1) Title, Abstract & Keywords
   *In your abstract, please include a brief session description (not to exceed 100 words), and three to four keywords. If your proposal is accepted, this description will be printed in the conference program.*

Title:

**Navigating Change through the Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence**

Abstract:

Session participants will learn how easy and effective it is to use the individual play web-based Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence in undergraduate and graduate courses. In this interactive and innovative simulation, students experience leading strategic change in different contexts given the instructor's ability to assign different authority levels and change urgencies to students. Students gain insights into change resistance and develop critical thinking skills. Simulations are also a great way to energize your courses and engage millennial students. We will share our experiences with the simulation, distribute our assignments, and discuss the strengths and limitations of the simulation.

Key Words: Change Management, Power and Influence, Simulation-Based Training, Student Engagement, Millennials

2) Teaching Implications:
   *What is the contribution of your session to management pedagogy/andragogy? Specifically, please include your learning objectives, and describe what management and/or teaching topics are relevant to your session, and why. Also, include theoretical, disciplinary, or theoretical foundations that will help reviewers understand how your ideas fit within the broader field of management.*

   The contributions of this session are to provide management educators with an innovative teaching activity, the Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence (Harvard Business Publishing; https://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/pages/home; HBP Product No. 3292) that allows students to experience the challenges and successes associated with leading strategic change. Effectively and ethically managing organizational change is an important skill for the workplace and this individual play web-based simulation provides a realistic environment where students make a series of decisions to influence the organizational members represented in the scenario to adopt the change initiative (success is determined when an adjustable critical mass of adopters is achieved). The simulation is easy to use and can be used to teach a variety of change management concepts such as Kotter's Eight Step Model of Change, which is based on Kurt Lewin's Unfreeze, Change, Refreeze change model, resistance to change, power as related to authority in the organization, and change urgency resulting in reactive or proactive change.

Appendix A provides a reference list of the theoretical foundations for the change management concepts illustrated in the simulation and subsequently the student assignments.

Furthermore, the simulation comes with an extensive Facilitator's Guide that includes the Teaching Note, clear directions on how to Adopt the Simulation and provide Student Access, a Simulation Overview that includes screenshots and commentary for ease of instructor administration, and several Appendices with detailed simulation information and theoretical resources. This information is provided in written and video formats. Students have access to a How to Play video with a transcript of the video. This information is also available in a PowerPoint file and a PDF. Students also have access to a PDF of the Foreground Reading and their individual Scenario Introduction also in a PDF. The cost to students is under $20.00 and the simulation provides a rich learning experience for students. Below is a brief description of the simulation scenario and the objectives of the change agent role followed by how we have used this simulation in our classes to teach change management and power and influence.

**Brief Description of Simulation:**

In this simulation, students play the role of a change agent in the Spectrum Sunglass Company, which designs, manufactures and sells sunglasses. The simulation includes a Foreground Reading that provides common background information about the company (e.g., financials, organizational chart, company status, information about the change initiative) and Scenario Readings that provide unique information about the change agent role(s). The change agent is responsible for leading the sustainability initiative and is seeking adoption from top and middle managers and key line workers. Two main contextual contingencies define the four change agent role options: Level of Urgency (high, low) and Level of Authority (high, low). Figure 1 depicts the four different scenarios that can be assigned to students.

| | | Power (Authority) of Change Agent | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Low | High |
| **Urgency of Change** | Low | Scenario 1: Director, Product Innovation | Scenario 2: CEO |
| | High | Scenario 3: Director, Product Innovation | Scenario 4: CEO |

