Assignment:
Common MGT 360 Management Analysis Report
wayne.smith@csun.edu
[updated: Wednesday, August 26, 2015]

Course: *MGT 360*
Title: *Management and Organizational Behavior* (3 units)

"Theory is about the connections among phenomena, a story about why acts, events, structure, and thoughts occur. Theory emphasizes the nature of causal relationships, identifying what comes first as well as the timing of such events."
--R. Sutton and B. Staw

Goal:
The Department of Management strives to ensure that all students enrolled in MGT 360 are critical thinkers and strong writers. In essence, the Department wants all students to be able to demonstrate competency and efficacy in applying the principles of management and organizational behavior to the issues of a contemporary organization and its broader environment.

Objective:
In narrative essay format, I want you to address a business/organization case study using multiple concepts from class. The case question and case text begin on page 5 of this document.

Building upon your knowledge from MGT 360, students should demonstrate their best understanding of management and organizational behavior theory, and the application of those ideas to improve the understanding of various issues. You need to clearly identify at least *three* distinct, substantive issues. For each issue you need to 1), identify evidence from the case text that shows why this issue is important, 2), use theory from our textbook as a base for your analysis, and 3), draw an analogy from something in class other than the textbook (e.g., supplemental materials, lectures, class discussions, movie clips, etc.) to strengthen your argument. You also need to use appropriate in-text citations and provide a "Works Cited" (Reference) page.

Additionally, building upon your skills from general education and lower-division core courses, students should demonstrate their best composition and technical writing skills.

Length:
This essay is to be no less than three full pages and in length and no more than four full pages in length. Other relevant formatting requirements ("style guide") are linked from the course web page.

Deliverable:
This assignment is due on the date specified on the course outline.

Performance Measurement:
There will be two different scores for this assignment. The *first* score will be for content, and the maximum numbers of points for content will be 15. The scoring rubric for the content portion of this assignment is as follows:

2	-	clearly identifying at least three key issues to be addressed
3	-	appropriate use of evidence from the case text
3	-	appropriate use of relevant theory from our Textbook
3	-	appropriate & rigorous use of supplemental materials/lectures/discussions
2	-	correct and proper use of In-Text Citations
2	-	correct and proper use of a References ("Works Cited") page

The details for earning strong scores are enumerated below.

Requirements Rationale:

- *You must* clearly identify at least three key issues. Readers, especially important readers whose time is valuable and decision-making you want to influence (which eventually will be *you*, at some point after graduation), can't be guessing as to what you are writing about. Four techniques can help immensely to improve clarity in this regard. The first is to identify the three issues by the end of the first paragraph, probably in the last line of the paragraph. This first step is crucial because it sets the expectations for the reader. The second is to use sub-headings liberally (think of sub-headings as "signposts"). The third is to repeat the issue in the first or second sentence of the paragraph that will address the issue. You might use slightly different words, but the issue, in essence, is the thesis (or topic) sentence of the paragraph. The fourth and final technique is to repeat the three issues (summarized, of course) somewhere in the final, concluding paragraph.

- *You must* use evidence from the case text. It will likely be a direct quote, paraphrase, or summary (all of which need a proper citation). Without some supporting evidence, there is no way to demonstrate that the issue you wish to discuss is even an issue, much less a distinct and substantive one. There might even be more than one piece of evidence, even from a single, journalistic article.

- *You must* lead the reader through the process of inference. That is, apply the general principles (theories, models, and frameworks) from this course to explain a phenomenon that occurred in the past or predict what phenomenon is likely to occur in the future. Both explanations and predictions require a deep understanding of "why". Support for "why" is

evidenced primarily by the rigorous use of appropriate theories, models, and frameworks. For this assignment those theories originate from the textbook readings. There are many theories in a textbook; choosing the best one requires diligent focus, a comprehensive understanding of course approach detail, and fervent review of technical subject matter. There are no "short-cuts" to using the best theory, models, or frameworks in an objective, purposeful manner.

