

**MAKERERE UNIVERSITY BUSINESS SCHOOL**  
**COURSEWORK TWO FOR THE BACHELOR OF HUMAN RESOURCE**  
**MANAGEMENT OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026**

---

**Course Name:** Training and Development    **Course Code:** BHR 2207

**Year of Study:** Two

**Semester:** Two

**Date:** 25<sup>th</sup> April, 2026

**Duration:** 10 days

**Mode of assessment:** Take-home

---

**Instructions**

1. Read the case study below and answer the accompanying questions.
2. The assignment should be done in groups of not more than five members.
3. Groups must avoid sharing their work. Cases of two or more groups submitting similar work shall be forwarded to the School Examinations Malpractice and Irregularities Committee.
4. Every group shall submit a presentable typed hard copy for marking. The name, registration number and signature of every group member should appear clearly.
5. To be submitted to Mr. Mugumya Duncan (0782585330) not later than 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2026 by 6:00 Pm.

**Case Study: Training for Recovery at Lakeview Foods Ltd.**

Lakeview Foods Ltd. is a medium-sized food processing company based in Mbarara, Uganda. The company buys milk, fruits, and grains from farmer groups and produces yoghurt, juice blends, and fortified porridge flour for supermarkets, schools, and hospitals across western and central Uganda. Over the last five years, demand for its products has grown steadily. The managing director, Ms. Ruth Turyahikayo, recently signed supply contracts with two large supermarket chains and one hospital network. On paper, the future looked promising. In practice, however, the company had begun to struggle.

During the previous eight months, customer complaints had increased. Some yoghurt cups had incorrect expiry labels. A few cartons of porridge flour were returned because of poor sealing. One supermarket temporarily suspended one product line after receiving complaints about inconsistent packaging. The hospital procurement officer also warned Lakeview Foods that unless delivery accuracy improved, the contract would be reviewed. Inside the company, production delays had become common. Workers blamed machines, machines operators blamed poor planning, and supervisors blamed “careless staff.” Tension between departments was growing.

The HR officer, James Byaruhanga, was asked to investigate. He found that the company had expanded faster than its people systems. Many employees had learned on the job through observation rather than formal instruction. Several long-serving machine operators were highly experienced, but they had never been trained to coach newer staff. In the packaging section, some workers could run the machines but did not fully understand hygiene standards, quality checkpoints, or how errors in sealing affected product safety and customer trust. In the stores department, stock records were often updated late, causing raw material shortages during production. The sales team frequently promised delivery dates without checking production schedules, creating conflict between departments.

One Monday morning, Ruth called a meeting with James, the production manager, the quality assurance supervisor, the sales manager, and three line supervisors. The discussion quickly exposed the depth of the problem. The production manager reported that output targets had not been met in three of the last six months. Downtime on one filling machine had risen because operators were making avoidable errors during setup. The quality assurance supervisor said that many workers still treated quality inspection as “someone else’s job” instead of part of everyday work. The sales manager complained that customer-facing staff lacked product knowledge and sometimes failed to respond professionally to complaints. One line supervisor added that team leaders were technically strong but poor at giving instructions, handling conflict, and coordinating shifts.

James then presented findings from HR records. Staff turnover among packaging assistants was rising, especially among younger employees. Exit conversations suggested frustration, limited guidance, and lack of growth opportunities. Absenteeism had also increased in two production teams. New recruits said induction was too brief; they were shown around the plant on the first day and then immediately placed on the line. A number of employees said they were never quite sure what standard of performance was expected. Some feared asking questions because supervisors often interpreted mistakes as laziness rather than skill gaps.

The managing director became concerned that the business was facing more than a production problem. She saw a risk to the company’s reputation, customer retention, and expansion plans. If product quality and delivery reliability continued to fall, Lakeview Foods could lose contracts, waste materials, and damage its brand. She also realized that the company could not simply buy new machines and expect performance to improve. Employees needed the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for a growing manufacturing business.