For each Scenario role the student must choose among decision options (i.e., change levers) to move organizational members through the four stages of adoption: Awareness, Interest, Trial, and Adoption. Success of each decision depends on both the stage of adoption of the organizational member and the current organizational-level change phase (mobilization, movement, and sustaining). The change phases parallel those identified by Lewin's (Unfreeze, Change, Refreeze) and subsequently Kotter's Eight-Step change models and are thus an effective way of increasing student learning about these models. Moreover, students can use these models, especially Kotter's Eight-Step model, to guide which decision options may be more effective given the change phase. In addition, some decision options help organizational members gain Awareness of the change initiative, while other decision options are more effective if the individual has already progressed to the Interest or Trial stage of adoption. Likewise, to increase

the realism of the simulation, some organizational members are identified as "resistors," thus requiring more attention in some cases to reach adoption of the change initiative. Furthermore, the simulation also show the social networks of the organizational members and students can use this information to influence the stages of adoption. The impact of the decision options is also influenced by the urgency of the change and the authority of the change agent. The Facilitator's Guide provides information on how each of the decision options map to six areas (Credibility, Communication, Training, Technical, Political, and Cultural), the impact of the decision option given the organizational-level change phase, and the relative disruptiveness of the decision option.

Instructors can assign all four roles or select certain roles for students to complete. Scenario 4 (high urgency for change, high authority) is often perceived as the "easiest" change agent role. However, some students have noted that they found the low authority change agent role "easier" because it was a role that most closely replicated their work experiences (i.e., students typically have not been a CEO). It is also easy for the instructor to reset roles and allow students to try again. This results in lower levels of stress and increased learning opportunities for students.

Listed below are the main learning objectives of the simulation per the Facilitator's Guide (Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence Facilitator's Guide, p. 7).

"The simulation provides students a hands-on, interactive experience designed to demonstrate there is no simple, straightforward formula for leading change. Learning objectives include:

1. Practicing diagnostic and action-planning skills with regards to leading strategic change.
2. Gaining insight into why individuals and groups might resist change and how to overcome that resistance to include using social network information to develop a change management implementation strategy
3. Developing an appreciation for key contextual contingencies when implementing change.
4. Forming a better understanding of not only how to choose appropriate change strategies and tactics but also how to sequence them, given key contextual contingencies, and
5. Identify common missteps of change agents and how to avoid them."

**Use in the Classroom:**

Both authors have used this simulation several times over the past six to seven years. The simulation has been used at the graduate (MBA) level: Seminar in Organization Theory & Behavior, and at the undergraduate level in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management. Both authors have used written analysis papers to evaluate learning. At the graduate level the assignment is worth 25% of the total grade and requires at least five references within a five-page analysis paper. At the undergraduate level the assignment is worth 10% of the total grade and requires a paper that describes how the decisions made mapped to Kotter's Eight-Step model. Appendix B provides the assignment instructions for the written analysis papers for the graduate and undergraduate courses.

*Prior to the Simulation:*

Instructors add the simulation to their Course Page on the Harvard Business Publishing site (see webpage address above). Instructors then send an email to students that has a unique link for registering for the simulation (this is done through the simulation page). This can be done at any time, but we usually do this a week to two weeks in advance so the email does not get lost. Students must register (and pay if the school is not paying) and the instructor must assign the different scenarios to students before students can play the simulation. The scenarios can be assigned in any order and for the undergraduate courses, scenario 4 is assigned first followed by scenario 3 (then 2 and 1). This allows students to do the perceived "easier" scenarios (4 and 3) first (due to the high urgency of the change, it is "easier" to get organizational members on board or to adoption). The simulation is now ready to begin.

### *Introducing the Simulation:*

PowerPoint slides for introducing the simulation are provided by Harvard Business Publishing on the instructor's page of the Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence website and can be easily adapted to the needs of the instructor. In general, one class period (1 ½ hours) is used to introduce the concepts of change management and power and influence, including Lewin's and Kotter's models of change, reasons why individuals resist change, bases of power, and Organizational Development techniques. (Textbooks most recently used: Dolan, S., & Lingham, T. (2011). Introduction to International Organizational Behavior at the graduate level and Robbins, S. & Judge, T. (2014). Essentials of Organizational Behavior (12th ed.) at the undergraduate level).

