

***BUS 631M: Organizational Decision Making & Leadership***

**Goizueta Business School  
Emory University  
Summer 2014**

Professor Chris Rider

Office 557 | (404) 727-4198 | [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu)

***This syllabus is required reading for this course.***

**OVERVIEW**

To achieve individual and organizational performance objectives, executives must coordinate activities among employees, between groups, and across organizations. Although expected to meet these objectives, leaders are not always trained to do so. By focusing on both formal and informal aspects of organizations, this course prepares executives to practice evidence-based leadership and to manage networks of relationships.

This course will enhance your career in two ways: (1) by preparing you to design and implement strategic interventions that establish your results-based leadership credentials and (2) by providing you with a nuanced understanding of how networks can either aid or constrain your leadership. Applying key course principles in a variety of settings will enhance your leadership capabilities in industries increasingly characterized by technological and regulatory change, globalization, and demands for effective leadership.

Course sessions include presentations, exercises, and discussions. Presentations elaborate the theoretical foundations, exercises provide first-hand insights, and discussions apply principles of effective organizing to real-world situations. Graded, applied exercises include the following:

- (1) Group Assignment: Design an organizational intervention that can produce credible evidence of leadership effectiveness.
- (2) Individual Assignment: Develop an individual network action plan for building and using social capital to achieve personal and/or organizational goals.



## ***COURSE FORMAT***

Class sessions include lectures, in-class and online case discussions, and in-class exercises. For all discussions, executives are expected to carefully read all assigned materials, draw insights from their reading, and contribute thoughtfully to a critical discussion of the key issues. I will cold-call students so it is in your best interest to prepare for every class and to pay close attention during class. Expectations for online case discussion etiquette are detailed in Appendix 1 of this syllabus.

## ***EXPECTATIONS***

This course will be most valuable and enjoyable if all students are prepared to contribute to a productive learning environment by meeting the following expectations:

1. Notify the instructor, via email, of expected absences.
2. Prepare for every class discussion, both in the classroom and online.
3. Pay attention. Listen. Seek first to understand and then to contribute.
4. Participate regularly throughout the course, both in the classroom and online.
5. Treat all classmates and their opinions with respect.
6. Carefully consider your position and then state it clearly.
7. Apply course concepts to frame and support your position.
8. Display your name card in each class.
9. Use laptops only for taking notes during class.
10. Switch phones to silent mode during class.
11. Complete all assignments within the specified timeframe.
12. Obey the Goizueta honor code (see Appendix 2).

## ***COURSE MATERIALS***

Summary session slides will be distributed via Blackboard after each session. Distance learning sessions will be briefly summarized on Blackboard or live via Adobe Connect at times that will be determined after the course starts. Audio recordings of live sessions will be posted online for review at a later date. More details on the first day of class. The Blackboard course login page is located here: <https://classes.emory.edu/>

There will not be a textbook. The course reader will be provided by the MEMBA Program Office. Fees for the reader and the Social Capital Assessment are paid by the MEMBA program office. Other readings will be available via Blackboard, online at specified URLs, or in class.



## GRADING

There are three components of your course grade. Some details below; more in class.

### Individual

1. *Class Participation (CP)* 40%

Your contributions to both in-class and online discussions will be evaluated. You need not participate often; you need participate thoughtfully. Careful arguments based on facts that support your position are good; even better is specific identification of what it would take to change your position (e.g., alternative assumptions, changes in facts). Structured comments that move discussions forward are preferred to restating case facts, repeating previous points, or sampling excessively from personal experience.

2. *Individual Network Action Plan (AP)* 30%

Each student will apply course concepts to their career and/or business goals. This plan should specifically identify career and/or business objectives, the social capital necessary for achievement, actions that must be taken to develop a network that increases one's chances of success, and an implementation timeline. See Appendix 4 for more details.

### Group

3. *Group Case Assignment (GC)* 30%

Each group will submit one group case assignment. This assignment must be completed in cooperation with all group members. See Appendix 2 for more details on the Goizueta Honor Code and Appendix 5 for details on case analyses.

