From Performance Management to Performance Improvement

Leveraging Key Drivers of Individual Performance
Not an Easy Road

Forum members must overcome many challenges to build a high-performance workforce

Evolving in a High-Growth Environment

“What’s worked for us in the past won’t work moving forward now that we have doubled in size. We must be more strategic.”

Vice President, Human Resources Manufacturing Company

Corporate Wide Goal Alignment

“Goals are ill defined at a minimum. If we do nothing more than goal setting, it would be a huge gain. This is where we need to start. When there are clearly defined goals, managers know how to evaluate employees.”

Senior Vice President, Human Resources Computer Software Company

Lack of Management Support and Role Modeling

“Our managers simply won’t dedicate the time to ongoing performance coaching and development.”

Director, Human Resources Energy and Utilities Company

Ease of Use

“Sometimes HR creates barriers to effective performance management by over-engineering or by making extensive changes. We turn managers off.”

Vice President, Human Resources Media Company

Source: HR Executive Forum research.
## 106 Potential Performance Management Drivers

### Performance Management System
- Challenge and applicability of development plan
- Employees’ accountability for “things that matter”
- Employee understanding of how system works
- Employee understanding of performance standards
- Extent to which employees receive performance ratings they deserve
- Fairness of performance standards
- Link between performance management system and organizational strategy
- Number of formal reviews received each year
- Presence of multi-rater feedback
- Presence of employee development plan
- Presence of procedures for handling grievances with performance reviews
- System credibility
- Use of rank-ordering

### Performance Culture
- Coworker involvement
- Diffuse decision-making authority
- Risk taking
- Coworker cohesion
- Innovation
- Flexibility
- Differential treatment of best and worst performers
- Internal communication
- Future orientation

### Manager–Employee Interaction
- Breaks down projects into manageable components
- Clearly communicates expectations
- Creates work plans and timetables
- Diffuses unhealthy rivalries or competition among team members
- Encourages employees to be positive and enthusiastic about work
- Expresses confidence in employees’ ability to do job
- Helps team get started on a new project
- Helps attain needed information, resources, and technology
- Helps find solutions to problems at work
- Holds people accountable
- Identifies or removes unnecessary barriers at work (such as unnecessary rules or regulations)
- Inspires others
- Listens carefully to views and opinions
- Measures performance and results
- Persuades and encourages others to move in a desired direction
- Recognizes and rewards achievement
- Translates long-term goals into step-by-step plans
- Makes frequent changes to projects and assignments

### Formal Performance Review
- Emphasis on performance strengths
- Emphasis on performance weaknesses
- Emphasis on personality strengths
- Emphasis on personality weaknesses
- Emphasis on skills and behaviors needed in the future
- Emphasis on specific suggestions for doing the job better
- Immediate versus delayed feedback
- Manager likelihood to volunteer informal feedback
- Method of delivering informal feedback (e.g., face-to-face, in writing)
- Manager knowledgeable about employee performance

### Informal Performance Feedback
- Emphasis on amount of effort put into the job
- Emphasis on performance strengths
- Emphasis on performance weaknesses
- Emphasis on personality strengths
- Emphasis on personality weaknesses
- Emphasis on skills and behaviors needed in the future
- Emphasis on specific suggestions for doing the job better
- Fairness and accuracy of formal performance review (e.g., promotions, raises, or bonuses)
- Emphasis on specific suggestions for doing the job better
- Time to complete projects and assignments

### Day-to-Day Work
- Challenge of projects and assignments
- Connection between successful project completion and incentives such as the following:
  - Size of annual merit increase
  - Size of annual bonus
  - Opportunity for higher performance rating
  - Opportunity for promotion
  - Raise in base salary
- Employee influence in selecting projects
- Employees’ personal enjoyment of their work
- Employee understanding of connections between day-to-day work and organizational strategy
- Employee understanding of how to complete projects and assignments
- Importance of projects to business unit and organization
- Importance of projects and assignments to employees’ long-term careers
- Importance of projects and assignments to employees’ personal development
- Number of projects and assignments