- *You must* make a strong argument in your analysis. Convincing another smart person that your thinking is right or best is some of the most difficult work you'll do after you graduate. In addition to evidence and theory, another critical piece of a strong argument is the elegant use of an analogy. You offer additional support for your analysis of your issue by the use of a relevant <u>analogy</u> between a fact from the case text and a fact from a (non-textbook) class-related material or activity (e.g., supplemental materials, lectures, class discussions, movie clips, etc.).

- *You must* cite your references, including specific page numbers, in-text (i.e., "in-line") in the sentence in the narrative. You cannot make crass, unsubstantiated arguments or use ambiguous references. You need to provide tangible support for your reasoning. You build authority and credibility by acknowledging and referring to the work of others. Put another way anything you write that isn't cited is assumed to be your own work. If you intentionally or unintentionally let the reader assume that the work of other individuals is your own work, you are plagiarizing. You cannot do this…ever…in either academic or professional work. You may use APA or MLA format. There are examples of in-text citations in the APA Style Guide summarized nicely by the CSUN Library:

  http://library.csun.edu/egarcia/documents/apacitation_quickguide.pdf

- *You must* use a "Works Cited" page (sometimes called a "References" page). Someone else must be able to locate and use each reference on the "Works Cited" page. Multiple, In-text citations from the narrative that refer to the same reference in the "Works Cited" page are listed only once in the "Works Cited" page (even if different elements are used in the In-Text citation). You may use APA or MLA format. There are examples of how references are to be formatted on "Works Cited" pages in the APA Style Guide summarized nicely by the CSUN Library:

  http://library.csun.edu/egarcia/documents/apacitation_quickguide.pdf

Other Tips:

- *Don't* write haphazardly. *Do* balance <u>breadth</u> (broad coverage of multiple issues) with <u>depth</u> (sufficient, detailed analysis of each distinct issue). These

issues emerge from your reading of the article, your education and experience, and your understanding of what the firm needs to succeed. You'll write a better paper if you identify issues that resonate with you <u>viscerally</u> because you'll have more acumen and concomitant passion for those issues.

- *Don't* focus on principles, concepts, and materials from *other* business classes (lower-division or upper-division). *Do* focus on principles, concepts, and materials covered in *this* course—MGT 360. Take the perspective that the materials from this class on "Management and Organization Behavior" are <u>unique and distinctive</u> from other upper-division business courses. Here are two tips: 1), review the titles of the textbook chapters, HBR and supplemental readings, 2), review the organizational structure and details of the course outline.

- *Don't* just use concepts from the current part of the course, or materials just after the mid-term exam. *Do* use materials from the <u>entire</u> course, including from materials on <u>leadership</u> and <u>change</u> near the end of the course. Therefore, you need to review prior materials and you need to read ahead. This class doesn't have a cumulative final exam. However, this assignment is indeed a <u>cumulative </u>assignment.

- *Don't* arbitrarily ignore General Education courses. *Do* incorporate materials from one or more of G.E. courses if you feel those materials strengthen your thinking.

- *Don't* write like you speak. *Do* organize your thoughts well. The main body of the report are the issues. Additionally, the first paragraph of the report should be an introduction, and the last paragraph should be a conclusion. The last sentence of the introduction might be a summary of what is to come in the main body, while the conclusion might be a summary of what was said and final recommendations.

The *second* score will be for <u>writing</u>, and the maximum numbers of points for content will be 10. The scoring criteria for the writing portion of this assignment will be similar to the writing scoring criteria used previously in this class.

Although the raw scores differ for Content (15 points) and for Writing (10 points), both scores are weighted equally (half of 10% is 5% each).

Case Question:

Assume that you are a consultant to the Board of Directors at Citigroup (note: the Board hires the CEO). The Board of Directors at Citigroup has hired you to assist them in better understanding a new performance management evaluation system at Citigroup implemented by the new CEO, Michael Corbat. Write a brief management analysis report that informs the Board about this initiative. That is, using the language of our class, describe (explain) why this new initiative may be successful (or not) and prescribe (predict) what Mr. Corbat will need to do to be successful at Citigroup.