The second class period is used to directly introduce the simulation, using the introduction slides provided by Harvard Business Publishing and the "How to Play" video on the simulation website. Students will typically have questions, which we will address in the OBTC session. At the undergraduate level, we readily use examples of how the change agent can "establish a sense of urgency" and "form a powerful guiding coalition" (the first two steps in Kotter's model) – by reviewing the different decision options in the simulation. We also discuss how some decision options, e.g., "restructuring the organization" are highly disruptive and if used at all, should be used towards the end of the change process. Another option that we have used is to let students know that we are willing to re-set their play if they get into trouble. This option can be time consuming but often helps students to learn the concepts better because they have a chance to be successful.

### *During the Simulation:*

Both authors establish "virtual" class periods for completing the simulation. This essentially means that we do not formally meet for class during the time allotted to the simulation and students are free to complete the simulation on their own time. At the undergraduate level a due date is imposed for the completion of the first run (or scenario) so that time management is practiced.

### *Debriefing the Simulation:*

Again, Harvard Business Publishing provides excellent Debriefing slides that pull in the unique performance data of the class. Pie charts are provided that show what percentage of players were successful in obtaining the required number of adopter for the change initiative. Students can be grouped into the four different scenarios or can form small groups on their own to discuss the simulation experience. Examples of questions we have used include:

- What were your main lessons learned or "aha" moments?
- What was easy for you? Fun?
- What was challenging?
- How were you able to "navigate change" (from assigned reading: Bisoux, T. (2015). Navigating Change, *BizEd*, 14(1), 20-24).
- Compare and contrast Scenario 4 and Scenario 3. Was one scenario easier for you?
- How did you use the change levers (i.e., decision options)?
- What were the affects of social networks?
- How successful were you in your timing of the change levers? Did some levers work better given the organization's change phase?

Our experiences have been that students respond very favorably to the simulation experience and gain significant learning about the challenges and successes that one can achieve from leading strategic change. It is also been the case that students will comment and bring up connections to other course materials and in some cases in other courses about their learning experiences.

3) Session Description and Plan:
*What will you actually do in this session? If appropriate, please include a timeline estimating the activities will you facilitate: how long will they take, and how will participants be involved? Please remember that reviewers will be evaluating how well the time request matches the activities you'd like to do, and the extent you can reasonably accomplish the session's goals. Reviewers will also be looking for how you are engaging the participants in the session.*

The 30-minutes session will be as follows:

0-10 minutes: Outlines the session and Introduce the simulation using the "How to Play" video (~ 7 minutes).

10-15 minutes: Share the different assignments we have used and briefly provide the strengths and limitations of the assignments/simulation.

15-25 minutes: Have participants share their ideas on how to use this simulation in their classes. Discuss benefits of using simulations in the millennial classroom. Address questions or concerns about using simulations.

25-30 minutes: Encourage use of simulation and exchange participant information to create a continued learning partnership for simulation based training.Application to Conference theme:

4) How does your session fit with the overall OBTC theme of *Navigating the Changing Currents*?

There are two primary connections with this year's theme of Navigating the Changing Currents.

1. The topic of this simulation is Change Management and Power and Influence. The simulation itself allows students to practice their hand at leading strategic change and understand that managing change can be difficult as not everyone may be interested in changing. The simulation also provides practical tools (e.g., Kotter's Eight-Steps) to lead change systematically. The simulation provides a realistic, engaging way for students to learn about "navigating the changing currents."
2. The learning preferences of millennial students necessitate that we as educators adapt our learning activities. Millennial students embrace technology and this web-based simulation provides a sophisticated platform for learning that not only engages students but also is perceived as being practical and relevant to the workforce they will be entering.

