Employees

Symantec employees are affected by the decision of the company. Its employees consisted of product managers, sales representatives, sales representatives, marketing managers, customer service representatives and top managers.

Corporate Management and CEO

The decisions of managers and CEO affects the future of Symantec. They are in charge of making decisions and implementing new strategies for the employees to follow.

Stockholders/shareholders

The stockholders and shareholders are affected by the decisions of Symantec because they have invested funds into the company and its products, and depending on how things go they could either have a return on their investment or lose capital.

Courses of Action/Alternatives

1. Do Nothing

Doing nothing for Symantec would mean that the company would continue doing what is working for them. Nothing would be changed. The information flow would be the same and right now, communication is scarce among departments

2. New email system/Update current system

Symantec was extremely reliant on email and phone mail. It was used for the majority of its communication, by updating or fixing the current communication system, a lot of issues would be eradicated. The current system had issues, at least once a month, the emails would

corrupt files for no apparent reason. And its e-mail package was intolerant of noise. There was a lot of unreliability

3. Hire a New MIS Director

Symantec needs a better MIS department and with that they needed a new MIS director to take charge of the MIS department. A new director would have the leadership skills needed to lead the employee to communicate better among each other.

Recommendation

I would recommend that Symantec gets a new MIS director. It's important to have a leader in place that will lead the rest of the pack in the right direction. With a new MIS director, they could require weekly meetings and hold company wide company meetings. In the past, groups did not communicate at all, but if they did communicate they could have avoided having to reinvent the wheel every time and could just gather information from other teams.-meeting with the whole marketing and engineering department regularly was the solution to this problem. The first company wide meeting wasn't held until 1990. With a new MIS, employee performance should be evaluated more frequently. Symantec practices measurement by objectives. Performance was evaluated annually. It looked at two core things: overall performance and success in meeting quarterly objectives. However, they didn't always keep up with it. "Performance evaluations had been done sporadically" according to some managers they believed the whole performance systems needed to be refined. The same method of evaluation was used across the board when it needed to be department specific. And depending on the employee performance, Symantec should continue to give employees bonuses. The amount employees received in incentive was based on their ability to meet their objectives. Managers at meetings wanted employees to question things and not just accept them as they are given.