### Job Opportunities
- On-the-job Development Opportunities
  - Opportunity to:
    - Spend time with a professional coach
    - Do challenging and leading-edge work
    - Experiment and take risks
    - Have significant accountability and responsibility
    - Help launch a new business, initiative, or program
    - Help turn around struggling business
  - Work with a mentor
  - Be promoted
  - Work for strong senior executive team
  - Work in a different country
  - Work in a variety of jobs/roles
  - Work in new business units
  - Work in new functional areas
  - Work on the things you do best
  - Work with a diverse group of people
- Training
  - Business (e.g., accounting, finance)
  - Diversity
  - IT
  - Leadership
  - New employee orientation
  - People management (e.g., communication, team-building)
  - Process management (e.g., managing timelines or budgets, resource allocation)
  - Product
  - Quality control
  - Sales
  - Technical
  - Other

---

Source: Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
**Our Two-Part Challenge**

From Performance Management to Performance Improvement

- **Identifying the True Drivers of Performance**
  - Companies need to expand their definition of performance management to include the most powerful drivers of employee performance.
  - There are a vast number of potential levers that an organization can pull to improve performance, but only a small handful that drive the lion’s share of improvement.
  - Improving performance depends on many different factors all coming together at once; members should approach it as portfolio strategy, not a single solution.

- **Leveraging Practices That Drive High Performance**
  - Companies should align goals horizontally before cascading them vertically across the organization; whenever possible, employees should have greater ownership and involvement in defining and planning their stretch goals.
  - When upskilling managers for performance improvement and coaching, companies should create ample opportunities for knowledge sharing across the managerial bench, and develop mechanisms that measure manager performance on people development activities.
  - The effectiveness of any performance management system depends upon the quality of the activities, not the quantity; focus measurements and metrics on the quality of interactions, rather than on compliance or other quantity metrics.

Source: HR Executive Forum research.
Analysis in Action
A Methodological Overview

Step #1: Measure Employee Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collect Company-Provided Raw Data</th>
<th>Test Validity and Reliability Tests</th>
<th>Standardize Percentile Rank in Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step #2: Measure Presence and Effectiveness of “Performance Levers”

On average, about how often does your manager give you informal feedback about your work performance?

- Once a day
- 2–4 times a week
- Once a week
- 2–3 times a month
- Once a month
- 8–11 times a year
- 4–7 times a year
- 1–3 times a year
- Once a year
- Less than once a year
- My manager never gives me informal feedback about my work performance

Step #3: Measure Attitudes of High Performance

When needed, I am willing to put in the extra effort to get a job done.

- Very strongly agree
- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Very strongly disagree

Step #4: Estimate Impact of “Lever” Using SEMs

Step #5: Calculate Total Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Informal Feedback</th>
<th>Change in Employee Discretionary Effort?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect effects work through five key attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step #6: Prioritize Levers According to Maximum Impact

Company Reported Data

Manager and Employee Survey Data from More Than 19,000 Respondents

Statistical Analysis

Source: Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
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Defining Relative Impact on Performance

**NOT ALL DRIVERS ARE CREATED EQUAL**

- **A-Level Drivers**
- **B-Level Drivers**
- **C-Level Drivers**
- **D-Level Drivers**

Vast majority of companies’ performance management activities fall into the C-Level driver category.

What Are the Most Important Drivers of Performance?

1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________

Source: Corporate Leadership Council 2002 Performance Management Survey; HR Executive Forum research.
The First Area of Focus

From Performance Management to Performance Improvement

Organization

The Performance Management System

Manager

Manager–Employee Interaction

Formal Review

Informal Feedback

Source: HR Executive Forum research.
Performance Driver #1: The Performance Management System

The Importance of Understanding and Fairness

Maximum Impact of Performance Management System Levers on Employee Performance*

- Connection and Understanding
  Mean = 12.9
- Fairness and Credibility
  Mean = 3.1
- Content
  Mean = 1.6

The content or “nuts and bolts” of performance reviews (e.g., the number of reviews, rank order), are far less impactful than employee understanding of the standards on which they are evaluated. The average impact of employee understanding of performance standards is about seven times that of most of the other characteristics of performance management systems.

* Each bar presents a statistical estimate of the maximum total impact on employee performance each strategy will produce. The total impact includes the strategy's direct impact on performance, as well as any indirect impact it may have through employee attitudes. The maximum total impact is calculated by comparing two statistical estimates: the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “high” on the strategy and the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “low” on the strategy. The impact of each strategy is modeled separately. A strategy that fails to achieve traditional levels of statistical significance is denoted with a clear bar (t < 2.0).