5) Unique Contribution to OBTC:
   *Have you presented the work in this proposal before? If so, how will it be different? Is this proposal under current review somewhere else? If so, please explain. How will your proposal be different for the OBTC conference?*

This is a new project/session that has not been presented or written up before. It is not under review but the authors hope to further develop this session into a Resource Review for the Management Teaching Review. This session will provide attendees with an immediately useful classroom activity and related assignments that are based on relevant change management theories. The session also provides innovative pedagogy that targets millennial learners.

APPENDIX A: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

This appendix provides a reference list of the theoretical underpinnings of the Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence. This list also serves as the Reading List for the graduate level assignment for the simulation.

References

Amis, J., T. Slack, and C. R. Hinings. 2004. The pace, sequence, and linearity of radical change. Academy of Management Journal 47 (1): 15-39.

Armenakis, A., and A. Bedeian. 1999. Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. Journal of Management 25 (3): 293-315.

Audia, P., E. Locke, and K. Smith. 2000. The paradox of success: An archival and laboratory study of strategic persistence following radical environmental change. The Academy of Management Journal, 43 (5): 837-854.

Balogun, J. 2001. Strategic change. Management Quarterly (January): 2-11.

Balogun, J., and V. H. Hailey. 2008. Exploring Strategic Change. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Beckhard, R., and R. T. Harris. 1987. Organizational Transitions: Managing Complex Change. 2nd ed., Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Beer, M. 1990. The Critical Path to Corporate Renewal. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Beer, M., R. A. Eisenstat, and B. Spector. 1990. Why change programs don't produce change. Harvard Business Review (November–December): 2-11.

Beer, M., and N. Nohria. 2000. Breaking the Code of Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Beer, M., and N. Nohria. 2000. Cracking the code of change. Harvard Business Review (May–June). Harvard Business Review. 2010. Special Issue: Make Green Profitable (Spring).

Bourne, L., and D. Walker. 2005. Visualizing and mapping stakeholder influence. Management Decision 43 (5): 649-660.

Bunker, B., and B. Alban. 1997. Large Group Interventions: Engaging the Whole System for Rapid Change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christensen, C. M., and M. Overdorf. 2000. Meeting the challenge of disruptive change. Harvard Business Review 78 (2): 66-76.

Cohen, A. R., and D. L. Bradford. 1990. Influence Without Authority. New York: Wiley.

Fletcher, J. 2004. The paradox of post heroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change. Leadership Quarterly 15 (5): 647-667.

Franken, A., C. Edwards, and R. Lambert. 2009. Executing strategic change: Understanding the critical management elements that lead to success. California Management Review (Spring).

Gabarro, J. 2010 May. Organizational alignment, performance, and change in professional service firms.

Garvin, D. A., and M. A. Roberto. 2005. Change through persuasion. Harvard Business Review (February): 30-38.
Greenword, R., and C. R. Hinings. 1996. Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. Academy Management Review 21 (4): 1022-1054.

Gulati, R., A. Mayo, and N. Nohria. Forthcoming. Chapter on Organizational Change. In Principles of Management. Mason, OH: Cengage Publishing.

Hambrick, D. C., D. A. Nadler, and M. L. Tushman. 1998. Navigating Change: How CEOs, Top Teams, and Boards Steer Transformation. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Harvard Business Review. 2010. Special Issue: Make Green Profitable (Spring).

Higgs, M., and D. Rowland. 2005. All changes great and small: Exploring approaches to change and its leadership. Journal of Change Management 5 (2): 121-151.

Hill, L. A., and K. Lineback. 2011. Define the Future. In Being the Boss. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Ibarra, H. 1997. Building Coalitions. Harvard Business School case study (497-055). Boston: Harvard Business Publishing.

Jick. T. 1990. AT&T: The Dallas Works (A). Harvard Business School case study (492-023). Boston: Harvard Business Publishing Journal of World Business. 2010. Special Issue: Sustainable Business 45 (4).

Judge, T. A., C. J. Thorensen, V. Pucik, and T. Welbourne. 1999. Managerial Coping with Organizational Change: A dispositional perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology 84 (1): 107-122.

