When Training Professionals Begin to Manage Vendors
Lessons from Apple Computer

By Jim Everett, Endeavour Business Learning (now Think180™) – July, 1999

Chapter printed in the ASTD's In Action Series – "Building Learning Capability Through Outsourcing" by Jack J. Phillips, Series Editor and Merrill C. Anderson, Editor

---

Increasing numbers of training projects are being outsourced these days. The role of managing these projects typically is assigned to training professionals within training departments. Most often, these are people who have been individual contributors, and whose motivation and experience are in developing or delivering training themselves. Training managers must consider the selection of the vendor who best fits the particular project and also must help the training professional both adjust to the new role and acquire the appropriate project management skills and approaches to succeed in this role. This chapter looks at two different real-life situations and the lessons learned from them in the framework of a strategic outsourcing model.

Outsourcing is not new. Medieval Popes and early Scots knew about it long before modern managers. Painting the Sistine Chapel was an outsourced project; Scottish weaving mills have used home-based woolspinners for centuries; city governments have long used contractors for services; for decades businesses have engaged executives on a temporary basis.

So, what happens in today's company when training work is outsourced? The job of managing the program or project often is assigned to a professional from within the training department. In some cases, this may be the first time that this individual has been directly responsible for work carried out by others.

As well as getting to understand the issues and requirements for the outsourcing process, there is also a personal or career transition and a learning process the individual training professional must go through, to be successful in the new role. For some, this can mean a major shift in thinking, and a range of new skills and techniques. For these people, a coach can help show how to approach the new role, to take on different tasks, and to see how their own job is changing.

To a person accustomed to working as an individual contributor, the work of managing can sometimes appear less concrete than the "hands-on" work of a professional trainer. Managing may appear either easy or daunting. Ironically, as will be seen in a later vignette, most problems seem to occur when the role of vendor manager is seen to be obvious and easy.

Models and processes can help to provide a framework for both the new and the experienced manager to wrap their mind around the job of setting up outsourcing for a project. They help in selecting and engaging the most suitable vendor, getting the process underway, and managing the performance of the vendor on the project.

In this chapter, we look at two scenarios, and a vignette, where individual contributors have been assigned projects that involve selecting, engaging and partnering with external training providers or "vendors." As an aside, it is worth noting that partnering requires adopting a different mindset from simply engaging a vendor, as well as a different approach to that engagement.

In the first of our two scenarios, we meet Len, a feisty, hands-on service technician trainer who reluctantly has to turn over to an external organization the work of training service technicians and then manage that vendor relationship and program.

In the second, we meet Ruth, a well-qualified and seasoned training professional. She is a member of the development team in a large training organization that is planning to engage specialized consultants to develop and deliver train-the-trainer (T3) events for a national strategic training program for the company's field sales staff and reseller sales staff. We also get a glimpse into the motivations and working styles of Len and of Ruth, since these are very much part of in the equation of selecting and working with the respective vendors.

In each situation, the training professional participates in the process of selecting the vendor and setting up the project. In each case, specific selection techniques are used, and project controls are put in place. Coaching and guiding plays a key part in creating confidence and enthusiasm with the individuals for the processes involved.

By examining these two scenarios, we can see how two different examples of partnering fit clearly into a model that allows us to quickly identify the key criteria and actions for each "form" of outsourcing can be managed.

Internal or External Resources?

Training departments are increasingly using vendors, contractors and consultants to perform specialized roles, or supplement their training staff for varying workloads. Vendors play a crucial role in the success of many training activities.

Training departments may decide to use external resources when:

- Specialized or costly expertise is required for short time frame, and it is not cost-effective to hire a full time employee.
- A specific, time critical program requires dedicated, specialized resources in order to meet a tight timeline.
- The nature of the training requires a vendor that is set up and geared to run training in a way that is not possible with internal resources.
- The training is such that it requires a specialized operation designed for cost-effectiveness and efficiency required (such as software training for employees).
- The internal resources are tied up on other projects, are unavailable – perhaps as a result of stovepiping of staff (that is, adhering to rigid organizational lines based on function or expertise) to deal with different functions, or maybe even as a result of internal politics.
- The training or development work requires a unique set of skills or expertise that typically is available only with a consulting organization (a breadth of understanding of the marketplace and competition).

