# MODULE 2 UNIT 2

## Activity submission

Learning outcomes:

LO3: Deconstruct the sensemaking approaches of leaders in different industries.

LO4: Deduce how effective leaders use sensemaking to manage change within organizations.

### Name: Donal Phipps

#### 1. Instructions and guidelines (Read carefully)

##### Instructions

1. Insert your name and surname in the space provided above, as well as in the **file name.** Save the file as: **First name Surname M2 U2 Activity Submission** – **e.g., Lilly Smith M2 U2 Activity Submission.** **NB:** *Please ensure that you use the name that appears in your participant profile on the Online Campus.*

2. Write all your answers in this document. There is an instruction that says, “Start writing here” under each question. Please type your answer there.

3. Submit your assignment in **Microsoft Word only**. No other file types will be accepted.

4. Do **not delete the plagiarism declaration** or the **assignment instructions and guidelines**. They must remain in your assignment when you submit.

**PLEASE NOTE:** **Plagiarism cases will be investigated in line with the Terms and Conditions for Participants.**

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Please ensure that you have checked your program calendar for the due date for this assignment.

##### Guidelines

1. There are 5 pages and 3 questions in this assignment.

2. Make sure that you have carefully read and fully understood the questions before answering them. Answer the questions fully but concisely and as directly as possible. Follow all specific instructions for individual questions (e.g. “list,” “in point form”).

3. Answer all questions in your own words. Do not copy any text from the notes, readings, or other sources. **The assignment must be your own work only.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Plagiarism declaration:** |
| **1. I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another’s work and pretend that it is one’s own.**  **2. This assignment is my own work.**  **3. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.**  **4. I acknowledge that copying someone else’s assignment (or part of it) is wrong, and declare that my assignments are my own work.** |

#### 2. Questions

In the preceding casebook, different leaders explained how they utilized sensemaking within their organizational context. In this activity submission, you are required to analyze the sensemaking approach of one leader from the casebook. Select one case from the casebook and use it to answer the three questions that follow. Answer each question in paragraph form.

##### Question 1

How do your selected leader’s behaviors align with sensemaking practices? Ensure that your answer contains the following considerations:

* Identify which leader you selected.
* Associate your selected leader’s behaviors with the relevant sub-dimensions of sensemaking.
* Note any sub-dimensions that did not form part of their approach to sensemaking.
* With the information available to you, suggest how your selected leader could have further strengthened their approach to sensemaking.

(200–250 words)

Start writing here:
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Description automatically generated

Chart (above) shows perceived evidence of sensemaking sub-dimensions for Dr. Allikmets.

Dr. Allikmets found herself in a situation where she needed to set up a completely new type of team - a spin-in team - with a new way of operating. This context required that she take an open-minded approach, because she needed to find new operating models by considering new approaches.

By speaking with other internal teams and external biotech companies, Dr. Allikmets demonstrates an openness to consider others’ ideas and learn from their experience. She used this information to better understand the conventional structure of teams at Takeda, and to differentiate her spin-in team. She also mentions speaking with startup companies, which could provide her with a unique perspective on the factors which influence successful innovation.

However, Dr. Allikmets does not mention any steps taken to understand how the macro environment and her personal preferences might influence her sensemaking.

Dr Allikmets mentions that time constraints forced her team to simultaneously sensemake and invent solutions, and to iterate over many sensemaking-inventing cycles. This is an indication that the team were experimenting with mindsets and operating models.

Dr. Allikmets does not explain any steps taken to build a shared understanding of the team's vision. This shared understanding is an important part of "Creating meaning from uncertainty", which can serve as a navigational aid for stakeholders and project team members. Dr. Allikmets may consider capturing the team's vision, objectives and organisational context in a way which can be easily understood and acted on by those around her.

##### Question 2

By engaging in sensemaking, what did your selected leader learn, and how did it contribute to their ability to understand and manage their changing context? (150–200 words)

Start writing here:

##### Through sensemaking, Dr. Allikmets learned crucial information about the context and environment of her new team, the factors critical to success and the resources available for this success.

##### Dr. Allikmets explains that she was able to discern the position of her new team within the organisation, including how it fit in relative to existing teams. She also better understood the nature of her team's unique connection with the board of Takeda.

