

MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Term-End Examination

June, 2011

**MS-22 : HUMAN RESOURCE
DEVELOPMENT**

Time : 3 hours

Maximum Marks : 100

(Weightage 70%)

-
- Note :** (i) *There are two Sections A and B.*
(ii) *Attempt any three questions from Section A.*
Each question carries 20 marks.
(iii) *Section B is compulsory and carries 40 marks.*
-

SECTION - A

1. What are the 3 Ss of Organisational Development ? Discuss the Competency based Organisational Development System. Explain with suitable examples.
2. What are the objectives of compensation - cum-reward system ? Briefly discuss various components of compensation system, citing suitable examples.
3. How does HRD Audit contribute towards development process of an organisation ? Explain the process of HRD Audit in an organisation.

4. What are the issues in managing technological change in work organisation ? Briefly discuss the role and relationship of HRD in managing technological change.

5. Write short notes on *any three* of the following :
 - (a) 360 Degree Appraisal
 - (b) Mentoring
 - (c) Role of Trade Unions in HRD
 - (d) Career Transition and choices
 - (e) Diversity Management

SECTION - B

6. Read the case and answer the questions given at the end :

The HRD programme was decided to be initiated in IOC as a totally fresh and uncontaminated idea. To introduce HRD as a fresh idea was in itself an innovative idea, since the Corporation had well - established Human Resources Management policies and practices. Yet, the very idea was mooted as a concept, accepted as a principle, presented to the top management in the company represented by the Directors and got cleared for introduction as a necessary intervention, considering the growth and development plans of the organisation.

To start with, the road -show of the concept comprised a wide campaign to create extensive awareness that HRD, as an issue, was everybody's baby and that it needs to be properly nurtured and cared for. When the whole objective was explained to critical senior management groups, the concept received wide acceptance. After all, any new idea should be worth looking into !

The top and senior management groups in the Corporation, thus backed and accepted in principle, the process of undertaking a company -wide campaign for the new-look HRD programme. This, no doubt, implied that the

established policies will continue to be operated, but are liable to be tested for validity and modified for deficiency, wherever called for.

The awareness campaign was set in motion with great vigour and gusto. The initial campaign was concentrated on executives at all levels. This pre - supposed two things : top management commitment as a vanguard action and executive involvement as a lead group activity. Within a short time, conferences, seminars, workshops and training programmes were designed, drawn -up and delivered throughout the organisation to cover virtually every executive.

What was missed in the process was the large bulk of non- executives. Though there was a plan to cover the non -executives in the second leg of the campaign, the very fact that initial efforts were going only in the direction of executives created its own rustles and rambles.

The HRD action groups, who were spearheading and controlling the HRD activities, naturally had to take notice of the message which had come too soon from the non -executive categories of employees. It was, therefore, only natural to recognise that without waiting for the second leg of the campaign, the need was to advance the campaign schedule and initiate the HRD awareness programme for non- executives

as well. After all, the milk has to be given gladly to the baby which started crying !

But the process of covering the large mass of non- executive employees was not an easy task. The number as well as the spread at numerous locations throughout the country made the task much more difficult. It was felt necessary to achieve coverage of maximum number of non-executive employees to a one-day “HRD awareness programme”. The programme outline was centrally designed but the specific inputs were left to be decided by the divisional and unit functionaries.

The programme design provided for executives as faculty, who would cover small non - executive groups in lecture and discussion sessions on the whole concept of new HRD programme that the Corporation is contemplating. When the executives speak to the non -executives on any projected company programme, needing involvement of non -executives, a pinch of salt is always present ! This was true for the initial awareness programmes organised for non -executives as well. When it became clear that the message was not really going down to the participants, naturally the question arose whether it was worthwhile going ahead with the rest of the programmes covering the large majority of non-executives.

The HRD group stepped in and rolled back their campaign at least temporarily to review whether everything is going to be okay or not. It was the general view that there is a “receptability block” operating in the communication channel between the executive faculty members and the non -executive participants. This has to be overcome if the programme is to give the maximum possible return.

It was one of the ideas to try out the next few programmes with faculty drawn from among the non -executives themselves, rather than the traditional executive faculty. Employees from non - executive category with excellent communication, comprehension and influencing skills were identified and provided with a briefing as to what exactly is the inherent purpose of the awareness programme.

It was a revelation to find a sea - change in the receptability of participants. Although, the programme input was the same, the difference lay in the fact that earlier the executive faculty used to speak to the non - executive participants, whereas now it was the non - executives themselves functioning as faculty, speaking to their own colleagues in a language perceived as their own. We often tend to forget this and end up reaping a harvest much below our expectation.

Therefore, it is worth considering : why settle for a lean harvest when you can afford to have the full harvest ! It is small ideas that often bring big results.

Questions :

- (a) What is the problem as you see it ?
Elaborate.
 - (b) List the lessons learnt. What is your recommendation in this situation ?
 - (c) What is the "receptability block" ? Explain.
 - (d) What were the changes witnessed ? How did they occur ?
-