Understanding and Managing Vendors vs. Employees

Managers must understand key differences between employees and vendors or contractors, and what it means to how they manage. Differences are more obvious when distinct; standalone work is outsourced to a vendor. The role of vendor or external resource is clear and distinct from that of employees. When a contractor, consultant or vendor representative either joins or manages a training project team, the distinction between them and an employee becomes less obvious and less clear. The table is designed to clarify the situation.

Characteristics of Employees vs. Vendors

Employee	Vendor/Contractor
Work defined by job description	Work defined by contract
Works measured by achievement of objectives for review period	Work measured by milestones or service levels in agreement
Terms & conditions set out in blanket employment contract	Terms & conditions in agreement or contract for specific work
Permanent work, not time bound	Engaged for a specific period of time or phase
Termination must be in accordance with employment law and for acceptable reason(s)	Contract may be terminated at any time subject to requirements of contract
Sign-off and authority level by delegation	Discretion to act is granted and authorized in writing in contract
Company assumes liability	Carries liability
Performance in role reviewed periodically	Performance reviewed against milestones or services levels
Directed by manager as required	Directed by client as per contract
Negotiates on role, career, responsibilities, growth, salary	Negotiates on deliverables, standards, timing, cost
Learning and development is part of the job	Expected to be proficient and learn at own cost
Commitment to the company	Commitment to project or program
Manager shares responsibility for poor performance or failure. Company usually assumes liability	Vendor responsible to deliver according to agreement. May be legally liable for failure
Manager has discretion on bonus	Bonuses specified in contract with requisite conditions

Understanding Forms of Outsourcing and Management Priorities

Outsourcing can be designated in four different forms, depending on two key differentiators:

1. ***Integration with the Business*** – the extent to which the function, activity or project is integrated with company operations, and whether the vendor participates in the meetings and decisions of the business.
2. ***Recipients of Service*** – who receives the results of the function, activity or project. This may be employees or internal company functions, or customers, partners, channel members, or other outside stakeholders of the company.

These differentiators make up the two axes on the Outsourcing Matrix (shown on page 5). The resulting matrix creates four distinct forms of outsourcing, and shows characteristics of each with examples, what key value is provided, as well as specific selection priorities for each. It also clearly shows the actions essential to achieve the best results through selecting and managing vendors effectively for each distinct form. As in life, not all situations fit neatly into a box, and some outsourcing situations may be a blend of more than one form, or a shift over time.

Outsourcing Forms

The four distinct forms of outsourcing shown in the Outsourcing Matrix range from "most like an employee" (Team Partner), to "least like an employee" (Facility Vendor).

- **Team Partner** – Contract expertise is brought in to work internally as part of a team or within a function. Of the four, it is the most integrated with company functions and decision making. Many IT projects use this form of outsourcing. Examples include contract developers and project managers.
- **Delivery Partner** – External third parties provide integrated solutions or deliver strategic information on company products to customers, as part of the overall marketing and product definition. Examples include VARs and product sales training providers.
- **Delivery Vendor** – The delivery of a service or product to the customer is contracted out and completely handled by an external agency. Outsourced functions may include merchandise fulfillment, technical support and national service providers for company products.
- **Facility Vendor** – An internal service or function is contracted to an external agency. Of the four, it is the least integrated with company functions and decision making. Examples include a company travel agency and graphic production service.

As shown in the matrix, each of these forms has a particular value that is added through the outsourcing approach. Each has particular issues that must be addressed. Naturally, there are issues that apply to more than one form (e.g., proficiency, quality of work, ethical practice). However, each form has strategic priorities that relate to the business objectives for the task.