Each graded course component will be normalized by the class mean on each component. The calculation is as below, where  $i$  represents the student's score and  $m$  represents the class mean on that component. For example, if the average class participation grade is 11 out of 15 then a student that received a score of 14 receives a normalized score of 1.27 ( $=14/11$ );  $CP_i = 14.0$ ;  $CP_m = 11.0$ . Each normalized component score will then be weighted by the percentages above to produce a Final Grade Score using the formula below:

$$\text{Final Grade Score} = 0.40*(CP_i / CP_m) + 0.30*(AP_i / AP_m) + 0.30*(GC_i / GC_m)$$



**GRADING** (continued)

There is no predetermined relationship between absolute numeric scores and letter grades. Numeric final grades will be converted to letter grades by ranking all Final Grade scores and assigning letter grades according to the approximate grade distribution below:

Grade	Expected % of Students Receiving Grade
Distinction	10% to 15%
High Pass	35% to 40%
Performance Standard	40% to 50%
Low Performance	0% to 10%

**QUESTIONS and GRADE APPEAL POLICY**

To enable a complete understanding of the course content, clarification questions will be answered promptly and additional feedback will be provided upon request. Email is the preferred mode of communication. **Absolutely no grade appeals will be considered.**

**GROUPS**

You will work in the groups assigned by the MEMBA program office. These groups will deliver a group case analysis. More assignment details are offered later in this syllabus.

**SUMMARY OF KEY COURSE DATES** (for more details, see course calendar and session details below)

- May 1 - 3                      Residency 4 class sessions
- May 12 – July 3            Distance learning
- June 9                        1<sup>st</sup> group assignment deliverable due
- June 13                      2<sup>nd</sup> group assignment deliverable due
- June 30                      1<sup>st</sup> individual assignment exercise due
- July 3                         2<sup>nd</sup> individual assignment exercise due
- July 13 – 15                Residency 5 class sessions
- July 25                        Final individual assignment due



**COURSE CALENDAR**

MAY 2014						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1	2	3
		<p align="center"><b>Residency 4</b></p> <p>Thursday, May 1<sup>st</sup> <i>The Perils of Learning-by-Doing.</i>            Friday, May 2<sup>nd</sup> <i>The Difficulty of Replicating High Performance.</i>            Saturday, May 3<sup>rd</sup> <i>Principles of Evidence-Based Leadership.</i></p>				
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<p align="center"><b>BREAK WEEK</b></p>						
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
<p align="center"><b>Prepare for Distance Learning Discussion #1</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Implementing Evidence-Based Leadership.</i></p> <p align="center">Prepare to discuss Google Project Oxygen case.</p>						
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
<p align="center"><b>Distance Learning Discussion #1</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Implementing Evidence-Based Leadership.</i></p> <p align="center">Google Project Oxygen online case discussion. Login to Blackboard on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.</p>						
25	26	27	28	29	30	31
<p align="center"><b>Prepare for Distance Learning Discussion #2</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Practicing Evidence-Based Leadership.</i></p> <p align="center">See session detail for more information.</p>						



JUNE 2014						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	<p align="center"><b>Prepare for Distance Learning Discussion #2</b>  <i>Practicing Evidence-Based Leadership.</i>  <b>GROUP ASSIGNMENTS DUE</b>            Submit presentation to <a href="mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu">chris.rider@emory.edu</a> by 12pm on Monday, June 9<sup>th</sup>            Submit detailed plan to <a href="mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu">chris.rider@emory.edu</a> by 6pm on Friday, June 13<sup>th</sup>            See session detail for more information.</p>					7
8	<p align="center"><b>Distance Learning Discussion #2</b>  <i>Practicing Evidence-Based Leadership.</i>            Students login to Blackboard on Monday and Tuesday to provide plan feedback. Groups modify plans on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.</p>					14
15	<p align="center"><b>BREAK WEEK</b></p>					21
22	<p align="center"><b>Distance Learning: Individual Social Capital Assessment Exercise</b>  <i>Social Capital for Effective Leadership</i>  <b>INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT DUE</b>            Complete your Individual Social Capital Assessment by 12pm on Monday, June 30<sup>th</sup> (more details provided closer to date).</p>					28
29	30					