(If you need to make any assumptions about the firm or the industry, or background regarding anything you might have read in the case text, simply state them as needed.)

Case Citation:

Kapner, S., (2013, March 5). "Citi's CEO is Keeping Score: New Chief Plans Broad Benchmarks for Executives" *Wall Street Journal.*

Case Text:

Four months after taking over as chief executive of Citigroup Inc., Michael Corbat is putting his stamp on the company with a simple formula: You can't manage what you can't measure.

At a gathering of 300 executives last month at a Hilton Hotel in East Brunswick, N.J., Mr. Corbat proposed a slate of new, more-rigorous ways to track both the performance of individual executives and the third-largest U.S. bank as a whole, said people who were there. His approach includes score cards that will rate top managers across the New York company in five categories.

"You are what you measure," Mr. Corbat told the gathering.

Banking executives like to think of their job as a delicate dance between serving clients, selling products and making money -- for the company and for themselves. Adding to that mix, Mr. Corbat wants to more-closely track how executives perform against their financial plan. "You said you would do this. Did you?" was how one executive described Mr. Corbat's approach.

The quantitative focus is the sharpest sign yet of how Mr. Corbat is likely to differ from his predecessor, Vikram Pandit, who was forced out by the board in October after a series of mishaps. More clues to Mr. Corbat's thinking are likely to come Tuesday, when he is scheduled to speak to analysts and investors at a financial conference in Boston hosted by Citigroup.

The initiatives are designed to bring more accountability and discipline to a company that has been considered by regulators, politicians and some investors as too big to manage after it required $45 billion in government aid to stay afloat during the financial crisis.

Mr. Corbat isn't alone in making greater operational efficiency a priority. Antony Jenkins, chief executive of Barclays PLC, has adopted a similar strategy as an antidote to the slow economic growth that is crimping industry profits.

And New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who dined with Mr. Corbat during the recent two-day summit, also subscribes to the philosophy, popularized by Peter Drucker, the management guru, that to manage something, you must objectively chart progress against stated objectives, according to people familiar with his thinking.

Mr. Corbat is expected to unveil quantifiable targets that will allow analysts and investors to more-easily gauge the company's performance, said the people familiar with the plan. Those goals are expected to be similar to ones outlined in a new executive compensation plan that grades performance based on return on assets and tangible common equity, the people said.

Citigroup has had a mixed track record of making good on goals in the past. It exceeded a target set in 2010 of boosting assets from continuing operations by 5% a year, but fell well short of another benchmark that would have required a return on those assets of 1.25% to 1.5%. In 2012, the return was 0.85%.

Citigroup has run into problems when former chief executives set goals that led to excessive risk-taking. Sanford Weill, who presided over the 1998 merger that created the company and served as chairman and CEO through 2003, famously promised to double the company's earnings every five years. Charles Prince, his handpicked successor, focused on raising market share, said people who worked with him.

"Improper incentives lead to improper behavior," said Mike Mayo, an analyst with CLSA Credit Agricole Securities. "The most important job of the CEO is to make sure the right incentives are in place."

The 52-year-old Mr. Corbat is hoping to instill the right incentives through the use of score cards that will grade the 50 or so top executives based on a set of weighted goals from five categories: capital, clients, costs, culture and controls. The highest score is 100%; the lowest is minus 40%, said people familiar with the plan.

"The concept is a good one, but it's important not to measure every widget, because the numbers aren't going to tell you the whole story," said Cliff Rossi, a former Citigroup risk officer who is now a Tyser Teaching Fellow at the Robert H. Smith School of Business at University of Maryland.

Most large financial companies use some type of metrics to gauge their progress. Under Mr. Pandit, Citigroup used score cards for some departments, but not others. Mr. Corbat

intends to make their use more consistent across the entire company. Mr. Corbat declined to comment.

Mr. Corbat's plan to roll the score cards out to all divisions has raised objections from some executives who view the strategy as too much of a "one-size-fits-all" approach, said people familiar with their thinking.

They have argued that technology, legal, risk-management and other divisions don't lend themselves to this type of measurement, these people said.