When outsourcing is implemented, the particular form has very important strategic priorities that need to be followed, to ensure the success of the outsourcing initiative. These are show in the matrix, and each relates to the job to be done, and the context in which it is done. The actions recommended ensuring these priorities are listed in the matrix for each form.

When evaluating the options for getting resources for a project, and making a decision to outsource, it is important to take into account the nature of the task, the context in which it will be done, and the audience or recipients of the work impact the plans for implementation. Using the matrix to identify the form of outsourcing can be a useful guide and starting point.

Think180 Outsourcing Matrix

Integration with the Business	Internal delivery	External delivery
Standalone	**4. Facilities Vendor** **Characteristics** • Works on company operations • Performs defined, standalone activities • Manages own operations **Examples** • Travel agency • Employee software training • Payroll services **Value** • Reduce operational issues to manage **Selection Priorities** • Cost-effectiveness • Responsiveness **Actions for Success** • Provide current company information • Create service level agreement • Monitor value for service provided	**3. Delivery Vendor** **Characteristics** • Delivers to customers, account, channel • Performs standalone business activities • Manages own operations **Examples** • Fulfillment house • National service provider • First level call center **Value** • Leverage vendor’s operations **Selection Priorities** • Reliability and service level • Customer satisfaction **Actions for Success** • Provide current product information • Create service level agreement • Monitor customer satisfaction
Fully Integrated	**1. Team Partner** **Characteristics** • Works on company operations • Works with employees • Participates in decisions and meetings **Examples** • Contractor on project team • Product launch project manager • Business consultant (e.g., TQM) **Value** • Use cost-effective expertise as needed **Selection Priorities** • Team/cultural fit; adaptability • Knowledge of company business **Actions for Success** • Provide accurate, detailed briefing • Treat as a full team member • Ensure "ownership" of outcomes	**2. Delivery Partner** **Characteristics** • Delivers to customers, account, channel • Works with employees • Participates in decisions and meetings **Examples** • Systems integrator/VAR • Product sales trainer • Enterprise account technical support **Value** • Augment in-house capabilities **Selection Priorities** • Shared “look and feel” • Knowledge and expertise **Actions for Success** • Give orientation and information • Treat as an equal partner • Ensure "ownership" of outcomes

Recipients of the Services

Common Outsourcing Problem Areas

Problems start in many different ways. As a seasoned Training Manager, I have seen many problems occur. And, I admit, I have created a few of my own along the way. In one case, a particular Project Manager (not Ruth) had ignored the processes, had not discussed and properly agreed the deliverables and standards with the vendor. There was only a loosely written agreement. Members of the Training Department were witness to several heated and entertaining corridor confrontations over deliverables and payments due. These arguments highlighted the distinctions between employees and vendors, in terms of how work and results are measured, and the need for careful agreement and specification of outsourced contract work.

These and other problems most often arise with vendors or in an outsourced project where:

- Short term benefits and expediency dominate as the reason for outsourcing
- Finance, legal and vendors dominate the decision process
- Scope of work is incomplete or inaccurately defined
- Milestones or Service Levels are loosely defined or not measurable
- General requirements and expectations are not fully agreed and documented
- Vendors are not selected on their total capabilities against project requirements
- A project manager or sponsor is not clearly designated
- Payment schedule is unrelated to deliverables
- Changes in project are not well managed

Selecting the Vendor

It is easy to select a vendor on the basis of liking or comfort. Vendors who are known and have performed well in the past appear to be a safe choice. Even projects that look similar may need a different set of skills – a vendor who develops effective product data sheets may not create effective training materials for that same product. These types of distinction are important but, in my experience, can often be glossed over.

Criteria need to be developed by carefully examining what is required to perform a specific program or set of tasks. Selecting a vendor against a set of objective criteria increases the likelihood that the vendor will meet the delivery and performance standards.