To understand the issue better, James visited several departments over a two-week period. In production, he observed that some employees did not fully follow standard operating procedures. Certain operators skipped minor calibration checks because they believed these steps wasted time. In quality control, records were sometimes incomplete because staff were not confident in documentation procedures. In stores, one clerk had basic computer skills but struggled with the inventory software the company introduced four months earlier. In sales and distribution, drivers and sales representatives lacked training in customer communication, complaint handling, and delivery coordination.

James also noticed important differences across work groups. Team A in yoghurt processing consistently met targets and had fewer defects. The supervisor on that team held short pre-shift briefings, checked understanding, and encouraged members to solve problems together. Team C, by contrast, had poor communication and frequent blame-shifting. Members waited for orders instead of coordinating tasks. When one worker was absent, the entire line slowed down because others had not been cross-trained. In meetings, the team rarely discussed causes of mistakes or how to improve workflow. This suggested that the company's challenge was not only about individual capability, but also about how teams worked together.

At the individual level, James found several clear cases of unmet development needs. Sarah, a newly promoted shift supervisor, was respected for her technical ability but admitted she had never been trained in leadership, delegation, or performance feedback. She often corrected errors by taking over tasks herself, which frustrated her team and exhausted her. Peter, a storekeeper, was hardworking and trustworthy but had difficulty using spreadsheets and stock management software, leading to delays in inventory updates. Aisha, a sales representative, had strong energy and confidence but limited skill in handling difficult customer conversations and converting complaints into service recovery opportunities. Meanwhile, several machine operators wanted to learn basic preventive maintenance so they could reduce downtime, but no structured training had been provided.

When James summarized his findings, he argued that training and development were now necessary for three broad reasons. First, at the organizational level, the company needed to improve quality, productivity, compliance, customer satisfaction, and readiness for expansion. Training was no longer optional; it was necessary for business survival and competitiveness. Second, at the team level, better coordination, communication, cross-functional understanding, and problem-solving were needed if departments and shift teams were to work smoothly. Third, at the individual level, employees needed support to perform current jobs well, prepare for new responsibilities, and feel valued enough to stay and grow with the company.

Ruth agreed, but she raised a practical concern: "We cannot train everybody on everything at once." The management team therefore began discussing priorities. In production and quality assurance, they proposed training on food hygiene, quality standards, machine handling, error detection, packaging accuracy, and standard operating procedures. For supervisors, they suggested coaching in leadership, communication, delegation, conflict management, and performance monitoring. For stores staff, digital stock control and record accuracy became urgent needs. For sales and distribution staff, customer care, product knowledge, complaint handling, and coordination with production were identified. The production manager also proposed team-based problem-solving workshops and cross-training so employees could support each other during absences or peak demand periods.

As these discussions continued, a final incident increased the urgency. A school that had recently begun ordering porridge flour reported that its delivery arrived two days late and with incorrect quantities. The school bursar warned that the company would be removed from the supplier list if such mistakes happened again. At the same time, one experienced operator announced he had

accepted an offer from a competing processor that promised structured staff development. For Ruth, this was a turning point. She concluded that training and development were not simply about correcting weakness; they were also about protecting knowledge, building morale, strengthening teamwork, and preparing the company for future growth.

Lakeview Foods now faces a key HR decision: how to design a training and development response that addresses business performance, team effectiveness, and employee capability at the same time, within limited resources.

### **Activities**

- a) In reference to the above case, it is obvious that not all production inefficiencies can be solved through training, examine the training oriented inefficiencies you perceive from the case and suggest their appropriate training methods. **(15 marks)**
- b) Identify the relevant learning partners in the case study and describe their role towards learning among workers of LakeView Foods Limited. **(15 marks)**
- c) Discuss the training and development limitations portrayed by the case study of LakeView Foods Limited. **(10 marks)**