##### Through making connections and exploring this organisational context, Dr. Allikmets was able to reveal and define the key elements of the team which were necessary to "make things happen".

##### Finally, and critically, through sensemaking Dr. Allikmets was able to understand the expected outcomes for her team, including the expectations of the R&D management team.

##### This information is likely to have improved Dr. Allikmet's sense of orientation: allowing to answer questions such as “where are we?”, “what is happening around us?”, and “where do we need to go?”. These are important questions which would help her define the current state, and determine the best course of action as she pursued success.

##### Question 3

What have you learned from your selected leader’s approach to sensemaking that you could apply in your own context? Ensure that your answer contains the following considerations:

* Reflect on which aspects of your selected leader’s approach to sensemaking you found the most valuable.
* Explain how you would like to incorporate these aspects into your own leadership signature. You may wish to include an example of current changes in your own context that could benefit from this capability.

(150–200 words)

Start writing here:

I am particularly impressed by Dr. Allikmet's desire to learn from others and to understand the most influential factors in her success.

I can imagine that connecting with other internal teams and external innovators would have required a large amount of effort, commitment and belief that this would be a worthwhile activity. In my experience, human beings can often rush to the "doing" phase of a project without giving sufficient time to sensemaking and reflection. I think Dr. Allikmets serves as an excellent example of why sensemaking is important in a changing business landscape.

As a result of this learning, I plan to change the frequency and extent of my communication with other teams, both in my organisation and elsewhere. I will aim to set up informal coffee & social meetups with internal teams, allowing us to have social conversations but also to build connections and share ideas about how we operate. I will also use my membership of a number of Slack teams to connect with my peers and converse via Slack and in person. My aim will be to identify the common aspects of high performance in my industry.

#### 3. Rubric

Your submissions will be reviewed according to the rubric below:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria not met** | **Criteria met** | **Good** | **Exceptional** |
| **Analysis of selected leader’s approach to sensemaking  (Question 1)**  *Participant identifies one leader from the casebook, explains how the selected leader’s behaviors align with the sub-dimensions of sensemaking, notes whether any sub-dimensions did not form part of the selected leader’s approach, and suggests how the leader’s approach could be strengthened further.* | No submission or attempt.  OR  The response is not related to the question. | Participant partially analyzes their selected leader’s approach to sensemaking. However, at least one aspect of the answer is irrelevant or inadequately addressed. | Participant adequately analyzes their selected leader’s approach to sensemaking. All relevant aspects are addressed. | Participant perceptively analyzes their selected leader’s approach to sensemaking. All relevant aspects are insightfully addressed. |
| **Benefits gained by the selected leader through engaging in sensemaking  (Question 2)**  *Participant provides insight into how their selected leader benefited by engaging in sensemaking, specifically focusing on how it made them a more effective leader who is better equipped to manage change.* | No submission or attempt.  OR  The response is not related to the question. | Participant provides some insight into how the selected leader benefited by engaging in sensemaking. However, at least one aspect of the answer is irrelevant or inadequately addressed. | Participant provides adequate insight into how their selected leader benefited by engaging in sensemaking. All relevant aspects are addressed. | Participant provides detailed insight into how their selected leader benefited by engaging in sensemaking. All relevant aspects are insightfully addressed. |
| **Applying the selected leader’s approaches in your own context (Question 3)**  *Participant highlights which aspects of their selected leader’s approach were most valuable, and explains how these aspects can be applied in the participant’s own context.* | No submission or attempt.  OR  The response is not related to the question. | Participant partially highlights which aspects of the leader’s approach they found most valuable. However, at least one aspect of the answer is irrelevant or inadequately addressed. | Participant adequately highlights which aspects of their selected leader’s approach they found most valuable. All relevant aspects are addressed. | Participant perceptively highlights which aspects of their selected leaders’ approach they found most valuable. All relevant aspects are insightfully addressed. |
| **Structure and logic of writing**  *Submission is clearly and logically structured.* | No submission or attempt. | Submission has some logical structure and is clear enough to comprehend. | Submission is well-structured in terms of logic and clarity. | Submission is exceptionally well- structured in terms of logic and clarity. |