When outsourced training work must be integrated with internal activities, and the vendor deals with employees or customers as part of the program, good selection must take into account factors beyond “best price” and “most relevant expertise.” Beyond the tangible requirements for an outsourced program, it is important to include the “softer” elements of selection. These are the less tangible, yet critical elements of selecting the most appropriate vendor. These are "The Soft C's of Selection," and include "chemistry" "cultural fit," and "credibility."

Specifying Partner Requirements for Outsourcing

Take a look at the Outsourcing Matrix – you will see each form has specific priorities for selection. Our two scenarios fall under "Delivery Provider" and "Team Partner." The relationship described in Scenario #1 actually started in more of a partnering manner, but the resulting work to be done was that of a Delivery Vendor. The following summarizes the selection priorities for the various relationship forms:

1. Team Partner
   - Team/cultural fit; adaptability
   - Knowledge of company business
2. Delivery Partner
   - Shared "look and feel"
   - Knowledge/expertise
3. Delivery Vendor
   - Reliability and service level
   - Customer satisfaction
4. Facilities Vendor
   - Cost-effectiveness
   - Responsiveness

Why and How These Outsourcing Forms Are Important

Before I describe our two case study scenarios, let's look at another situation. Apple Computer wanted to provide orientation training for new resellers selling Apple products. To do this, the decision was made to outsource this training. At the time, Apple had in place a national alliance program for training companies who provided computer productivity training for customers. The "best" of these alliance members was selected to provide the reseller sales orientation.

The training was not the expected success. The major flaw in the strategy was choosing a vendor from the wrong outsourcing category. While the company was an excellent Delivery Vendor, its sets of skills, operations, and overall orientation were not a fit for this task. Because it was important for this vendor to have a "look and feel" of Apple, a more ideal vendor would have matched the requirements for a Delivery Partner.

Why a Strategy-Based Approach is Important

Decisions and processes that are not founded on a sound strategic framework have much greater risks of problems arising or failure in terms of achieving positive outcomes. A good strategy helps to ensure that you are attending to the following actions:

1. Making a good business decision to use external resources
2. Selecting the best-fit vendor with whom to partner
3. Creating a strong basis for managing the project and vendor performance
4. Ensuring effective transitions for Training professionals to manage vendors
5. Assessing project effectiveness against valid, business-related outcomes

Scenario 1 – Outsourcing Service Technician Training

Setup and Investing in the Process

During a period of rapid growth, Apple Computer's Australian operation was facing the challenge of training and certifying the number of technicians needed by resellers and service agents to provide a high level of service to customers nationwide. Australia's population is approximately the same as New York state's; geographically, however, it is close to the size of the entire United States.

At the time, I was the reselling channel training manager for Apple, and was facing other internal challenges. The three service trainers had been cut back to two, and there was pressure from headquarters to cut that to one, so that the second trainer could focus on meeting the increasing need for networking courses. Both trainers were highly skilled and experienced, and enjoyed the work, up to a point. However, they were having trouble keeping up with the demand. Moreover, providing national coverage required a traveling road show. Each course presentation required shipping and setting up 40 to 50 large boxes of expensive equipment.

The trainers were approaching burnout, and their increasing frustration with the workload, making it impossible to update the materials to reflect the current product range. Clearly, an outsourced solution needed to be considered. But who would be the best vendor to provide the training, and what would be the criteria used to select the vendor?

The potential candidates would need to have national facilities, a good technical understanding of computing and repairs, instructors available, and a solid reputation. In addition, the company to be selected needed to be independent of what was then a volatile reseller channel.

At the same time, Apple was also outsourcing the specialized servicing of components to deal with the increasing volume of servicing needs associated with the rapid increases in sales volumes. The company that had been selected as Apple's national service provider, which will be referred to here as Amalgamated Radio and Electronics of Australia (AREA), was also a potential solution for solving the service training logjam.

Because Len, the service trainer mentioned earlier, would be the one to manage the program, I wanted to be sure that he was part of the process relatively early. So Len was brought into the discussions, and was assigned to help set up the criteria and assess AREA for suitability as a training and certifying vendor.

