

Name:

Enrolment No:



**UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & ENERGY STUDIES**

**End Semester Examination (Online) – Jan, 2021**

**Program: BBA (AVO)**

**Subject/Course: Human Resource Management**

**Course Code: HRES 3001**

**Semester: VI**

**Max. Marks: 100**

**Duration: 3 Hours**

<b>SECTION A</b>		
<b>Q.No</b>	<b>Each question of 5 marks Instruction: Fill in the blanks</b>	<b>COs</b>
1-	The first step in determining supply of manpower is placing advertisements in newspapers. _____ (Yes/ No)	CO3
2-	Two quantitative methods of HRP are _____ and _____	CO1
3-	One of the advantages of HR outsourcing is _____	CO2
4-	Two different types of transfers are _____ and _____	CO1
5-	The value of selection process can be assessed on the basis of _____ and _____	CO2
6-	The four different methods of job designing are _____, _____, _____ and _____	CO1
<b>SECTION B</b>		
<b>Each question of 10 marks Instruction: Write short answers</b>		
7-	How can human resource management be instrumental in helping a company create a competitive advantage?	CO4
8-	With the help of a flow diagram show the training process generally followed by the organizations. Briefly explain the 'Kirkpatrick' model of training evaluation.	CO2
9-	Which method of wage payment- time rate or piece rate- would you adopt in the following situations? i) When methods of production are standardized. ii) When workman has no control over the quality of the product iii) When office clerks are to be remunerated, and iv) When a collective effort of a group of individuals is necessary for completion of a job.	CO3

10-	Briefly explain two internal and two external factors which affect the recruitment process of a company.	CO2
11-	<p>For the job of a sales executive, a company is willing to provide Rs. 10,000/- per month as CTC. What can be some of the ways to distribute this amount under the categories of basic compensation, variable compensation and supplementary compensation? Which distribution do you think is the best and why?</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Differentiate between ‘Social insurance’ and ‘Social assistance’? What kind of social security benefits are generally provided by Indian companies?</p>	CO3
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SECTION C</b></p> <p><b>This question is of 20 marks</b></p> <p><b>Instruction: Read the caselet and answer the question which follows</b></p>	CO4
12-	<p>Reetesh Gangwar, the newly appointed vice president for administrative affairs at the State University, faced a tough problem shortly after his university career began. A few weeks after he came on board in September, University's president, Mr. Gangwar's boss, told him that one of his first tasks was to improve the appraisal system used to evaluate secretarial and clerical performance at the University. Apparently, the main difficulty was that their performance appraisal was traditionally tied directly to salary increases given at the end of the year. So most administrators were less than accurate when they used the graphic rating forms that were the basis of the clerical staff evaluation. In fact, what usually happened was that each administrator simply rated his or her clerk or secretary as "excellent." and cleared the way for all support staff to receive a maximum pay increase every year.</p> <p>But the current University budget simply did not include enough money to fund another "maximum" annual increase for every staffer. Furthermore, the University's president felt that the custom of providing invalid feedback to each secretary on his or her year's performance was not productive, so, he had asked the new vice president to revise the system. In October, Reetesh sent a memo to all administrators telling them that in the future no more than half the secretaries reporting to any particular administrator could be appraised as "excellent." This move, in effect, forced each supervisor to begin ranking his or her secretaries for quality of performance. The vice president's memo met widespread resistance immediately from administrators, who were afraid that many of their secretaries would begin leaving for more lucrative jobs in private industry; and from secretaries, who felt that the new system was unfair and reduced each secretary's chance of receiving a maximum salary increase. A handful of secretaries had begun quietly picketing outside the president's home on the university campus. The picketing, caustic remarks by disgruntled administrators, and rumors of an impending slow down by the secretaries (there were about 250 on campus) made Reetesh Gangwar wonder whether he had made the right decision by setting up forced ranking. He knew, however, that there were a few performance appraisal experts in the School of Business, so, he decided to set up an appointment with them to discuss the matter.</p> <p>He met with them the next morning. He explained the situation as he had found it: The</p>	

present appraisal system had been set up when the University first opened 10 years earlier, and the appraisal form had been developed primarily by a committee of secretaries. Under that system, the University's administrators filled out forms. This once-a-year appraisal (in March) had run into problems almost immediately, since it was apparent from the start that administrators varied widely in their interpretations of job standards, as well as in how conscientiously they filled out the forms and supervised their secretaries. Moreover, at the end of the first year it became obvious to everyone that each secretary's salary increase was tied directly to the March appraisal. For example, those rated "excellent" received the maximum increases, those rated "good" received smaller increases, and those given neither rating received only the standard across-the-board cost-of-living increase. Since universities in general have paid secretaries somewhat lower salaries than those prevailing in private industry, some secretaries left in a huff that first year. From that time on, most administrators simply rated all secretaries excellent in order to reduce staff turnover, thus ensuring each a maximum increase. In the process, they also avoided the hard feelings aroused by the significant performance differences otherwise highlighted by administrators.

Two experts agreed to consider the problem, and in two weeks they came back to the vice president with the following recommendations. First, the form used to rate the secretaries was grossly insufficient. It was unclear what "excellent" or "quality of work" meant, for example. In addition, they recommended that the vice president rescind his earlier memo and no longer attempt to force university administrators to arbitrarily rate at least half their secretaries as something less than excellent. The two consultants pointed out that this was, in fact, an unfair procedure since it was quite possible that any particular administrator might have staffers who were all or virtually all excellent-or conceivably, although less likely, all below standard. The experts said that the way to get all the administrators to take the appraisal process more seriously was to stop tying it to salary increases. In other words, they recommended that every administrator fill out a form for each secretary at least once a year and then use this form as the basis of a counseling session. Salary increases would have to be made on some basis other than the performance appraisal, so that administrators would no longer hesitate to fill out the rating forms honestly.

Mr. Gangwar thanked the two experts and went back to his office to ponder their recommendations. Some of the recommendations (such as substituting the new rating form for the old), seemed to make sense. Nevertheless, he still had serious doubts as to the efficacy of the graphic rating form, particularly if he were to decide in favor of his original forced ranking approach. The experts' second recommendation - to stop tying the appraisals to salary increases - made sense but raised at least one very practical problem: If salary increases were not to be based on performance appraisals, on what were they to be based? He began wondering whether the experts' recommendations weren't simply based on, ivory tower theorizing.

### Questions

1. Do you think that the experts' recommendations will be sufficient to get most of the administrators to fill out the rating forms properly? Why? Why not? What additional (if

any) do you think will be necessary?

2. What performance appraisal system would you develop for the secretaries if you were in Reetesh Gangwar's place? Defend your answer.