

Dec 6, 2023

Jianfei Shi

Final Reflection: Spectrum Sunglass Simulation

APAN 5700: Applied Analytics and Leading Change

Diagnosis

- Diagnosing the situation is the first step in any change scenario. Diagnosis includes understanding the context of the change, the change agent's power and influence, and the stakeholders. Answer the following:
 1. Is the change in S1 reactive or proactive?
 2. Is the change in S1 addressing an opportunity gap or a performance gap?
 3. Is the change in S3 reactive or proactive?
 4. Is the change in S3 addressing an opportunity gap or a performance gap?
1. The change in S1 should be reactive as I am playing as a subordinate role of product innovation.
 2. I would say the change in s1 is an opportunity gap, for it provides possibility for me as an subordinate to play as a leader, clarifying organization value and announcing goals for the entire company
 3. The change in s3 is still reactive as s1
 4. It is addressing a performance gap now, for conducting projects, posting progress reports, and telling a 'success' story are more effective in adopting people

Was it harder to lead proactive change or reactive change? At what phase did you observe the biggest differences in leading reactive change and proactive change? Explain your rationale and relate it to the situation at Spectrum Sunglass, i.e. the context for the change scenario.

It is harder to lead proactive change than reactive one because the leader needs to be self-determined about the blueprint of the plan. For example, providing external skill-building sessions could be effective; however, it did not meet the expectation as it happened on week 64 when people are already familiar with the techniques and action targets require other educational persuasion such as telling a 'success' story to be adopted, which was proved later in week 68. I also found that other similar actions such as conducting private interviews and issuing email notice did not work as effective as reactive changes like confronting resister. Hence we need to apply these changes in terms of both timing and different scenarios.

What were the biggest differences in running the high low urgency simulation (S1) compared to the high urgency simulation (S3)?

The high low urgency simulation prefers reactive actions such as posting progress reports, while high urgency simulation is prone to proactive actions like providing external skill-building and clarifying organizational values

As the director of product innovation, you have no formal power. How did you build and maintain your credibility?

What I did first are to get consultant and ceo support to back up my credibility on pulling any lever. After those actions I kept posting progress reports to keep my manager updated, which helped maintain my credibility among the organization. Last but not the least, I found walking the talk effective in adopting people mindset and keeping my credibility stabilized.

What factors determined the receptivity of the change targets? How would you learn about these factors?

People from interested to adopted have also influenced top executives actions on them. When I observed some of the managers have adopted the change, I made a quick decision on recognizing them as the adopter which conducted chained reaction on their subordinates. It managed to adopt other employees following the change. Same effect can be found in conducting pilot project which aims to adopt a whole department of people onto the change. I noticed these factors when I ran the high low urgency simulation and it requires a lot of reactive measures.

Change adoption

- Raising awareness is a key element of the mobilization phase. Beyond raising awareness, what were your major goals during the mobilization phase? How did you achieve them?

I mainly focus on getting consultant and ceo support, for the first step is to get acknowledged on education-wise advice and talk through my ideas based on them in front of top executives and ceo, who have the power to make organizational decision and distribute sufficient resources.

- Trial and adoption are key activities in the movement phase. Beyond these, what were your major goals during the movement phase? How did you achieve them?

I aimed to achieve our plan of change step by step, including announcing goals and deadlines and posting progress report. I also held down hall meetings to keep colleagues updated and informed on changed plan and progress. After these procedures I would build a coalition of support with them to reinforce the efficiency.

- Gaining a critical mass of adopters is necessary to achieve successful change. Beyond this, what were your major goals during the sustain phase? How did you achieve them?

I kept the style of building coalition of support throughout employee relationships. In the meantime, I convinced executives and ceo by telling them 'success' story and strengthen the determination towards final goal.

Summary

- Write a summary (no more than 2 pages) of how you approached the **low authority** simulations and the lessons that you learned. Do not provide a step-by-step description of levers. Describe what you learned about effectively leading people and the organization through the mobilization, movement and sustainment phases of change. Compare your performance based on:
 - CER
 - Building and maintaining your credibility
 - Timing and impact of change levers
- Explain why there were any differences in performance in the two scenarios (S1 and S3).
- What are the top 3 lessons that you will apply in your role as an analyst?
- What are the top 3 lessons that you will avoid in your role as an analyst?

I completed s1 which is low authority and low urgency as cer turned out to be 0.24. It spent 83 weeks which from my perspective is overdue towards the final goal. The reasons why it took so long, in my opinion, are that I didn't apply effective measures at the right phase/time. In a low-authority and low-urgency scenario, I tried to get ceo's public support on week 63 which gained no effect on people. Additionally, I conducted private interviews on wrong people which caused resisters that need to be solved later. Applying wrong measures at a wrong time can aggregate excessive time to fix the problems later.

As in scenario s3 which is low authority but high urgency, I held a lot of meetings and included details by writing progress report for the manager. They get me in good places where people become interested and adopt the changed plan smoothly. I would also raise the morale by telling people my success stories and it effectively persuade my boss and other colleagues to follow up my steps on the plan.

At the movement phase when s1 lies, applying meetings and progress reports is less effective than in s3, for those actions can take additional time for people to draw back attention on what they are currently on. However, in scenarios with high urgency, these steps become much more crucial on adopting people into the change of plan.

Top 3 lessons that I will apply in my role as an analyst:

1. Conduct right actions at a right time
If something is urgent to get fixed, do not waste time on holding unnecessary meetings or interviews. Putting sufficient resources like posting progress reports and building coalition into the job and getting it done are the priorities.
2. Raising morale is the key
Telling a 'success' story worked effectively to adopt executives and colleagues in both high and low urgency scenarios. It proves that giving a persuasive speech about overcoming obstacles strengthens faith of people towards change of plan in most cases.
3. Get support from consultant and CEO whenever needed

When I needed to make a strategic decision of changing the plan, I would strongly suggest build up the knowledge base first. I would initiate an research on the topic, or simply find a consultant evaluate the schema. The more people assess the decision from different perspectives, the more likely it would be adopted and successful.

Top 3 lessons that I will avoid in my role as an analyst:

1. Private interviews

It is ineffective discussing a crucial shift with certain people. Not only the final decision might be biased, but also internal conflicts could arise and it took excessive time to resolve any resister.

2. Holding general meetings at wrong phase

I encountered the problem of holding meeting at trial phase multiple times when I would like to draw general attention on the change of plan; however, it did not work as expected, as people believe in successful cases and only after they would buy it

3. Announcing goals & deadlines prematurely

It pressures workers and executives with elusive goals and disturbs strategic plans at early stage. If I constructed actions in terms of change of plan, I would take skill-building sessions and build a coalition support to initiate the plan step by step.