Iv calculations practice questions and answers

In this section: In search of FDA guidance documents issued: Guidelines issued by the Bureau of Bureau of Drug Evaluation and Research since June 20, 1979, the agency has been asked many questions about good lab regulations. Submit comments on this guidance document electronically via dock ID: FDA-2013-S-0610 - Special electronic submissions, For fda doctrinal management personnel (i.e. Citizens' Petitions, draft guidance documents, deviations and other administrative statements of records) If you are unable to submit comments online, please write written comments: Dockets Management Food and Drug Administration 5630 Fishers Lane, Rm 1061 Rockville, MD 20852 All comments should be identified under the guidance name. In a detailed interview, we asked Collins about the impact of his research and ideas on the economy, the stock market, and the very nature of executive leadership. Good and great companies that you wrote about all the great stock market results you've achieved over a 15-year period. But today the stock market is down. Does that mean we will not see any great companies today? Firstly, I want to correct a serious misconception. The stock market is not down. What does the stock market look like compared to 1985? The stock market is not down. What does 1990 look like? The stock market is not down. The market was irrationally out of whack - we didn't have a stock market; we had a speculative casino. The tech bubble was not a new economy - there is a new economy that goes years deeper. However, the cruel fact is that companies that were at the top of the technology bubble had no results. You can't get zero profit and claim that you have results. Companies that had great results before the bubble burst in case they're down in the period now, but what? The bottom line about a company like Cisco is, we don't know the answer yet. It is possible that these companies are only very difficult for a period of 6 to 12 months. Let me use the analogy. Let's say you have a great basketball dynasty like the UCLA Bruins under John Wooden. This is a team that is going to win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. It's a team that's gone from good to great. But in 1970 they lost three games. Does that mean we're going to write them off and say they're not a great team? We need to look at it in the longer term. The same applies to companies that have fallen into a bubble. It was too short a period. It will take more time to tell which companies that are in trouble now just going through an instant period and will have the resilience to come back. But for many entrepreneurs, the current slowdown is a sign of the collapse of the new economy. It's one of the most amazing times in history. What great complaint did we hear two or three years ago? So hard to get good people! Whining, whining, whining! Today we have the greatest chance that we are going to have for decades big people on the boat - not busload, but the boat - . And great companies always start with what, not what. Finally, we can get to the right side of the Law of Packard. Packard's Law is like a law of physics for great businesses. He says that no company can become or remain high if it allows its growth rate of income to exceed its growth to get the right people in a sustainable way. It's one of those timeless truths that transcend technology and the economy. Now, instead of trying to raise capital, we can build up people. If I were in the company today, I would have one priority, not everyone else: to buy as many of the best people as possible. I would postpone everything else if I could afford it – buildings, new projects, R&; D - fill your bus. Because things will come back. My gossses are going to start turning. And one of the biggest constraint on growth and my organization's success is not the market, there is no technology, there is no possibility, no stock market. If you want to be a great company, the single biggest limitation of your ability to grow is the ability to get and hang on enough right people. It's also a great time to force yourself to look back. When you were violated by Packard's Law, you probably let a lot of bad people on the bus. It's a good time to turn them off. In fact, now it is a little easier to do this. We can blame this on the circumstances. What else would you do to take advantage of this revaluation period? This is also a great time to ask yourself really tough questions. In a time of irrational prosperity when the market will give you money, whether you deliver or not, many companies have not answered any of the three layers of questions (What can we be the best in the world? What is the economic denominator that best promotes our economic engine? And who are our main people very passionate?). They had no idea what they could do better than any other company in the world that was sustainable, they didn't have a profit denominator, and the only thing they had a passion for was to flip the company. Now we can no longer live in that fantasy land. We have to look hard at all the things we do and put them all in the three-wheel test. Any things that do not meet the test, we must stop doing it - today. I see many companies that find themselves with a lot of capital. So they wandered into all kinds of acquisitions or new companies or new directions, just because they could. But they did not necessarily fit in three circles. Today, the task is to prune them. Those who explain their three laps will come out of this just fine. Those who did not deserve to die. Leaders today find themselves in little time to prove their worth. What advice will you give the CEO about the hot seat? If I were the CEO of the hot seat to take over the company that I wanted to go from good to great, that's what I would do. I would take that good and great stock chart and I put it before my director. I would say: We're on the left side of this curve. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Right? If that's what we all want, we know what it takes to get it. You can't keep lurching from CEO to CEO. If you do this, you will find yourself in the Doom Loop - and then we will find ourselves as one of the comparison companies, not one of the big companies. I don't think all directors are stupid. Most of them are intelligent, but they act out of ignorance, not a lack of good intentions. We need to hit them over the head with empirical results. Our job is to overcome the market sustainably over time. We need to think about the share price over a five-year period. And we have to start doing whatever it takes to make that spike turn. Finally, if I am CEO, I want the board to give me that guarantee: No matter how long or short my tenure as CEO, whatever i pick up as my successor, you need to pick up that spike in the middle and continue to push in a consistent direction. I can only get a spike rotating 16 RPM. But my successor has to take him to 100 RPM. His successor must take him to 500 RPM and his successor - 1 000 RPM. It's not about me as CEO - it's about committing to a coherent program. We're not going to do the Doom Loop.The executives who took their companies from good to great were mostly anonymous – far from the celebrity executives we read about. Is it an accident? Is this the cause and effect? I think it's more a matter of cause and effect than an accident. There is something directly related between the absence of celebrities and the presence of good and excellent results. Why? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into one genius with 1000 helpers. This creates a feeling that all this really is about the CEO. And this causes various problems - if a person goes away or if a person turns out to be a genius. On a deeper level, we have found that leaders do something great, their aspiration must be the greatness of work and enterprise, not for themselves. That doesn't mean they don't have an ego. This does not mean that they do not have any self-needs. This means that the point of decision after the decision - critical intersections where Choice A would favor their ego and choice of B would favor the company and its work - over and over again those leaders choose choice B. Celebrity executives, while deciding points, are more inclined to themselves and egos through company and work. Like anonymous executives, most companies that have made a transformation from good to great are unprotected. What does that tell us? The truth is that most people do not work in the most colorful things in the world. They do real work – meaning that most of the time they do a lot of drudgery just a few points of excitement heck. Some people release fried bread. Some are building retail stores. Real work the economy gets made by people who make cars that sell real estate, who own grocery stores and banks. So one of the biggest findings of this study is that you can be in an excellent company and do it in steel, pharmacies, grocery stores. Just not that if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool. It doesn't matter where you are. So no one has the right to whine about their company, their industry or the kind of business to which they are - again. Have the 11 companies that made the transformation used their anonymity? One of the biggest advantages that these companies have had, no one cared! Kroger began his transition; Nucor began his transition; no one expected much. They may not be underestimated and too much to deliver. In fact, if I took over the company and tried to force it from good to great, I would tell my vice president of communications that his job was to make the whole world think that we were constantly on poor edges. During the study, we actually printed transcripts of the CEO's presentations to analysts, made by good and excellent companies and comparison companies. We read all those. And it's astounding. Great people always talk about the challenges they face, the programs they build, the things they are worried about. You go to comparison companies, they keep hyping themselves, they sell the future – but they never score. If I'm not a CEO, how do I get good and great lessons? Good and excellent concepts apply to any situation , if you can choose the people around you. That is the essential thing. But basically, we really do – we have a lot of discretion within our lives of people, people we decide to let our bus, whether it's our department at work or in our personal lives. But the main message is this: Create your own gossses. You can do it. You can start building momentum for someone for which you have a responsibility. You can create an excellent section. You can create a great church community. You can take all the good and great ideas and apply them to your work or your life. What has your study been taught about changes in business in general? Is this basically a message to go back to basics? Very rarely significant changes ever lead to a sustainable result. This is one of the really important conclusions of the book. We started with 1,435 companies. And 11 companies did it. Let's look at this moment of fact. The fact is that this does not happen very often. why not? Because we don't know what we're doing! And since we don't know what we're doing, we're putting in all sorts of things that don't produce results. We end up like a bunch of primitive dances around the campfire chanting on the moon. I feel strongly that we need some science to understand what we really need to change things. Is it back to basics? No, it's waiting for an understanding. Why is this the basic principles that managers need to be ambitious for their companies, not themselves? Why go back to the basics so that first of all it can be said who and who doubts who and where the question is second? Since when has it returned to the basics for a company to start with a question like why we sucked 100 years ago, and what are the brutal facts we have to face? Why go back to the basics to argue that stop work lists are more important than task lists? And since ever returned to the basics to say that technology is just an accelerator, not a creator of anything? I do not think that these concepts have returned to the basics. Because if they are, we need to be able to come back in time and find that people have used these ideas. People didn't do it , so there are only 11 out of 1435. So, no, it doesn't go back to basics. This is waiting for an understanding. How do you value the new economy? We have seen many changes, and we have seen a lot of opposition against change. How do you make sense of all this? The huge changes that are taking place around us make it the most exciting time in history to be alive. It's a lot of fun. All these changes - technological change, globalisation - are brutal facts that must be integrated into any decisions we make. Walgreens people didn't ignore the internet because they were focused solely on the basics. They encountered a cruel internet fact and then asked: How does it fit our three circles, and how can we use it to turn our spikes faster? You will never ignore the changes – press them head on as brutal facts, or come to them with a great sense of glee and excitement. This change in this new technology opens you up a way to prevail, to be even better as a company. All good and excellent companies have taken the changes and used them in their favor, often with a large sheen. When the new pianos came, Mozart didn't hang up his music. He didn't say, There are these new pianos! Harpsichord is out of the way, so I washed as a composer! He thought, It's so cool! I can do it out loud with a piano forte! It's really neat! He maintained the discipline of writing excellent music and at the same time, with great sheen and excitement, embraced the invention of pianos. With all the changes around us, we have to be like Mozart. We maintain great discipline about our music, but at the same time we accept things that can allow us to make even more music. Alan M. Webber (awebber@fastcompany.com) is head of Fast Company. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote an essay in The Built Flip in the March 2000 issue of Fast Company. His new book, Good Great: Why Some Companies Make a Leap... And others will not, will be available in October. October.