JULY 2014						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4	5
<p align="center"><b>Distance Learning: Individual Social Capital Assessment Exercise</b>  <i>Social Capital for Effective Leadership</i>  <b>INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENT DUE</b>            By 6pm on Thursday, July 3<sup>rd</sup> exchange a 2-3 page analysis of your social capital assessment report to a classmate for feedback in Residency 5.            See Appendix 4 for details on the final deliverable.</p>						
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<p align="center"><b>PREP FOR RESIDENCY 5</b></p>						
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
<p align="center"><b>Residency 5</b></p> <p>Sunday, July 13<sup>th</sup>    <i>The Social Capital of Brokerage.</i>            Monday, July 14<sup>th</sup>    <i>The Social Capital of Closure.</i>            Tuesday, July 15<sup>th</sup>    <i>The Social Capital of Evidence-Based Leadership.</i></p>						
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
<p align="center"><b>Individual Network Action Plan Assignment Due by</b>  <b>6pm on Friday, July 25<sup>th</sup> via email to <a href="mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu">chris.rider@emory.edu</a>.</b></p>						
27	28	29	30	31		

*Session Details***RESIDENCY 4: Session 1*****The Perils of Learning-by-Doing*****THURSDAY, MAY 1<sup>ST</sup> @ 1PM - 4:30PM**

Leaders must execute on a long-term organizational vision that is often compromised by unanticipated operational consequences of strategic action. Problems arise. Solutions from prior experiences are applied. More unanticipated consequences follow. The cycle repeats. In this session, we build the case for evidence-based leadership as a departure from this typical learning-by-doing leadership loop. Producing credible evidence of what does and does not work enables leaders to allocate greater focus to executing on the strategic vision.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

1. Entire course syllabus.
2. Kerr, S. (1995 [1975]) "On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B." *Academy of Management Executive*, 9(1): 7-14.
3. Arck Systems (A) (HBS Case #9-911-056).
4. Pfeffer, J. and R. Sutton (2011) "Trust the evidence, not your instincts." *New York Times*. September 3<sup>rd</sup>.

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR ARCK SYSTEMS CASE**

- How do the pay-for-performance compensation plans at Arck and at Lux differ?
- Why do these two companies utilize different compensation plans?
- If you were Bryan Mynor, then which differences would concern you most? Why?
- What, if any, changes should Mynor make to Lux Software's compensation plan?

**RESIDENCY 4: Session 2*****The Difficulty of Replicating High Performance*****FRIDAY, MAY 2<sup>ND</sup> @ 1PM - 4:30PM**

Leaders regularly produce evidence of what does and does not work but many intervene in ways that cloud interpretations of the evidence produced (e.g., Did the intervention cause good performance? Or did changes in market conditions?). This session builds the case for strategic organizational interventions that produce credible evidence of leadership effectiveness (or ineffectiveness). Strategic leaders learn to intervene in ways that convincingly distinguish skill from luck, enhancing their chances of reproducing high performance and avoiding repeatedly low performance.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

1. Chatman, J. A. and S. E. Cha (2003) "Leading by leveraging culture." *California Management Review*, 45(4): 20-34.
2. Lincoln Electric: Venturing Abroad (HBS case #9-409-039)
3. Infosys (A): Strategic Human Resource Management (HBS case #9-412-029)

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR LINCOLN ELECTRIC CASE**

- How has Lincoln sustained success in a highly competitive, commodity industry?
- Why did Lincoln's internationalization efforts in the 80s and 90s fail?
- Will Massaro's internationalization strategy be more successful? Why or why not?
- Should Lincoln proceed with the investment in Indonesia? Why or why not?
- If Lincoln does proceed, then which compensation option (i.e., standard wage, merit-based bonuses linked to factory performance, or individual-based piecework) should Gillespie choose? Why?