Judge, W. 1999. The Leader's Shadow: Exploring and Developing the Character of Executive Leaders. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Judge, W. 2010. Building Organizational Capacity for Change: The Strategic Leader's New Mandate. New York: Business Expert Press.

Judge, W., and T. Douglas. 2009. The evolution of the organizational capacity for change construct. Journal of Organizational Change Management 22:635-649.

Judge, W., and D. Elenkov. 2005. Organizational capacity for change and environmental performance: An empirical assessment of Bulgarian firms. Journal of Business Research 58:894-901.

Kanter, R. 1983. The Change Masters. New York: Touchstone.

Kanter, R. M. 2003. Leadership and the psychology of turnarounds. Harvard Business Review (July).

Kanter, R. M., B. Stein, and T. D. Jick. 1992. The Challenge of Organizational Change: How Companies Experience It and Leaders Guide It. New York: Free Press.

Kegan, R., and L. L. Lahey. 2001. The real reason people won't change. Harvard Business Review (November): 85-92.

Kim, W. C., and R. Mauborgne. 2003. Tipping point leadership. Harvard Business Review (April): 60-69.

Kotter, J. 1995. Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. Harvard Business Review (March): 59-67.

Kotter, J. 1997. Leading Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kotter, J. 2008. A Sense of Urgency. Boston: Harvard Business Publishing.

Kotter, J., and D. Cohen. 2002. The Heart of Change. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kotter, J. P., and L. A. Schlesinger. 1979. Choosing strategies for change. Harvard Business Review (March–April): 106-114.

Kouzes, J., and B. Posner. 2003. Credibility: How Leaders Gain It and Lose It, and Why People Demand It. New York: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E., and C. Worley. 2006. Built to Change: How to Achieve Sustained Organizational Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, K. 1947. Frontiers in group dynamics. Human Relations 1 (5): 41.

Mayo, A. J., N. Nohria, and M. Renella. 2009. Entrepreneurs, Managers, and Leaders: What the Airline Industry Can Teach Us About Leadership. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mohrman, S., V. T. Ramkrishnan, and A. Mohrman. 2003. The role of networks in fundamental organizational change: A grounded analysis. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 39 (3): 301-321.

Nadler, D. A., and M. L. Tushman. 1989. Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. The Academy of Management Executive 3 (3): 194-204.

Oreg, S. 2003. Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. Journal of Applied Psychology 88 (4): 680-693.

Oshry, B. 1996. Seeing Systems: Unlocking the Mysteries of Organizational Life. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Pfeffer, J., and R. I. Sutton. 2000. The Knowing-Doing Gap. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Porras, J. E., and R. C. Silvers. 1991. Organizational development and transformation. Annual Review of Psychology 42 (1): 51-78.

Ready, D. A., L. A. Hill, and J. A. Conger. 2010. Are you a high potential? Harvard Business Review (June):1-8.

Roberto, M., and L. Levesque. 2005. The art of making change initiatives stick. Sloan Management Review 46 (4): 53-60.

Rogers, E. M. 2005. Diffusion of Innovations. New York: Free Press.

Schein, E. H. 1980. Organizational Psychology, 3rd Edition. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall).

Stebbins, H., and A. Braganza. 2009. Exploring continuous organizational transformation: Morphing network interdependence. Journal of Change Management 9 (1): 27-47.

Tichy, N. M. 1983. Managing Strategic Change: Technical, Political and Cultural Dynamics. New York: Wiley.

Tichy, N. M., and M. A. Devanna. 1986. The Transformation Leader. New York: Wiley.

Tushman, M. L., and C. A. O'Reilly. 1996. Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. California Management Review 39 (4): 8

Tushman, M. L. 1997. Winning Through Innovation: A Practical Guide to Leading Organizational Change and Renewal. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Ulrich, D., J. Zenger, and N. Smallwood. 1999. Results-Based Leadership. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Unruh, G., and R. Ettenson. 2010. Growing green: Three smart paths to developing sustainable products. Harvard Business Review (June): 96-100.

