

15.73

Memorandum/instruction

Job

re MANAGEMENT TRAINING FOR SENIOR PERSONNEL

to

from

GEORGE CLARKE

IAN ARNOLD

copies to D. Gazzard, J. Flower, A. Stenders, file date

1 May, 1973.

Your memo of 27 April, 1973 calls for comment. As a training programme introduction it is disastrous.

1. The 'style' of introduction will not fit any of the five defined points of the Grid.
2. You have not revealed the nature of your discussions with David Lloyd-Thomas about the strategy or tactical basis for your proposals.
3. You have not given any idea as to how you were affected by the grid or as to how it satisfied your own perceived management 'style' needs.
4. You have not stated how the proposed course of action in nominating people to attend the Phase I Seminars satisfies particular needs of U.S.C.
5. It would have been consistent with Grid Theory and Practice for you to have consulted with your fellow Directors before inviting anybody to attend Seminars.
6. You failed to acknowledge in your proposals that I have had thirteen years of formal and informal management training both external and 'in house' and management development and training was clearly defined as my responsibility by Consultants to USC.
7. Vague references to 'internal problems within USC' do not help. Post resignation interviews with all 'lost' staff and those 'lost' that are still here soon reveals the nature of discontentment. Honest and open discussion would provide real solutions. Then a training programme would make sense.
8. When, as you say, you would have resisted the suggestion of a training programme up until recently

it is unreasonable to push it through with such undue haste, without consultation and with concealed attitudes and apparent evaluations after you changed your mind.

9. The blanket approach of using Phase I of the Grid for Directors down to junior staff would not indicate a balanced and considered approach to USC's real needs in personnel development at this time.
10. There is disagreement in respect to the incidence of faults and their correction. It is acknowledged that we all have faults but it does not follow that we have themequally quantitatively or qualitatively as the Grid will demonstrate.

As you know George, I was pleased to hear you first mention sensitivity training and thought it a good move that you attend the Grid Seminar. I think further selective training would be of great value to you personally and to the firm.

There are few critics of the Grid Programme. My training manager and consultant friends who have attended seminars and incorporated the Grid in their own programmes (included at least two people in the seminar you attended) are happy with it and knowing my own background they think it would be of considerable interest to me to attend. I would very much like to do so and I am sure the other Directors would like to attend as well. Following my earlier remarks I would be very pleased to organise it along with a variety of other programmes.

You may be interested to know that from 1960 to 1966 following my own introduction in 1960 to an intensive training programme, I acted as a course leader in presenting various programmes to top management down to supervisor level. The value of training can be immense if properly applied but it can be wasted effort if not matched to the real and perceived needs of the organisation. One thing is absolutely certain and that is that such programmes must be introduced with complete openness and frankness to avoid the disaster of any management technique wrongly applied.

Don Gazzard has requested an Executive Committee Meeting to discuss this matter and the purpose of this memo is to put my own views forward to you as this might not be possible otherwise.