

## Transcription - Talent Development

---

Welcome back, I'm Kim Baillie, she's Fulyana Orsborn and this is Inside Exec. Today we're going to talk about talent development. And this is a topic that is probably close to both our hearts because as you probably recall, for a long time, I was a training and development manager. And Fulyana has always developed talent one way or another, whether it's been through her corporate career or through the mentoring and the coaching and the accountability partnerships that she continues to do up to this day. We want to look at changes that have happened and the reactions when you do put time in, we do invest in talent development and that talent moves on somewhere else. So let's first of all have a look at what is happening in the world of talent development at the present time and then we'll look at the problems that might be associated with that.

I think this is a topic, of course, and everybody knows the benefits. I think what's happening more now, which is a bit concerning, is the fact that we're saying people are moving jobs more frequently now and that's more acceptable. Two to three years seem to be absolute maximum for most. And there's a bit of reluctance to invest in people, in the talent. Everybody wants to get the best people in the organization and then they say, well, what's the point? Some of them are, from what information I'm getting, saying what's the point? We have a limited budget. We train them and then they go somewhere else.

Well, as an organization, whether you're small or big, you attract talent based on what you've got to offer. Is it a good place to work? Is it a good brand? Is it within my values, et cetera? Do I have a career path? Will they invest in my training and development? In fact, they said as far as retention is concerned, there was a survey done recently by LinkedIn, that said 94% of people will stay if they receive development and training. So why wouldn't you?

Even if you're right, if we all think I'm not going to train them because they're going to go and everybody did that. Nobody then is investing in training and development. But if we all did it, then that's why I invest in Mr. or Ms. X and then they leave in two years and somebody else benefits. But guess what? I'm getting Mr. or Ms. Y and I'm getting the benefit of their investment.

I don't understand the basis of people saying, I've trained them and now they've gone somewhere else. So if you're not training them in your very specific tasks and activities, then you're just training them generally in the industry. So why would it be an issue? Your investment in them is for the industry. It's not for you unless you're training them only in your systems. And if they're leaving, it's because they're not happy with your systems or you, it's not about the industry.

And I don't think that there's this great influx of people that you've trained and then they leave the industry altogether and go into something completely different.

To my mind, it starts to sound like there needs to be industry training bodies. If the individual organisations are not interested. So not an industry training body as in a semi-government organisation, but someone who sets up a commercial entity that provides a range of training and skills development for a particular industry. Fulyana I are involved in something at the moment where there's a provider who is looking to use some of our content from Inside Exec

as part of the offering that they have for training and development within that industry. And to my mind, that's a much better model than organisations trying to think about how they were training people because in the long run, what tends to happen is that if you're in an organisation, you want the best person to train your staff in negotiation skills? You'll pick a company that's famous for that. And that company that provides the negotiation skills training will train every other company that are your competitors or are your peer group basically in industry.

So if you've trained someone using that person and they go somewhere else, there's no loss because as Fulyana has said, you'll get someone in who's had that same training anyway or similar training.

A lot of their development, particularly as you grow in your career, they're transferable skills. Not just industry, technical training. The other thing is, and I do have sympathies with this, medium and small businesses. They're struggling to just make ends meet and cover the wages. So I do understand. But I'm very pleased to say that I've learned some innovative things that they have done.

For example, there's one company that I'm working with at the moment, very small, you know, they just started out and they're building a really solid future.

And with the people up front when they get them on board, they say that we limited with that development, however, what we can do and we want to invest in your development, we can't afford to pay for courses or stuff like that. But we're hoping as the business grows, that is something really important to us and we want to put money aside for that. In the meantime, however, we will give you time to study. Whether you are studying online, which is so much more available online from universities around the world, attending in person, time to do your homework, time to read, whatever it is. You tell us what you want to do and what time you need and if it's specific, like is it specific time or I just want two hours a week or is it on every Wednesday because we have an interactive session online or I go to attend something and we'll approve that upfront.

So to me, I was really happy to hear that because there you go. Yes, the person is paying for it if it's a requirement. But the person doesn't feel like they're not supported by the employer. The employer is being honest and I believe that 100%, will pay for courses when they able to. That's good to see.

The other one, is a medium size and they again, they don't mind spending some but they can't afford too much. So they focus a lot more on getting the person involved into other things. Middle managers being involved in a lot of the strategy really young in a career sense and they haven't had exposure to what happens at the top end. And so the second one is we give you that exposure and give you that experience, you can attend the board meeting. It says they are trusted with the confidentiality etc. Another one they put them on a project, in some cases to contribute, but to learn in other cases, was leading a group when they'd never done that before. And they said well you lead that project even though you're not the most qualified person to do it and because the culture of that organization is such that nobody got offended.

Again, I'm not going to buy this "we haven't got the budget". Those two examples, those two organizations, I'm very impressed with.

Absolutely and I think it's about the resources and it's not about investing money necessarily in making the development happen, it's about, like with everything else, what resources have we got that we can turn to this activity that makes it a development activity rather than have to find someone. We have to find it somewhere in the budget because not always is external training the best training that you can get for an organization.

Another example was very good technical report writer but not so good at communication material type of writing. Again, the organisation couldn't afford them going to a communication course and expanding their ability that way.

So the immediate manager said why don't you start a newsletter? They never had a newsletter. This way you've got to collect information, you've got to analyze it, you've got to get sign off for it from the person you're quoting or interviewing and this way you're writing completely different material, you're not writing a technical specification. That person thought, oh but I haven't got experience yet. The manager responded with - I'll give you time to do it. Again another example of nil cost but a product at the end that's used by everyone and those are skills that are transferable.

In the event that you have a management structure that says, oh we gave them all these opportunities, we let him learn how to write or her how to write something that wasn't technical and now they've gone off and left the organization, what do we do now?

Well I think that's a management question that you really need to consider in terms of what were you expecting. What were you expecting? A pat on the head because you developed this person or you're doing it because you saw that it was going to benefit the organization as well as you've had the benefit to the organization as well as you've had the person there for that period of time?

And the bottom line to all of this is that yes, people leave organizations but sometimes they come back and when they come back they come back with other skills that they've learnt and if they're coming back, they're coming back because, as we mentioned earlier, they value the organization, they value the culture, they value the ethics, whatever else it is and they're prepared to come back with these extra skills that they've developed along the way.

They've developed as people along the way and will share with your organization. So you've got to look at both sides of that equation, that people are coming in to your organization with skills that they've prepared to give to your organization as well as leaving with skills that they've developed within the organization. Know the benefits of development and training this way, your reputation, you attract the right people, you retain the right people, you have better employee satisfaction, you have better customer satisfaction, you have better productivity when people are satisfied and therefore the bottom line is better, your shareholders are happy, your company will thrive.

So we know those benefits of how they translate to the bottom line at the end of the day. So why not do it as an equation that is equal on both sides? You can't have a mission statement or a value statement that says we value our people and we develop them and we let them be the best that they can be for this organization if you're not letting them develop and be the best that they can be.

Because it's all a one way street. We just need to bear in mind that development works for everybody, it's not just about the person and them getting all these skills, you're benefiting

from it in the organization by doing it.

We've had our "political" message for this session! Let us know if you have seen a change in the way development is handled within your organization and what you feel that is reflecting about the organization, but for now I'm Kim Baillie, she's Fulyana Orsborn and this is Inside Exec.