

VIEWPOINT COMMENTS

on

"Training Needs or Development Needs?" (July 08)

Most of the responses we got were quite simple expressions of agreement with the position taken in the article. Some people said more, and we've picked out these below: -

"Both methods can be useful for an organisation but in some ways are actually linked. As Wentworth requires a significant commitment on time and resources, the individual's growth prospect and future development are the first factors in determining if we should commit. It is then that we identify what training or behaviours the individual needs to address. To send someone to a course like this just as part of an annual training objective would not be the most effective use of time and resource.

Our company now looks at Wentworth as a behavioural awareness intervention that can help the individual grow and be more effective but reserve this training also for the leaders and the next generation of leaders for our organisation."

- Randall (USA)

"Having a mixture of people who have some barrier or development weakness together with high potentials can give some extra variety to the course, and for the maximization of individual potential and leadership everyone (including high potentials) will have some weaker areas that will be challenged by the course.

Personally, I think both reasons are valid assuming everyone who a company sends is an investment and so they both have potential to grow."

- Neil (Russia)

"I totally agree with you (surprised??): I believe it is better to grow people, and it should definitely not be the responsibility of the HR department. They should help the directors take the right decisions by pointing towards the areas where growing is needed. But maybe for that to happen, some (HR and directors) should do Wentworth 2???"

- Nicolas (France)

"I would tend to agree with your viewpoint, although I am also a pragmatist (and happen to reside in an HR department!) and so know that the realities of corporate life mean resources are indeed constrained and sometimes there is a choice to be made between spending resources on performance improvement versus performance enhancement. On balance, and given complete free choice, I, like you, would focus on the latter.

A more important consideration for me is the individual's motivation and engagement with the particular development activity in question. So, for example, I would far rather have an individual attend training for performance improvement reasons if that individual is fully motivated to change and develop themselves as opposed to sending an already high performer on the same training if their attitude is one of "I don't need this as I am already at the top of my game". This for me is a more important consideration."

- Tim (UK)