In spite of clear burnout, Len was initially quite skeptical and resistant to the idea. For him, letting go service training was like selling the family jewels. Issues of quality, credibility, cost, control and suitability were raised. AREA was nothing like Apple. They were a large, long established electronics company, and moved at a different pace. The culture was gentlemanly (in the true sense), conservative and, in contrast with the brashness of Apple, a little modest. Also, unlike Apple, their managers wore suits and ties.

As the services management team looked more closely at the criteria, we realized that the national service provider did not need to be like Apple. That was not what the customers were seeking. The customers wanted to be able to take their computers in to a reputable, national company, and have them fixed reliably. Indeed, Apple's own culture may not have been able to give the customers that experience for repairs. Large business customers respected the soundness and reliability of AREA.

We still had some concerns that AREA may have been more oriented to the Windows™ personal computer (PC) platform, rather than Apple's Macintosh system. Although this was not a problem for the service part of the outsourcing, the training side was a different story. As well as just covering the technical requirements of the training, Apple needed the service trainers to be advocates. After all, the technicians being trained were from Apple's own customers and resellers.

So there were two levels of "courtship." The first was when Apple and AREA "wooed" each other for the broader, partnership. In the second, Len and AREA's Training Department got to know each other (like cousins meeting for the first time).

Len began working with his point of contact in AREA, the technical training manager. He found a somewhat kindred spirit who related to his own knowledge base, issues and priorities. Len's comfort level increased, his enthusiasm grew, and he found that he now had time to develop and update the materials. He even initially enjoyed some of the "management" aspects of the role that he had previously been quite disparaging about. His one concern was that his contact in AREA was more oriented towards PCs than Apple's product and system.

As the program got underway, internal staffing issues and turnover within AREA made Len's task of managing the outsourced service training much more of a challenge than had been anticipated. Quality issues with the training delivery, the result of unfamiliarity with the system, and logistic problems with the equipment-intensive road show component led to a much greater involvement by Len and made demands on his time. The "arms length" program management problem-solving aspects were unwelcome and demanding for him. In retrospect, I see that I owed him more coaching and preparation for dealing with these issues.

Lessons Learned

The key lessons of this exercise for me were these:

1. An outsourced vendor does not have to have the same culture or look and feel of the company that is outsourcing. In this case, the key criteria were "reliability," "reputation," and the capacity to consistently meet standards service levels.
2. Where the outsourced training vendor is dealing with your customers in the classroom, it is important that they be willing to embrace and be an advocate for your company's product. This is a key element, and needs to be built into the agreement.
3. The process of assisting the transition of a professional or specialist from individual contributor to the role of program manager requires care; it also requires involving that person in the decision-making process for him or her to have more of a stake in the outcome.
4. When assigning a training professional to take on program management, the most crucial areas for coaching and preparation are in the skills and patience required for ongoing management problem solving.

Scenario 2 – Contracting Development of Train-the-Trainers

Balancing Qualifications and Chemistry

The U.S. sales operation of Apple Computer needed to boost training for its channel. The CEO had a strong sales orientation and actively spent time in the field, visiting resellers. One of the key messages he brought back from one trip was, "The resellers want more leader-led training on our product." Apple had a strong contingent of field trainers who could potentially deliver this training, but in many cases their skills were focused around delivery, rather than development. Apple needed resources to create a train-the-trainer program to quickly equip the field trainers with a course and set of materials to redeliver to the reseller channel, and to Apple's own field sales force.

Apple had already established outsourcing on other training projects; however, this project was the first time a project of this size had been done with this methodology. This high-profile, high-gain, high-risk project was accompanied by many unknown factors to anticipate, as will be shown.

Although Apple's own training department had a development team, these resources were mostly busy on other projects. Moreover, the development team did not have a charter to deliver training, just to develop materials, and most of the trainers from other groups in the department were deployed on other tasks. Finally, some specialized expertise was needed both to develop materials and to train the trainer, to embody the specific messages for each quarterly focus, and to act as the guru on the project team.