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR INFOSYS CASE**

- What are the most effective human resource policies or processes that you have observed in your professional experience? The most ineffective?
- To what extent are human capital strategies contributing to or detracting from the primary objectives of the Infosys leadership?
- Specifically, how do you propose to resolve the tension between achieving high performance metrics and high employee satisfaction metrics?
- What should Infosys do to address declining job satisfaction? Why should we expect this to work?

**RESIDENCY 4: Session 3*****Principles of Evidence-Based Leadership*****SATURDAY, MAY 3<sup>RD</sup> @ 1PM - 4:30PM**

Many claims of effective leadership are dubious. Even credible evidence may not be applicable to our competitive contexts. This session builds the case that strategic leaders can produce credible and applicable evidence by implementing organizational field experiments. If we change organizational policies or structures, then we might as well do so in a way that produces convincing evidence of the change's effectiveness. Why intervene in ways unlikely to persuade others that we caused success? We discuss design principles for producing credible evidence of effective leadership and then gain experience with designing persuasive field experiments.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

1. Pfeffer, J. and R. Sutton (2006) "Management half-truth and nonsense: How to practice evidence-based management." *California Management Review*, 48(3): 77-100.
2. Bloom, N., R. Sadun, and J. van Reenen (2012). "Does management really work?" *Harvard Business Review*, 90 (11): 76-82.
3. Bloom, N., J. Liang, J. Roberts, and Z. J. Ying (2013). "Does working from home work? Evidence from a Chinese experiment." NBER Working Paper #18871.

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR THIS SESSION**

- Identify one common management practice that your organization espouses for performance-enhancing reasons. What is the evidence that supports the belief that this practice enhances organizational performance?
- Identify one management practice common to your industry that your organization does not embrace. What is the evidence supporting the belief that doing so would diminish organizational performance?
- Based on the call center field experiment, what is the evidence that working from home works? For whom does it work when it does?

**DISTANCE LEARNING CASE DISCUSSION*****Implementing Evidence-Based Leadership*****MONDAY, MAY 12<sup>TH</sup> TO FRIDAY, MAY 23<sup>RD</sup>**

So, you want to be an evidence-based leader but expect internal resistance to the experimental approaches most likely to produce evidence of leadership effectiveness? This discussion elaborates sociopolitical tactics for gaining organizational support for evidence-based leadership and for field experiments in particular.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

- Google's Project Oxygen: Do Managers Matter? (HBS Case #9-313-110)

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR PROJECT OXYGEN CASE**

- Characterize Google's culture.
- Prior to Project Oxygen, how were Google managers viewed?
- Consider the attraction-selection-attrition dynamics governing management roles at Google. Describe the typical Google manager.
- How did the PiLab identify characteristics of effective Google managers?
- How did the PiLab implement Project Oxygen? Were effective managerial practices widely adopted? Why or why not?
- Are the Oxygen 8 attributes applicable to other settings? Why or why not?
- What should Setty's priorities be now? Which initiative(s) should he pursue? Should his team aim to develop "truly amazing managers"? Contrast the challenges of developing amazing managers with the challenges of recruiting amazing managers.



## DISTANCE LEARNING EXERCISE #1

### *Practicing Evidence-Based Leadership*

**MONDAY, JUNE 2<sup>ND</sup> TO FRIDAY, JUNE 13<sup>TH</sup>**

In this exercise, groups design a field experiment with the aim of producing credible evidence of leadership effectiveness. On Monday, June 9<sup>th</sup>, each group submits a 4-slide summary presentation of their proposed strategic intervention. Peers provide feedback on what is and is not convincing about the proposal. Designs are modified before the group deliverable is submitted on Friday, June 13<sup>th</sup>.

