GL BAJAJ Institute of Management & Research
Approved by A.I.C.T.E., Ministry of HRD, Govt. of India

Roll No…………

Plot No. 2, Knowledge Park-III, Greater Noida (U.P.) –201306

POST GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN MANAGEMENT (2019-21)
END TERM EXAMINATION (TERM -V)

Subject: Performance Management and Competency Mapping	Time: **02.30 hrs**
Sub. Code: PGH03	Max Marks: **60**

Note:
All questions are compulsory. Section A carries 10 marks: 5 questions of 2 marks each, Section B carries 30 marks having 3 questions (with internal choice question in each) of 10 marks each and Section C carries 20 marks one Case Study having 2 questions of 10 marks each.

SECTION - A

Attempt all questions. All questions are compulsory. **2×5 = 10 Marks**
Q. 1 (A): What is Performance Management System?
Q. 1 (B): Explain HR scorecard
Q. 1 (C): Compare KRAs and KPIs
Q. 1 (D): Describe SMART
Q. 1 (E): What is Competency Model?

SECTION - B

10 x 3 = 30 Marks

All questions are compulsory (Each question has an internal choice. Attempt any one (either A or B) from the internal choice)

Q. 2 A: Design and develop suitable Performance Management System for new start-up venture.

OR

Q. 2 B: The competency model has to be developed with reference to the roles. Elaborate the significance for business organization.
Q. 3 A: Performance Management may be what line managers do but they don't seem to do it very well. Discuss the issues involved and suggest the suitable alternatives to make it more effective.

OR

Q. 3 B: Explain the Lancaster Model of Managerial Competencies?
Q. 4A: Discuss the competency models with reference to applications.

OR

Q. 4B: Multi source feedback facilitates all round performance evaluation of senior management staff. Explain its components and applications for business organization.

SECTION - C

Read the case and answer the questions **10×02 = 20 Marks**
Q. 5: Case Study:
Frank became chief financial officer and a member of the Executive Committee of a medium-sized and moderately successful family-owned contracting business six months ago. The first nonfamily member to hold such a position and to be included in the Executive Committee, he took the job despite a lunch-time remark by the company's CEO that some members of the family were concerned about Frank's "fit with the company culture." But the CEO (who is married to the daughter of the founder of the company) said he was willing to "take a chance" on Frank.

Soon after Frank started, the company decided for the first time to "right-size" (a euphemism for downsize) to respond to rapid changes in its business. Frank, who had been through this before when he was a senior manager in his previous company, agreed this was good for the long-term health of the 20-year-old company. He decided not to worry that family members seemed more concerned about their own short-term financial interests.

Besides, the CEO was relying on Frank to help him determine how to downsize in an ethical manner; the CEO said he trusted Frank more on this than he did the head of his personnel department, who had "been around a little too long."

On Frank's recommendation, the company decided to make its lay-off decisions based on the annual performance appraisal scores of the employees. Each department manager would submit a list of employees ranked by the average score of their last three appraisals.

If the employee had been with the company less than three years, if the score for two employees was identical, or if there was some extraordinary circumstance, the manager would note it and make a decision about where to rank the person. At some point, Frank and the Executive Committee would draw a line, and those below the line would be laid off.

As Frank was reviewing the evaluations, he was puzzled to find three departments in which the employee at the bottom of the list had "N/A" where the evaluation score should have been written. When he asked the managers to explain, they told him these employees had been with the company almost since the beginning. When performance appraisals had been instituted six years earlier, the CEO agreed to the longtime employees' request that they keep receiving informal evaluations "as they always had."

The managers told Frank they'd questioned this decision, and the CEO had told them it wasn't their problem.

When Frank raised this issue with the CEO, he responded, "Oh, I know. I haven't really evaluated them in a long time, but it's time for them to retire anyway. They just aren't performing the way they used to. The company's been very good to them. They've got plenty of retirement stored away, not to mention the severance you've convinced me to offer. They're making pretty good money, so cutting them should let us lower the line a little and save jobs for some of the younger people--you know, young kids with families just starting out. And don't worry about a lawsuit. No way they'd do that."

"Do they know they're not performing well?" Frank asked.

"I don't know," the CEO responded. "They should. Everybody else in the company does."

As they walked to the door, the CEO put his arm around Frank's shoulder. "By the way," he said, "you should know that you've won over the Executive Committee. They think you are a terrific fit with this company. I'm glad you talked with me today about these three employees. You got it right: This is a company that cares for its employees--as long as it can and as long as they're producing. Always has, always will."

Frank left the CEO's office with the vague feeling that he had some moral choices to make.

Question

Q5(A): If you would have been in place of frank then what would have been your ways to execute the decision.

Q5(B): Prepare a suitable PMS which you will recommend to "right-size" in an ethical manner.

Mapping of Questions with Course Learning Outcome

Question Number	**COs**	**Marks Allocated**
Q. 1:	**CO1**	**10 marks**
Q. 2:	**CO2**	**10 marks**
Q. 3:	**CO3**	**10 marks**
Q. 4:	**CO4**	**10 marks**
Q. 5: A	**CO3**	**10 marks**
Q. 5:B	**CO4**	**10 marks**

Note: Font: Times New Roman, Font size: 12.