Watkins, M. D. 2009. Picking the right transition strategy. Harvard Business Review (January): 2-8.

Weick, K. E., and R. E. Quinn. 1999. Organizational change and development. Annual Review of Psychology 50 (1): 361-386.

**Excerpted from syllabus:** MBA: Seminar in Organization Theory & Behavior. (Rubric below instructions.)

**4. Change Management Simulation - 25% of final grade - 250 points**
- Individual Paper

**PLEASE REVIEW THE RUBRIC FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT POSTED ON BLACKBOARD**

The *Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence* is an individual assignment and an experiential learning activity designed to enhance your learning about managing organizational change. The goal of the Simulation is to allow students to see and feel for themselves what it means to lead a strategic change in an organization. The assignment is to be completed during our *VIRTUAL* Class 9. No in-class meeting will be held.

Start by purchasing the Simulation after clicking on the coursepack link. Read the information provided about the Simulation. Select and read at least five (5) references (i.e. articles, books, etc.) from the list entitled: *Change Management Simulation: Power and Influence References* located in the Class Materials folder on Bb for Class 9. Then play the Simulation while being careful to reflect upon your reading prior to each of your decisions.

After you have completed the Simulation, write a five (5) page paper excluding title page and references, using 12-point font and double-spacing and post it through SafeAssign on Blackboard. You are to cite at least the five (5) references that you read in preparation for playing the Simulation in your paper. This means that you are to integrate the concepts from your reading and refer to them in a relevant way throughout your paper using APA format. In your paper, you must:

A. Describe each of the levers that you used and the sequence in which you used them. Provide a rationale for each of your choices.
B. Explain your assessment of how effective you were as a change agent.
C. Explain what you learned about managing organizational change.
D. Based on your response to C. above, describe what are you going to do differently the next time you are leading change.

Name: **Copy of Change Management Simulation Grading Rubric**
Description: **This rubric will be used to grade the Change Management Simulation Assignment. See course syllabus for assignment details.**

| | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Levers Used, Sequence, & Rationale** | Points Range:0 (0%) - 27 (10.8%) Some levers used may be missing from the discussion. The sequence of levers selected is not clear. The rationale for choosing each lever and the sequence of levers are minimally explained without examples. | Points Range:28 (11.2%) - 31 (12.4%) Each lever used and the sequence of levers selected are identified. There may be some confusion or vagueness regarding some of the levers selected. The rationale for choosing each lever and the sequence of levers are briefly explained. Few examples are provided and/or examples are not well explained to clearly explain | Points Range:32 (12.8%) - 35 (14%) Each lever used and the sequence of levers selected are identified. The rationale for choosing each lever and the sequence of levers are mostly explained with some examples. | Points Range:36 (14.4%) - 40 (16%) Each lever used and the sequence of levers selected are identified. The rationale for choosing each lever and the sequence of levers are thoroughly explained with examples. |
| **Change Agent Effectiveness Assessment** | Points Range:0 (0%) - 27.9 (11.16%) This section of the paper was omitted or minimally addressed without any specific references to the student's performance or | Points Range:28 (11.2%) - 31.9 (12.76%) An adequate assessment of the student's effectiveness as a change agent was provided with a few examples. Credibility and CER data was minimally discussed. | Points Range:32 (12.8%) - 35.9 (14.36%) A very good general discussion is provided about the student's effectiveness as a change agent including an explanation of her/his credibility during some of the steps of the game | Points Range:36 (14.4%) - 40 (16%) An insightful discussion is provided about the student's effectiveness as a change agent including an explanation of her/his credibility during each step of the game and at the end of the simulation. The student's overall CER was thoroughly reviewed and analyzed. Numerous specific examples are |

| | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | credibility and CER data. | | and at the end of the simulation. The student's overall CER was mostly reviewed and analyzed. Some specific examples are provided throughout the assessment. | provided throughout the assessment. |
| **Learning About Managing Organizational Change** | Points Range:0 (0%) - 27.9 (11.16%) Broad statements are made such as "managing organizational change is hard" or "changing an organization takes time." Little or no insight is offered to support general assertions about the student's learning. No data or examples from the simulation are used to explain the student's learning. No explanation is stated regarding how the student's | Points Range:28 (11.2%) - 31.9 (12.76%) Some broad statements are made such as "managing organizational change is hard" or "changing an organization takes time." Minimal insight is offered to support general assertions about the student's learning. Modest data and examples from the simulation are used to explain the student's learning. Minimal explanation is stated regarding how the student's thinking about managing organizational change has evolved after playing the simulation and reading organizational | Points Range:32 (12.8%) - 35.9 (14.36%) Only a few broad statements are made. Some insightful comments are offered to support general assertions about the student's learning. Some data and examples from the simulation are used to explain the student's learning. A brief or general explanation is stated regarding how the student's thinking about managing organizational change has evolved after playing the simulation and reading organizational change journal articles. | Points Range:36 (14.4%) - 40 (16%) Several insightful comments are offered to support specific assertions about learning. Numerous data and examples from the simulation are used to explain the student's learning. A thorough explanation is stated regarding how the student's thinking about managing organizational change has evolved after playing the simulation and reading organizational change journal articles. |

|  | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | thinking about managing organizational change has evolved after playing the simulation and reading organizational change journal articles. | change journal articles. |  |  |
| **What you would do differently next time you are leading change** | Points Range:0 (0%) - 27.9 (11.16%) General statements are given about managing organizational change or about the student's own preparation such as "I should have started the assignment earlier." No specific tactical statements are explained. No alternative strategic approach is outlined. | Points Range:28 (11.2%) - 31.9 (12.76%) A couple specific tactical statements about playing the simulation next time are partially explained such as "In the simulation I used the _____lever too often. Next time, I would use the _____lever instead because......." How the student's general or strategic approach to change would differ if she/he had the opportunity to lead a change project again is partially explained. | Points Range:32 (12.8%) - 35.9 (14.36%) Some specific tactical statements about playing the simulation next time are mostly explained such as "In the simulation I used the _____lever too often. Next time, I would use the _____lever instead because......." How the student's general or strategic approach to change would differ if she/he had the opportunity to lead a change project again is mostly explained. | Points Range:36 (14.4%) - 40 (16%) Several specific tactical statements about playing the simulation next time are thoroughly explained such as "In the simulation I used the _____lever too often. Next time, I would use the _____lever instead because......."A thorough discussion is provided about how the student's general or strategic approach to change would differ if she/he had the opportunity to lead a change project again. |
| **Organizational Change Literature Integration** | Points Range:0 (0%) - 48.9 (19.56%) Information from | Points Range:49 (19.6%) - 55.9 (22.36%) Information from insufficient sources | Points Range:56 (22.4%) - 62.9 (25.16%) Information from sufficient sources | Points Range:63 (25.2%) - 70 (28%) Information from sufficient sources was thoroughly explained. Organizational |