#### ASSIGNED READINGS

- Keeping Google Googley (HBS case #9-409-039)

#### GROUP ASSIGNMENT DUE

**By 12pm on Monday, June 9<sup>th</sup>:** Each group must submit to [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu) a 4-slide presentation that summarizes the basics of their proposed intervention.

- 1) What is the problem? State the problem as clearly as possible.
- 2) What is your solution? State the solution as clearly as possible.
- 3) What is your rationale for solving the problem this way? Explicitly state the causal logic (“If Google does \_\_\_\_\_, then Google will \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_.”)
- 4) What is your evaluation plan? How will you demonstrate to others that your solution worked? State your standards of evidence as clearly as possible.

**By 6pm on Friday, June 13<sup>th</sup>:** Each group must submit to [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu) a detailed strategic plan to “Keep Google Googley” – that is, to remain entrepreneurial and to avoid bureaucratic obstacles to decision making and innovation. Your submission should be no more than 4 pages (up to 3 pages of analytical appendices like graphs, diagrams, or tables are permitted) and should consist of the following:

- a) Clearly stated objective. What do you aim to achieve?
- b) Detailed plan description (e.g., specific policies, administrative responsibilities). What, exactly, needs to be done to implement your plan?
- c) A program evaluation design for obtaining credible estimates of your intervention’s “treatment” effects. How will you know if your plan worked? What will you measure? What comparisons will you make? How will you persuade executives to implement?

**DISTANCE LEARNING EXERCISE #2*****Individual Social Capital Assessment Exercise*****MONDAY, JUNE 23<sup>RD</sup> TO THURSDAY, JULY 3<sup>RD</sup>**

This exercise will prepare you to discuss general strategies and specific tactics for investing wisely in social capital. We first analyze our current networks to appreciate our current stock of social capital. When we meet in Residency 5, we then compare our network structures to our aspirational networks (i.e., the social capital we will need realize fantastic returns on a Goizueta degree).

**SOCIAL CAPITAL ASSESSMENT ASSIGNMENT DUE**

- **By 12pm on Monday, June 30<sup>th</sup>:** Complete the online Social Capital Assessment (more details forthcoming).
- **By 6pm on Monday, July 3<sup>rd</sup>:** Submit a 2-3 page analysis of your Social Capital Assessment report to a classmate for feedback in our next class session. Explicitly address the questions below in your analysis.

**YOUR ANALYSIS SHOULD EXPLICITLY ADDRESS THESE QUESTIONS**

- Why do you believe that your network structure looks the way it does?
- Given your professional objectives, what do you believe is the ideal network structure?
- How does your actual network structure compare to your ideal network structure?

**RESIDENCY 5: Session 1*****The Social Capital of Brokerage*****SUNDAY, JULY 13<sup>TH</sup> @ 1PM - 4:30PM**

This session introduces the search benefits enjoyed by brokers who occupy social positions between disconnected parties. Brokers identify value creation opportunities inherent in social structures. Arbitrage is possible because information is not distributed uniformly in any organization or market. We review the empirical evidence of brokers' network advantages and disadvantages. We also consider how the social capital of brokerage can influence one's reputation and career achievements.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

1. [Read brokerage section] Burt, R.S. (2009). "Network Duality of Social Capital.," chapter in 2009 Edward Elgar book, *Social Capital: Reaching Out, Reaching In* by V. A. Bartkus and J. H. Davis (eds.). Download at: <http://tinyurl.com/mk3qvo6>.
2. Managing Xerox's Multinational Development Center (Abridged) (HBS case #9-496-047)
3. Rider, C. I. (2009). "Constraint on the control benefits of brokerage: A study of placement agents in U.S. venture capital fundraising." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(4). 575-601.

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR XEROX CASE**

- What is John Clendenin's reputation within Xerox?
- How does Clendenin secure resources for his projects?
- Would you want to work for Clendenin? Would you want to hire him?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of Clendenin's leadership style?
- Why do Xerox employees view Clendenin the way that they do?

