

PGDM, 2019-21
Learning & Development
DM-321
Trimester – III, End-Term Examination: July, 2020

Time allowed: 1 Hr. 30 Min
Max Marks: 30

Roll No: _____

Instruction: Students are required to use pen and paper to write answers on unruled A4 sheet (s) and for identification, please scan your BIMTECH id card with answer sheets.

Analyze the case study and answer the questions that follow. Each question indicates the marks that it carries.

In 1987, Ms. Dillman was hired by IMP to work in Hangar 3 at North American International Airport as seamstress in their fabric shop. After six months, the workload dropped, so Ms. Dillman approached her supervisor and asked for additional responsibilities. He sent her to the sheet metal shop. A number of months passed and she approached the supervisor and asked if her classification could be changed from fabric worker to sheet metal technician; he complied.

At 20, years of age, she was the only women out of about 100 employees working in Hangar 3. She often received special attention in terms of help and guidance, which she indicated she appreciated. But it was a male dominated environment and the language was crude and vulgar. Having objectionable pictures in the locker room was prohibited, but some pictures were posted and little was done about it. There was also evidence that in apprenticeship programs men received extensive training, whereas women in the same programs received minimal training.

Mr. Pettipas was a long-time employee at IMP. In 1989, Ms. Dillman was assigned to work for him, and he was to provide her with on the job training. The first problem arose when Ms. Dillman made a mistake. Mr. Pettipas erupted in a torrent of verbal abuse directed at her. No one had ever heard him act so inappropriately. The incident caused Ms. Dillman to ask if she could be reassigned; the request was granted. When Mr. Pettipas was working in other hangars, things went fine. But when Mr. Pettipas was in her vicinity, he always made snide comments and insinuations. On one occasion, he screamed at her, calling her a tramp and trouble maker. He said, she was not welcome in the workplace. Whenever he went by her, he would say something derogatory. By 1990, everyone in Hangar 3 knew of the situation between the two employees.

In late 1990, a series of meetings between Pettipas, Dillman, a company representative, and a union representative were held, in an attempt to defuse the situation. But Mr. Pettipas refused to admit he had done anything wrong. The union representative and manager involved agreed that a warning letter would be placed in Mr. Pettipas file relating to his treatment of Ms. Dillman, and it would remain there for two years. In response, Mr. Pattipas went to see Mr.

Rowe, the President and CEO of IMP, and convinced him to remove the letter. Mr. Pettipas then went around the hanger bragging to everyone that he had won.

All this had a devastating effect on Ms. Dillman and in early May of 1991, she went on long term disability for a few months. When she returned, she met with the HR manager to discuss the difficulty with Mr. Pettipas. He suggested she take more time off, which she did.

In January of 1992, Ms. Dillman was transferred to another hangar, where she was involved with airframe construction. In the nine months she was there, the supervisor often complimented her on the quality of her work. None of her works was ever rejected. Then she received word that she was being transferred back to Hangar 3. Even though her own supervisor had nothing but praise of her work, the Director of Aircraft Maintenance had given the order because, "her work was not up to the standard". When she questioned the Director, he gave no specifics. When she indicated the problem regarding going back to Hangar 3, he promised to look into it. Nothing happened and she was sent to Hangar 3.

She filed a complaint with the Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission. As a result of the commission's findings, IMP had to pay Ms. Dillman about \$ 30,000. IMP was also ordered to provide training to all employees, on company time.

Answer the following questions assuming you have been contacted to provide this training:

- 1) **Would a TNA be needed in this situation? Why or why not? If yes, who would you want to talk to and collect relevant information? [10 Marks]**
- 2) **Based on the case study, what KSAs need to be trained? [5 Marks]**
- 3) **Why has the commission insisted on training for the whole company when the problem is clearly only Mr. Pettipas? Elaborate. [5 Marks]**
- 4) **For the training to be effective, what other things so you think need attention? [5 Marks]**
- 5) **What would you suggest in the way of evaluation of the training? How would you convince top management that it would be worth it? [5 Marks]**