Source: Corporate Leadership Council 2002 Performance Management Survey; HR Executive Forum research.
Performance Driver #2: Manager–Employee Interaction

MANAGERS NEED TO PROVIDE SOLUTIONS AND REQUIRED RESOURCES

Maximum Impact of Manager–Employee Interaction on Performance*

Managers who find solutions to problems at work drive an increase in three key employee attitudes and have a positive direct impact on individual performance.

Level of Performance Driver

A-Level ≥ 25  B-Level 10 to 24.9  C-Level 0 to 9.9  D-Level < 0

* Each bar presents a statistical estimate of the maximum total impact on employee performance each strategy will produce. The total impact includes the strategy’s direct impact on performance, as well as any indirect impact it may have through employee attitudes. The maximum total impact is calculated by comparing two statistical estimates: the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “high” on the strategy and the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “low” on the strategy. The impact of each strategy is modeled separately. A strategy that fails to achieve traditional levels of statistical significance is denoted with a clear bar (t < 2.0).

Source: Corporate Leadership Council 2002 Performance Management Survey; HR Executive Forum research.
Emphasizing the Positive Drives High Performance

Maximum Impact of Formal Review on Employee Performance*

Emphasizing performance strengths drives 36.4% improvement in performance, almost 60% higher than performance weakness, which can cause a 26.8% decline in employee performance.

Change in Performance

Emphasis on Performance Strengths

Emphasis on Specific Outcomes of Formal Review

Emphasis on Skills and Behaviors Needed in the Future

Emphasis on Specific Suggestions for Doing the Job Better

Emphasis on Long-Term Career Prospects

Emphasis on Personality Strengths

Emphasis on Personality Weaknesses

Emphasis on Performance Weaknesses

Level of Performance Driver

A-Level ≥ 25
B-Level 10 to 24.9
C-Level 0 to 9.9
D-Level < 0

* Each bar presents a statistical estimate of the maximum total impact on employee performance each strategy will produce. The total impact includes the strategy’s direct impact on performance, as well as any indirect impact it may have through employee attitudes. The maximum total impact is calculated by comparing two statistical estimates: the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “high” on the strategy and the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “low” on the strategy. The impact of each strategy is modeled separately. A strategy that fails to achieve traditional levels of statistical significance is denoted with a clear bar (t < 2.0).

Source: Corporate Leadership Council 2002 Performance Management Survey; HR Executive Forum research.
**Performance Driver #4: Informal Feedback**

**Fair and Accurate Informal Feedback Top Performance Drivers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairness and Accuracy</th>
<th>Feedback That Helps Employees Do Jobs Better</th>
<th>Manager Likelihood to Volunteer Informal Feedback</th>
<th>Detailed and Specific Feedback</th>
<th>Immediate Versus Delayed Feedback</th>
<th>Emphasis on Specific Suggestions for Doing the Job</th>
<th>Emphasis on Skills to Develop in the Future</th>
<th>Emphasis on Performance Strengths</th>
<th>Emphasis on Performance Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(10.9)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indirect and direct effects of fair and accurate informal feedback can improve employee performance by 39.1%.*

*Informal feedback that helps employees do their jobs better has both a positive indirect and direct impact on performance.*

*Each bar presents a statistical estimate of the maximum total impact on employee performance each strategy will produce. The total impact includes the strategy’s direct impact on performance, as well as any indirect impact it may have through employee attitudes. The maximum total impact is calculated by comparing two statistical estimates: the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “high” on the strategy and the predicted performance level for an employee who scores “low” on the strategy. The impact of each strategy is modeled separately. A strategy that fails to achieve traditional levels of statistical significance is denoted with a clear bar (t < 2.0).*

*Source: Corporate Leadership Council 2002 Performance Management Survey; HR Executive Forum research.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Performance Driver</th>
<th>A-Level ≥ 25</th>
<th>B-Level 10 to 24.9</th>
<th>C-Level 0 to 9.9</th>
<th>D-Level &lt; 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

© 2006 Corporate Executive Board. All Rights Reserved
Our Two-Part Challenge

From Performance Management to Performance Improvement

Identifying the True Drivers of Performance

- Companies need to expand their definition of performance management to include the most powerful drivers of employee performance
- There are a vast number of potential levers that an organization can pull to improve performance, but only a small handful that drive the lion’s share of improvement
- Improving performance depends on many different factors all coming together at once; members should approach it as portfolio strategy, not a single solution

