

HR

18110107
18110
HR
LB

18.10.2018

OD 03

Organization Development

Roll No.:

Total No. of Questions : 7

Total No. of Printed Pages: 3

Duration (hrs.): 3 hours

Maximum Marks: 60

Note:

Question no.1, 2 and 7 are compulsory.

Attempt any two questions out of question nos. 3 to 6.

All questions are compulsory

Q.1: (15 Marks)

What is Organisation Development (OD)? How is OD distinct from Change Management. Is OD a broader concept than Change Management? Who is an OD Practitioner? What are his competencies and roles.

Q.2: (15 Marks)

“Family Group Team Building”, “Diagnostic Team Building” and “Intergroup Team Building” are the group intervention techniques. What is difference between these interventions. Explain any one intervention out of the three.

Q.3: (10 Marks)

Explain Lewins Change Model, Action Research Model and Positive Change Model as three major theories of planned change? Give comparison of these three models.

Q.4: (10 Marks)

What do you mean by Diagnosing Organisation. Please explain the model for diagnosing organisation at Organisational Level, Group Level and Individual Level.

Q.5: (10 Marks)

What are the forces for change? Mention the five activities contributing to effective change management and explain any two of them in detail.

Q.6: (10 Marks)

Short Notes :

Third Party Interventions

Career / life planning

Q.7:

(10 Marks)

Read the following case and answer the questions.

Anu Thakur had just finished her master's degree in organisatin development and had landed her first consulting position with a small consulting company in Mumbai. The president, Madhavan Ganesan, convinced Thakur that his growing organisation offered her a great opportunity to learn the business. He had a large number of contacts, an impressive executive career, and several years of consulting experience behind him

In fact, the firm was growing: adding new clients and projects as fast as its president could hire consultants. A few weeks after Thakur was hired, Madhavan assigned her to a new client, a small oil and gas company. "I've met with the client for several hours," he told her. "They are an important and potentially large opportunity for our firm. They're looking to us to help them address some long range planning issues. From the way they talk, they could also use some continuous quality improvement work as well."

As Thakur prepared for her initial meeting with the client, she reviewed financial data from the firm's annual report, examined trends in the client's industry, and thought about the issues that young firms face. Madhavan indicated that Thakur would first meet with the president of the firm to discuss initial issues and next steps.

When Thakur walked into the president's office, she was greeted by the firm's entire senior management team. Team members expressed eagerness to get to work on the important issues of how to improve the organisation's key business processes. They believed that an expert in continuous quality improvement (CQI), such as Thakur, was exactly the kind of help they needed to increase efficiency and cut costs in the core business. Members began to ask direct questions about technical details of CQI, the likely timeframe within which they might expect results, how to map key processes, and how to form quality improvement teams to identify and implement process improvements.

Thakur was stunned and overwhelmed. Nothing that Madhavan said about the issues facing this company being discussed and, worse, it was clear that he had sold her to the client as an "expert" in CQI. Her immediate response was to suggest that all of their questions were good ones, but that they needed to be answered in the context of the long-range goals and strategies of the firm. Thakur proposed that the best way to begin was for team members to provide her with some history about the organisation. In doing so, she was able to avert disaster and embarrassment for herself and her company, and to appear to be doing all the things necessary to begin a CQI project. The meeting ended with Thakur and the management team agreeing to meet again the following week.

Immediately the next day, Thakur sought out the president of her firm. She reported on the results of the meeting and her surprise at being sold to this client as an expert on CQI. Thakur suggested that her own competencies did not fit the needs of the client and requested that another consultant – one with expertise in CQI – be assigned to the project.

...3...

Madhavan Ganesan responded to Thakur's concerns: "I've known these people for over 10 years. They don't know exactly what they need. CQI is an important buzzword. It's the flavor of the month and if that's what they want, that's what we'll give them." He also told her that there were no other consultants available for this project. "Besides," he said, "the president of the client firm just called to say how much he enjoyed meeting with you and was looking forward to getting started on the project right away."

Anu Thakur felt that Madhavan's response to her concerns included a strong, inferred ultimatum: If you want to stay with this company, you had better take this job. "I knew I had to sink or swim with this job and this client," she later reported.

As Thakur reflected on her options, she pondered the following questions:

- How can I be honest with this client and thus not jeopardize my values of openness and honesty?
- How can I be helpful to this client?
- How much do I know about quality improvement processes?
- How do I satisfy the requirements of my employer?
- What obligations do I have?
- Who's going to know if I do or don't have the credentials to perform this work?
- What if I fail?

After thinking about those issues, Thakur summarized her position in terms of three dilemmas: a dilemma of self (who is Anu Thakur?), a dilemma of competence (what can I do?), and a dilemma of confidence (do I like who I work for?). Based on the issues, Thakur made the following tactical decisions. She spent 2 days at the library reading about and studying total quality management and continuous improvement. She also contacted several of her friends and former classmates who had experience with quality improvement efforts. Eventually, she contracted with one of them to be her "shadow" consultant – to work with her behind the scenes on formulating and implementing an intervention for the client.

Based on her preparation in the library and the discussions with her shadow consultant, Anu Thakur was able to facilitate an appropriate and effective intervention for the client. Shortly after her assignment was completed, she resigned from the consulting organisation.

Q.i. Misrepresentation, misuse of data, coercion, value and goal conflict, and technical ineptness are the five ethical dilemma's related to professional ethics in OD. Explain each of them in detail.

Q.ii. What kind of ethical dilemma is Anu Thakur going through. Explain with reasons.

Q.iii. If you were in Anu Thakur's place, how would have you handled the situation.

Q.iv. If you become an OD consultant, what precautions would you take to ensure that you maintain professional ethics as an consultant.