Most of the technical resources, or subject matter experts (SMEs), belonged to another Division in Apple, one with a worldwide charter that focused on the development of a compact disk sent out quarterly with information for Apple's field sales force. The SMEs were not available to join the project team.

For these reasons, engaging an experienced training consultant was the answer. It was not cost-effective to hire as an employee a person with this level experience, nor would Apple have full-time need for these particular skills. There was also the other value that consultants bring: Not being part of the internal credibility chain, they are judged on their own merit.

We now meet Ruth, the Apple training professional chosen to lead the project. She was a strongly qualified instructional designer, with a solid career in the concepts of development and evaluation of training. She previously had engaged and managed contractors; however the more formal processes required in this setting (requests for proposal [RFPs], contracts, selection processes and project managing consultants) were relatively new territory to her. Being something of a free spirit, Ruth did not warm instantly to "processes and procedures." However, she quickly saw the value of a more structured approach and then eagerly accepted guidance.

A good database of training vendors had been built up, so we used that as a starting point. The potential candidates were quite diverse and it was clear we needed to set some specific criteria based on the job to be done and the internal people that would form the team.

Candidate 1 (Keith) had long been a favored advisor and sales training consultant to Apple. Could we just go with him? After all, he had loads of credibility with the field sales force, and really knew the product line, the technologies and competitive sales messages.

Candidate 2 (Carol) also had a history with Apple, in sales and presentation skills as well as organizational effectiveness training. She had a good understanding of the Apple product and sales model, but was perhaps a little light on technical depth.

Candidate 3 (Peter) had done a good deal of technical training for Apple and had also developed technical training materials. He knew the Apple product well, and had strong technical depth and credibility. His delivery style was more in line with technical delivery rather than around sales messaging.

Candidate 4 was a national technical training company, and our point of contact was initially the CEO. They had excellent in-house expertise and an established infrastructure for developing training and creating a "made to order" train-the-trainer program. However, most of their business was around the Windows platform.

As I began working with Ruth, it soon became clear that she had firm views about the type of person that she felt she could work effectively with. She was strong on her position of the type of person she wanted as the external consultant on the team, and who would not be a good fit. This is where the "Soft C's" came into sharp focus. Would it make sense to engage a vendor to be an integral team partner strictly on the basis of qualifications or strong credentials, when the designated project manager had a strong preference based on team chemistry?

We constructed and prioritized a set of criteria that embraced chemistry and culture. At the same time we created a detailed and thorough RFP. The process of doing these served more than one purpose. It was a vehicle for coaching and for focusing our thinking. It also served as a roadmap for the project and for transition, given that Ruth would be taking extended leave part way through the project. It was important that the selected vendor be able to work effectively with whomever her replacement project manager would be. Because this was a high profile project within the company, so it was critical that the work be transitioned smoothly.

As the project got underway with the field trainers, it was clear that, while Carol was excellent in every other aspect, she did not have sufficient technical depth for the content details required, as well as for credibility with the audiences. The project team, including Carol, approached Peter (candidate 3), who did have the technical depth. Because Peter felt very comfortable about how he had initially been advised with care and dignity that he had been unsuccessful in the initial round, he willingly joined the team and did a great job.

The adventure continued. As the project further evolved, many new factors were uncovered, and it became clear that the original plan to have Carol and her partner deliver nationally was not the best approach; a major rework of materials and format was required. Although it was like converting a 747 passenger plane to a Concorde in mid-flight, Carol and Peter excelled. They demonstrated tremendous partnering attitudes, as well as the resilience to respond to the 180-degree turn they were asked to make. This response was a strong validation for their selection.