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR RIDER ARTICLE**

- What services does a placement agent provide for a venture capital fund?
- Which funds do placement agents prefer to represent?
- Which firms most value placement agents' services?
- Why is the article's conclusion that brokers are likely to represent neither those who value representation most nor those who brokers would most like to represent?
- Why is a broker's reputation so valuable in this market?

**RESIDENCY 5: Session 2*****The Social Capital of Closure*****MONDAY, JULY 14<sup>TH</sup> @ 1PM - 4:30PM**

This session introduces the governance benefits enjoyed by densely connected clusters of contacts. Closed clusters encourage trust within the group because counter-normative behavior is sanctioned at the expense of one's reputation. We discuss the empirical evidence supporting the network advantages and disadvantages of closure and also consider how the social capital of closure can enhance one's career. The session concludes with a discussion of individual network enhancement.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

1. [Read closure section] Burt, R.S. (2009). "Network Duality of Social Capital.," chapter in 2009 Edward Elgar book, Social Capital: Reaching Out, Reaching In by V. A. Bartkus and J. H. Davis (eds.). Download at: <http://tinyurl.com/mk3qvo6>.
2. Rider, C. I. (2012). "How employees' prior affiliations constrain organizational network change: A study of venture capital and private equity." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57(3): 453-483.

**PREPARATION QUESTIONS FOR RIDER ARTICLE**

- Who do VC & PE firms tend to employ? Why?
- Which do VC & PE firms tend to do deals together? Why?
- Identify the brokerage vs. closure trade-offs that firms make in both partner composition and deal selection.
- How can a firm improve its "deal flow"?

**RESIDENCY 5: Session 3*****The Social Capital of Evidence-Based Leadership.*****TUESDAY, JULY 15<sup>TH</sup> @ 1PM - 4:30PM**

On February 1, 2003, the Shuttle Columbia disintegrated upon re-entry into the Earth's atmosphere. Seven astronauts lost their lives. This multimedia case explores Columbia's final mission from the perspective of six key NASA managers and engineers. An online application presents background information and replicates the desktop environment of those involved in the re-entry decision. Each executive is assigned a particular role. Executives must review the protagonists' actual e-mails, listen to audio re-enactments of crucial meetings, and review NASA documents. The class session reveals the importance of understanding social capital in order to apply evidence-based leadership to critical organizational decisions.

**ASSIGNED READINGS**

- Columbia's Final Mission (HBS Multimedia Case #305032-HTM-ENG).

**PREPARATION FOR COLUMBIA CASE**

- Prior to class, you will receive a role-specific login and password to access the multimedia content.
- Based on the video and other online content, please answer the following questions.
  - What are the strengths and weaknesses of NASA's culture?
  - Historically, how has NASA treated foam strikes? Why?
  - Compare and contrast NASA's foam strike response to the Apollo 13 incident and to the Challenger accident.
  - How do the behaviors of NASA managers and engineers differ?
- Also prepare to play a protagonist role in a classroom re-enactment of a critical Mission Management Team meeting that took place on Flight Day 8 (January 24, 2003). Please prepare to act the way you believe the protagonist acted in that meeting.
  - What implicit assumptions and beliefs guide your behavior?
  - What pressures are you under?
  - How does NASA's culture influence your behavior?



## FINAL ASSIGNMENT

### *Individual Network Action Plan*

**MONDAY, JUNE 23<sup>RD</sup> TO THURSDAY, JULY 3<sup>RD</sup>**

This exercise will prepare you to discuss general strategies and specific tactics for investing wisely in social capital. We first analyze our current networks to appreciate our current stock of social capital. During Residency 5, we compare our network structures to our aspirational networks (i.e., the social capital required to realize fantastic returns on a Goizueta degree).