Leveraging Practices That Drive High Performance

- Companies should align goals horizontally before cascading them vertically across the organization; whenever possible, employees should have greater ownership and involvement in defining and planning their stretch goals
- When upskilling managers for performance improvement and coaching, companies should create ample opportunities for knowledge sharing across the managerial bench, and develop mechanisms that measure manager performance on people development activities
- The effectiveness of any performance management system depends upon the quality of the activities, not the quantity; focus measurements and metrics on the quality of interactions, rather than on compliance or other quantity metrics

Source: HR Executive Forum research.
I. Driving Goal Clarity, Alignment, and Reinforcement

Executive Goal Alignment Workshop

Seagate

Goal-Strategy Task Force

Sherwood Company*

II. Accelerating Manager Development and Skill at Performance Coaching

Manager-Led Career Roundtables

Penrose*

Job-Integrated Coaching Simulations

Manager People Development Scorecard

Dual Performance Ratings

Alltel Corporation

PepsiCo

III. Assessing Success Against Performance Management Goals

Real-Time Performance Management Audits

Convergys

Garden Ridge

* Pseudonym.

Source: HR Executive Forum research.
The Pepsi Challenge

A correlation between manager quality and retention...

Employee Satisfaction with Managers at PepsiCo

- High: 94%
- Low: 42%

Employees Intending to Stay vs. Intending to Leave

...and employee dissatisfaction with performance ratings...

No One Wants to Get a “C”

“Employees felt that the old performance labels were demotivating and unproductive in our high-performance culture.”

VP of HR

PepsiCo

...prompts PepsiCo to institute a dual ratings-based approach to its appraisal process

Performance Management Process at PepsiCo

Objective Setting
- Rolling cascade from business goals
- HR facilitates and provides cross-business perspective

Appraisal
- Two ratings; five-point scale
- Calibration

Feedback
- Mid-year calibration
- Informal feedback as needed
- 360-degree review every two years

Reward
- Bonus
- Merit increases
- Long-term incentives (LTI)

Monitoring
- Manager and employee responsibility to track performance

Business Results
- Financial Targets
- Revenue Goals
- Product Development

People Results
- Team Leadership
- Teamwork
- Personal Development

Dual Ratings

Source: PepsiCo, Inc.; Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
It Takes Two

Two sets of annual performance expectations separate business and people objectives

**Business Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME: Jeff Radke</th>
<th>TITLE: Market Development Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSN/ID:</td>
<td>REVIEW PERIOD: From 1/1/04 To 12/31/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGER:</td>
<td>LOCATION: Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUSINESS OBJECTIVES**

1. Achieve 2004 Financial Targets
   - Volume—105 Index to PY;
   - Market Share—38 Share
2. Achieve Marketplace Initiatives
   - Brand A and Product B—110 Index to PY
3. Distribution Momentum—110 Index to PY
4. Product C Relaunch—110 Index to PY

**Accountability Areas**

Each objective should be tied to an accountability area

- Creating a diverse and inclusive organization
- Managing and developing people
- Teamwork and collaboration
- Personal development and growth

**People Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEOPLE OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce turnover from X% to Y%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deliver inclusive culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accelerate development of Employee Y and Employee Z; ensure both are ready for next-level positions by year-end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work with operations to improve speed to market on new initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reallocate time from “doing” to “leading”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Clearer communication of priorities and business results
  - Clearer and more frequent delegation |

**Objective Identification**

At least one people objective must originate either from 360-degree assessment feedback and/or organizational health survey trends.

Source: PepsiCo, Inc.; Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
Nowhere to Hide

Discrete ratings surface business and people management performance differences

Assignment of Business and Performance Ratings

Topline on Jeff’s Performance
While Jeff excels in managing the business, PepsiCo’s dual ratings highlight a significant gap in achievement against people objectives, indicating a need to develop his people performance during next review period.