Ruth since has moved from Apple. She has continued to work very successfully with Carol on similar projects in other companies. There is much to be said for taking into account "established chemistry." The greatest benefit is that the two parties understand each other, and effective communication about job requirements can take place in a much shorter space of time. After all, it really does take time to break in a new vendor and get them to understand one's way of working

Recently, I asked Ruth's former manager to comment on this outsourced project. She said, "I was bent on finding processes to follow, so that we didn't spend so much time reinventing the wheel. I also wanted to make sure that we were making the right selection of vendors and not picking someone just because they were available." She added, "I definitely think that you need in-house project/program managers to act as the go between, keep the project on target and so on, and then buy the unique expertise you need for development. Team chemistry is extremely important here! The outsourced person needs to feel a part of the in-house team, and the in-house program manager needs to feel in charge of the program."

I spoke also to the project manager who took over from Ruth. She felt that the approach and procedures we had created really helped in being fair and thorough in communicating the requirements to the vendor candidates for the next quarterly round of training.

Lessons Learned

The key lessons of this exercise for me were the following:

1. Chemistry and culture are just as crucial as qualifications and credentials. Neither is sufficient alone where the role is one of Team Partner.
2. Processes and procedures that are well structured and documented are of great value at the time of selection and engagement, as well as for capturing institutional knowledge essential for handover and later projects.
3. Projects may have elements and requirements that become clear only once the work is under way. If this looks likely, or if the environment is either in rapid change or has political uncertainties, it is important that a vendor be selected who has the resilience and adaptability to deal with changing job requirements.

Questions for Discussion

1. What if the vendor with the best expertise does not have the right "chemistry" for the project manager, for the team, or for the audiences to which the program is to be delivered? Should chemistry outweigh expertise?

2. As training manager, you are faced with a situation where the vendor preferred and chosen by the project manager, in your view, does not have the best expertise for the project. Should you intervene? What if you already told the project manager that the final decision is his or hers?

3. When you are notifying unsuccessful vendors, should you provide them feedback on their proposal and reasons they were not selected? If they ask who was the vendor selected and why. Should you tell them, and if so, should you give reasons?

4. How might you construct an RFP on a "Phase 0" approach, where the task is to research determine the final scope of work? Is it valid to have a vendor research and develop an RFP for a project, where that vendor may be one of the candidates proposing on the final project?

5. What are some of the motivational issues for professionals who are managing projects instead of doing the hands-on training or developing the training themselves?

6. What strengths or experience do trainers or instructional designers have that would be important for the role program or project manager engaging and managing vendors. What mindsets or working styles may need to be adjusted for this role?

7. What should a training manager do if a training professional is unhappy about managing vendors where the vendors does all the "interesting" hands-on work or upfront training?

8. How can a manager encourage a professional to see the benefit of careful processes for engaging vendors?

9. What is an appropriate course of action where there is a clear issue of "chemistry" between an incoming project manager and a vendor that has already been engaged?

10. How might you encourage a burned-out individual contributor but reluctant program manager to see program management as a valid line of work, and a possible career direction? Should the individual be encouraged or supported to leave for career progression or job satisfaction?

The Author

Jim Everett has 20 years of experience in the United States and the Asia-Pacific in corporate training and development, management development and reseller training, user-learning, and national partner program management. Working mainly in the computer industry, he also has prior experience with manufacturing and the Australian federal government and as a senior consultant with Touche Ross in Sydney, Australia. Everett has engaged and managed consultants and vendors extensively. His formal studies include an honors level B.A. degree from Australian National University, specializing in management, communications, motivation, and work performance.

With partner Jane Dixon, Jim founded California-based Endeavour Business Learning (now Think180™), specializing in strategic consulting and training in both the delivery and the engagement of professional services, including training and customer support for leading companies in the computer industry.

Jim Everett can be reached at:

Think180
3225 Ellenda Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90034

310.694.0414

jgeverett@think180.com

www.think180.com;.

References

- Ashkenas, Ron. *The Boundaryless Organization*.
  San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.
- Greaver, Maurice F., II. *Strategic Outsourcing*.
  New York; AMACOM, 1999.
- Laseter, Timothy. *Balanced Sourcing*.
  San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Rackham, Neil and Lawrence Friedman. *Getting Partnering Right*.
  New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996.