#### SOCIAL CAPITAL ASSESSMENT ASSIGNMENT DUE DATES

1. **By 12pm on Monday, June 30<sup>th</sup>**: Complete the online Social Capital Assessment (more details forthcoming).
2. **By 6pm on Monday, July 3<sup>rd</sup>**: Submit a 2-3 page analysis of your Social Capital Assessment report to a classmate for feedback in our next class session.
3. **By 6pm on Monday, July 25<sup>th</sup>**: Submit an Individual Network Action Plan of 5 pages or less via email to [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu).

#### SOCIAL CAPITAL ASSESSMENT

- Your plan should address the following: (1) your career objectives, (2) gaps between current and ideal network structures, (3) your strategy for closing the gap, and (4) specific actions you will take to do so.
- See Appendix 4 for more assignment details.

**Appendix 1: On-line Case Discussion Etiquette**

Brevity is especially important for online discussions. Please respect the limited time and attention of your classmates by limiting the messages that you post to our on line discussions to a few concise sentences.

The instructor's role is to facilitate the online case discussions by posing an initial question, synthesizing students' comments, inserting additional analysis, and occasionally asking follow-on questions.

Your enthusiasm for the online discussions is greatly appreciated. But, as a courtesy to your classmates in other time zones and/or with different work schedules, please resist the temptation to quickly populate the discussion board with comments. Those who arrive later to the discussion board will appreciate the opportunity to contribute.

During our three weeks of on-line discussions, I will post questions every weekday afternoon (Monday through Friday) to the case discussion boards. Please aim to participate in the discussion of approximately one-third of these questions. If all enrolled students participate in 30% to 40% of the questions and each contribution is of reasonably high quality, then we'll have a good discussion for each question and, accordingly, for each case.

Read all prior comments in the discussion thread before posting. Please avoid restating or rephrasing a classmate's prior statements. This error is much easier to commit in online discussions than in the classroom. This discipline is essential to the success of our on-line discussions.

**Appendix 2: Goizueta Business School Honor Code**

Members of the Roberto C. Goizueta Business School community are committed to values of honor, integrity, and accountability. We will not use dishonest means to gain unfair advantage in the academic arena, nor will we tolerate anyone who does so.

Academic dishonesty is a corrosive force at any University. Apathy or acquiescence in the presence of academic dishonesty is not a neutral act. It undermines the bonds of trust and honesty between members of the community and defrauds those who may eventually depend on our knowledge and integrity.

All members of the University community, students, faculty, and staff share the responsibility and authority to challenge and report acts of apparent academic dishonesty. Any member of the University community who has witnessed an apparent act of academic dishonesty, or has information that reasonably leads to the conclusion that such an act has occurred or has been attempted, has the responsibility to inform the faculty member in the class involved or the Honor Council promptly in writing.



### **Appendix 3: Case Discussions**

This course relies heavily on business cases. The likelihood that one benefits from a case discussion depends largely on their preparation but also on the preparation of their classmates.

Preparing for case discussions entails more than simply reading the case prior to class. Almost-adequate preparation involves reading the case *and* then forming original thoughts and preparing analyses based on case information. Adequate preparation involves arriving at a position regarding the situation and action(s) the company should or should not take. Students who prepare in an exemplary manner identify not only the assumptions and facts that support their position but also what, exactly, it would take to change their position.

Typically, the questions that will frame in-class case discussion are posed to students prior to class. All students should prepare articulate, organized answers to these questions. Because cold calls are standard practice, no one should be surprised by a case discussion question. Rambling, unorganized answers demonstrate a lack of preparation that impedes our progress during in-class discussions.

All answers are expected to draw upon course concepts and case facts. Good answers start with a clear position on what the company should do (or, otherwise, directly answer the question posed). Answer quality is increasing with the use of specific evidence to support the position taken. The best answers also explicitly identify the assumptions that connect evidence to position and address how the position might change should new evidence come to light.

Case analysis assignments are required of students. The best case analyses exhibit the aspects discussed above and support the position taken in a concise and persuasive manner. Good case analyses tend to follow these guidelines.