Jeff Radke—2004 Objectives and Results

**Business Results**

**Objectives**
- Meet market development goals
- Ensure that all activities are identified for the franchise territory and are executed with the cooperation of the supplier organization
- Execute 100% of local customer wiring plans
- Lead production development with franchise director

**Results**
- Exceeded aggressive plan targets
  - Volume 10% ahead of plan
  - Expenditures well within budget and well deployed
- Executed 100% of all planned initiatives
  - KPI target levels exceeded 80% trade compliance in the grocery channel
  - Executed 100% of all customer wiring
  - Led product development with franchise director
  - Successfully presented all drafts to manager

**People Results**

**Objectives**
- Be the primary person responsible for onboarding the new franchise manager
  - Coach new hire on processes and procedures
  - Review new hire’s work during his/her first two weeks
  - Participate in the selection process to hire one new franchise manager during 2004
  - Conduct at least five candidate interviews
  - Provide timely feedback to human resources and the franchise director
  - Deliver constructive development feedback to subordinates

**Results**
- Coached one new hire on processes and procedures
- Corrected new hire’s work rather than properly coaching him
- Canceled three out of five candidate interviews at the last minute
- Failed to follow up with human resources to provide feedback on candidate interviews
- Followed up with the franchise director by providing feedback immediately after each candidate interview
- Feedback from direct reports reflects a lack of emphasis on development efforts
- Peers report difficulty with Jeff in cross-divisional task forces; he comes across impatient and unengaged

**Performance Indicator**

Senior Executive Rating
Performance indicator rating is only for senior executives and helps to more accurately determine long-term incentives by calibrating individual executive performance relative to peers.

Multisource Evaluation Process
PepsiCo assesses individual performance using supervisory manager, direct report, customer, 360-degree assessment, and manager self-assessment feedback. Business and people results and ratings are generated during regular manager calibration meetings.

Source: PepsiCo, Inc.; Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
Pay for Performance

**PepsiCo weights business and people ratings to determine compensation...**

**Compensation Formula**

\[
\text{Compensation Index} = \text{Business Results Score} \times 2 + \text{People Results Score}
\]

---

**Differentiated Long-Term Incentives**

PepsiCo uses the executive performance indicator in a forced distribution to determine long-term incentives; typical top group ratings pairs are 4:4, 4:5, 5:4, 5:5.

---

**Case in Point**

**High Business Results, Low People Results**

- **Jeff Radke**
  - Business Results Score: \( 5 \times 2 = 10 \)
  - People Results Score: 1
  - Compensations Index: 11
  - Merit Increase for 2004 = 5%
  - Individual Portion of Bonus = 110% of Target

**High Business Results, High People Results**

- **Vanessa Martinez**
  - Business Results Score: \( 5 \times 2 = 10 \)
  - People Results Score: 5
  - Compensations Index: 15
  - Merit Increase for 2004 = 13%
  - Individual Portion of Bonus = 150% of Target

---

*This compensation index is illustrative and based on market data.*

Source: PepsiCo., Inc.; Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
Overall Accountability

Managers provide differentiated assessments of employees following the introduction of the people rating...

...promoting more accurate visibility into both performance measures and increasing manager accountability

Percentage of Individuals Receiving Different Scores for People and for Business Results

Manager Accountability for People and Business Results

Organizational Health Survey

Managers are held accountable for achieving BOTH their business results and their people results?

Source: PepsiCo., Inc.; Corporate Leadership Council research; HR Executive Forum research.
Implementing PepsiCo’s Dual Performance Ratings

**Step #1: Assess Organizational Readiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Diagnostic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does our performance criteria include people objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can we design our rating system to differentiate between business and people management performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will our organization accept partial weighting of compensation on people management performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can we assess the impact of this change in our ratings system?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What additional resources will we need?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step #2: Develop Execution Plan**

**Sample Project Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Evaluate current performance criteria and compensation structure against end goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Secure buy-in from senior management and finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Develop and present plan and materials to managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Implement new review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Assess immediate satisfaction and longer-term impact (e.g., annual improvement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step #3: Leverage Tools and Templates**

**Performance Management Design and Execution Center**

- **Practice Tools and Templates**
  - People management metrics
  - Compensation index
  - Performance improvement plan worksheet
  - Employee satisfaction survey

- **Additional Tools and Resources**
  - Sample performance standards
  - Sample performance appraisal forms
  - Sample individual development plan

* Please access www.hrexecutiveforum.com for these and other tools.

Source: HR Executive Forum research.
**Design and Execution Centers**

Toolkits provide implementation support to members seeking to adopt best practices profiled in forum research. Each toolkit provides an overarching framework and a set of tools with systematic implementation suggestions, enabling HR departments to implement a strategic process without substantial resource investments.
Education Center

On-demand, self-study seminars allow HR Executives and team members to deepen or refresh content knowledge and fluency in critical HR subject areas. Seminars can be viewed through the use of self-directed & easily navigated audio/visual online technology.