

The swimming pool 2

[Business](#), [Human Resources](#)



The swimming pool case study The main problem is that the new maintenance engineer was not qualified to run the pool operations, the general manager of the club had just fired the previous engineer who was qualified in this field. Mr. Angelo, the new maintenance engineer was qualified in all positions other than the repairing and maintenance of the swimming pool. The manager supposed that the experience of Mr. Angelo in other fields would substitute in the management of the pool. Besides, the manager believed that four day training on the basics of the maintenance and repair of the pool would provide him with enough knowledge to effectively run the pool. She was wrong. It was the responsibility of the general manager to ensure that the current engineer as fit for all the positions. Instead, she assumed that he was proficient at other roles; he would as well manage the pool (Hinkin 25). In the cedar case, the management seems to be under trouble due to the change of staff, the situation could only be changed if the new employees and managers receive specific training on how Cedar resort is operated. Otherwise, new staff will arrive with fresh ideas and ways of management (Hinkin 49).

Human resource professional are supposed to make decisions that they can be accountable in case of any setbacks. Human Resource managers and other decision makers of the management who take part in the process of making decisions have in the past years progressively been alleged “ personally liable” in the federal and state employment laws. In most cases, it is due to a decision that they made in the wrong manner. The case study on the swimming pool demonstrates personal liability for general managers who take part in human resource decision making, and what these managers can

do to reduce their experience to personal liability. This is the case in cedar, the new management is supposed to understand that it is their responsibility to train their staff the way they want the resort to be run.

Mr. Angelo was not qualified for the position of the pool maintenance and repair; he was qualified for other positions in the club. However, the general manager ignored this and provided undertraining on pool maintenance, this means that he was not fit to run the pool. This was purely the mistake of the manager. She is the one who is liable to anything that happened. In fact, Mr. Angelo was justified to act the way he did since he was acting in self-defense, in actual sense, he even didn't identify the problem. Besides, if Mr. Angelo admitted that it was indeed his fault, he would face legal accusations and the firm would not be on his side. Professional lawyers on human resources cases support prolonging liability to individual employees since they feel that experience can cause the business officials to move in a more careful manner to weigh the alternatives before taking an action. These accusations can also pressure the business to settle out of court when existing workers are faced with personal liability. The situation in the swimming pool case study could have been worse if the members sustained serious harms demanding for a full investigation that would identify that the manager hired a person with no experience. If these members had opted to file a lawsuit, the manager could be charged with several charges such as personal liability. Such cases can be avoided by ensuring that newly hired workers are fully qualified for the task they are assigned. If they are not, like in Angelo's case, they ought to receive a full training on the relevant field. Besides, the freshly trained employees are supposed to work under the

watch of a supervisor until the supervisor confirms that they can work independently. This can be of much help in reducing future errors that could be fatal (Hinkin 4).

Work Cited

Hinkin, Timothy. Cases in Hospitality Management: A Critical Incident Approach. Hoboken, N. J: John Wiley & Sons, 2006. Print.