- Frame the key issue in the form of a question (e.g., “Should ABC enter the market?”)
- Explicitly identify the factors considered before taking a position.
- Tell the reader how you will answer the key case questions above.
- Explicitly answer the questions posed for each case.
- Explicitly identify the assumptions that frame your position.
- Draw on only the case facts that you must in order to support your position.
- Analyze only the data necessary to arrive at your position.
- Acknowledge that some case facts do not support your position. Do not ignore these facts; address these potential challenges to your position.
- Explicitly identify what it would take for you to change your position.
- Be organized and logical. Tell the reader what you’re going to tell them. Then tell them. Then tell them what you told them.



#### **Appendix 4: Individual Network Action Plan**

In lieu of a final exam, each student will develop an individual network action plan. The purpose of this plan is to ensure that you act upon what we cover in class. This assignment will be worth 8 points and graded according to the rubric below. You must complete the online assessment by June 30<sup>th</sup> and exchange your interim analysis with a classmate by July 3<sup>rd</sup>. Your final plan must be submitted to [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu) by 6pm on Friday, July 25th. Your plan should be 5 pages or less and should explicitly address the following:

**1. Objectives (1 point)**

Identify at least one professional objective that you would like to achieve. This objective should be specific. Achievement should be unambiguous. And there should be an expected timeframe for achievement. You may identify multiple objectives (e.g., short and long term) as long as they meet the criteria above.

**2. Resource Requirements (1 points)**

You will need resources to achieve your objective. Some will be at your disposal. Others must be obtained from others. These might include information, capital, knowledge, influence, trust, labor, or social support. Be sure to acknowledge the specific demands of the professional context (e.g., industry, profession, company, region) in identifying your resource requirements.

**3. Social Strategy (3 points)**

You know your objective(s), how your current stock of resources positions you to achieve your objective(s), and the additional resources you require. You need a strategy that connects this knowledge with specific tactics that you will employ. This “social strategy” should help you develop the type of network structure (e.g., optimized for brokerage or closure) that will increase your chances of achieving your objective. For example, in your profession or at your employer a cohesive network composed of strong, trusting ties may be more valuable than a diverse network characterized by weak ties across groups. Based on the resources you must obtain through social ties, develop a strategy for developing the social capital required for achievement of your objectives.

**4. Social Tactics (2 points)**

Based on your current social capital and the social capital you believe you must develop, how will you implement your strategy? Be as specific as possible about the actions you will take (e.g., who, what, when, why, where, how). Consider these concrete commitments to developing the personal network you require for future success.

**5. Timeline (1 point)**

Develop a clear timeline for achievement of your objective(s), the implementation of your strategy, and the specific tactics you will use.

**Appendix 5: Group Assignment**

**By 12pm on Monday, June 9<sup>th</sup>**: Each group must submit to [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu) a 4-slide presentation that summarizes the basics of their proposed intervention.

- 1) What is the problem? State the problem as clearly as possible.
- 2) What is your solution? State the solution as clearly as possible.
- 3) What is your rationale for solving the problem this way? Explicitly state the causal logic (“If Google does \_\_\_\_\_, then Google will \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_.”)
- 4) What is your evaluation plan? How will you demonstrate to others that your solution worked? State your standards of evidence as clearly as possible.

**By 6pm on Friday, June 13<sup>th</sup>**: Each group must submit to [chris.rider@emory.edu](mailto:chris.rider@emory.edu) a detailed strategic plan to “Keep Google Googley” – that is, to remain entrepreneurial and to avoid bureaucratic obstacles to decision making and innovation. Your submission should be no more than 4 pages (up to 3 pages of analytical appendices like graphs, diagrams, or tables are permitted) and should consist of the following:

- A. Clearly stated objective. What do you aim to achieve?
- B. Detailed plan description (e.g., specific policies, administrative responsibilities). What, exactly, needs to be done to implement your plan?
- C. A program evaluation design for obtaining credible estimates of your intervention’s “treatment” effects. How will you know if your plan worked? What will you measure? What comparisons will you make? How will you persuade executives to implement?