|  | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | insufficient sources was unsatisfactorily explained. Organizational change literature was not integrated into the discussions about levers used, change agent effectiveness assessment, learning about managing organizational change, and what the student would do differently next time. Citations to the literature in the paper do not match with the list of references at the end of the paper. | was satisfactorily explained. Organizational change literature was minimally integrated into the discussions in a relevant manner about levers used, change agent effectiveness assessment, learning about managing organizational change, and what the student would do differently next time. Citations to the literature in the paper mostly match with the list of references at the end of the paper. | was mostly explained. Organizational change literature was mostly integrated into the discussions in a relevant manner about levers used, change agent effectiveness assessment, learning about managing organizational change, and what the student would do differently next time. Citations to the literature in the paper completely match with the list of references at the end of the paper. | change literature was thoroughly integrated into the discussions in a relevant manner about levers used, change agent effectiveness assessment, learning about managing organizational change, and what the student would do differently next time. Citations to the literature in the paper completely match with the list of references at the end of the paper. |
| **Writing Organization and Mechanics/Language** | Points Range:0 (0%) - 13.9 (5.56%) Disorganized with confusing, disconnected ideas; very difficult to understand analysis. Meaning is | Points Range:14 (5.6%) - 15.9 (6.36%) Not clearly organized; may wander or lack appropriate transitions, but thought can be followed. Displays competence with simple sentence | Points Range:16 (6.4%) - 17.9 (7.16%) Organized; clearly stated main ideas with only minor problems in cohesiveness; ideas appropriately sequenced. Displays facility with language; | Points Range:18 (7.2%) - 20 (8%) Very well organized; main ideas are clear and vivid; effective smooth sequencing. Displays consistent facility with language; variety of sentence structures (simple and complex); sophisticated/precise/clever word choice; appropriate |

|  | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | seriously or frequently obscured or confused due to major or frequent problems in sentence construction, grammar, mechanics or word choice/idiom usage. | structure, although may have problems with complex sentences; lacks variety of sentences; occasional errors in grammar, mechanics, word choice or idiom usage, that may occasionally confuse meaning. | competence with most sentence structures; good word choice; occasional minor errors in grammar, mechanics, idiom usage, but meaning is not obscured. | use of idioms; no detectable grammatical or mechanical errors. |

**Example from Undergraduate Organizational Behavior course**

**Assignment Instructions:**

Using Chapter 17 and 13 material, lecture notes, the BizEd article *Navigating Change* by Tricia Bisoux, any other readings from class, the simulation foreground readings, and experience with the simulation prepare a report that addresses the items below.

**For <u>each of the two scenarios</u> your report should include:**

1. Specifically identify which scenario you are writing about. State the title of the position and whether the situation was low-urgency or high urgency and the power level (high/low) of the change agent.

2. Complete the following table for each of the two scenarios (i.e., one for each scenario):

Table 1: Change Management Simulation Actions and Results

| Week | Intended Goal (Kotter's Step) | Lever Pulled (Action Taken) | Rationale | Results | Change Phase |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USE AS MANY ROW AS NEEDED | | | | | |

3. What did you learn about the change management process from the simulation given the change context and your player authority?
   Points you might include:
   - How did the receptivity to change (stages of adoption) of your change targets affect the timing of the particular levers you chose?
   - Did the stage of organizational change (mobilization, movement, sustaining) affect the success of your levers? (Include how many weeks you spent in each of the three areas of organizational change.)
   - What were the affects of social networks?
   - How did the urgency of the situation affect your success during the change process?
   - How did your power and credibility in the situation affect your success during the change process?
   - What actions did you take to increase your credibility?
   - What other insights did you gain from participating in the simulation?

**Grading:**
There are three parts to your evaluation: participation in the simulation, written report, and participation in the debrief. Your report will be graded on 1)<u>Organization/creativity</u>. 2) <u>Reasoning and insight</u>, 3) <u>Grammar and Spelling</u>, and 4) <u>Mechanics</u>.

**Important Note:**

Class times for October 18th and 20th are virtual class periods for you to complete the simulation on your own. **You must complete your first role assignment for the simulation by Tuesday, October 18th by 5:00 p.m.** The assignment requires you to complete two role scenarios. **Failure to complete the first role assignment by Tuesday the 18th will result in an automatic 50% grade reduction.** Complete second role assignment by Sunday, October 23rd at 11:59p.m.

**Hardcopy of your report is due beginning of class Tuesday, October 25th.** Your notes/insights from the class debrief are to be added to your report (hand written).