

Cornell's Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies

# Targeted Benchmarking on Employee Relations Structures/Scope of Work



CAHRS Partners have the opportunity to benchmark with other partner companies on HR topics of interest. The benchmarking is typically conducted with 5-7 other CAHRS Partners selected by the company that initiated the request. The CAHRS office identifies the appropriate connections at selected companies and the benchmarking company then schedules 1:1 phone calls to explore their questions.

Examples of recent requests include: Sponsorship Initiatives, Organization Designs and Structures, Diversity Metrics, Talent Management Practices, Competency Models and a variety of HR Policy Questions (i.e. Relocation, Cost of Living, Airline Mile Usage, etc.).

CAHRS partners find this more qualitative approach to benchmarking very valuable for revealing novel insights and practices, as well as for building their network. At the conclusion of the process, the benchmarking company shares an anonymized summary of their findings with the participating companies and CAHRS, who then makes them available so all partners can benefit from the learning.



## Employee Relations – External Market Research - Overview



### Structure:

- Most have COE or Shared Services Model
- Team sizes range from 5-25

#### Skill Set:

- Varies from Entry Level to Tenured (15 years) ER Experience
- · No requirements of legal background, some consulting
- High on: empathy, influence and partnership



#### EK:

- Most include Title VII issues
- Investigations
- No compliance or ethics (That's Legal)
- Some performance management

#### HRBP:

- Many still own performance management; Some manage discipline
- At time ER v. HRBP scope is determined by level (Director & Below v. Exec)
- Aspire to keep HRBP Strategic though



## Global

## **Global Structure:**

- Highly varies but majority aim for global consistency
- Many with Global COE and ER Partners in countries
- Some with local presence only when necessary (supporting HRD)



Cases

## Case Ownership

- Also highly varies
- Some are HRBP owned with ER consulting while others are solely owned by ER or Legal
- · At times, dependent on type of case.

### Case Load:

- Varies by client maturity
- · Highly correlated to employee experience
- One Ex: Avg case load is 15 (Team of 25)



Systems

### 1 .

### **Case Management System:**

- Varie
- Legal systems or ER system with shared visibility - or, no shared visibility with HRBP or legal

### Training:

 In most cases, ER owns training content or consults L&D. Owning is not always ideal.

## Reporting out on:

- Case volume, type, YOY trends
- · Repeat offenders
- Themes by business or country

## Employee Relations – External Market Research

Company	ER Structure	Scope of ER v. HRBP	Global Structure	Case Ownership	CMS, Training and Case Load		
А	COE: HRBPs lean on for more complex issues as they are the SMEs ER has a labor team and a legal employment team Labor team has a dotted line to CHRO but sits under legal.	Bargain for and non-bargain     Responsible for supporting all management employees     Specialist in unions     Aligned to different client teams	Global model is the same with I local support in each region to the extent that its necessary	HRBP owns the case with ER as a consultant     Sensitivity or severity of case dictates if there is a clear hand off to ER or Legal	Depends on the clients' maturity and type of work     For those with heavy case load, the weight is felt and affects employee experience		
В	<ul> <li>1-2 yrs HR Experience</li> <li>Relatively entry level</li> <li>Consulting experience</li> <li>5 team total</li> <li>2 are long term (10+ yrs ER)</li> <li>Work closely with employment legal</li> </ul>	Transferred policy/compliance violations to compliance group (legal), no longer within HR. ER:  • Mostly working with Director level and below  • Cases of performance and LOA  • ER conducts investigations and serves as Facilitator/Mediator  HRBP:  • Cases for Executive level	Outside of US, HRBP owns the matter.	<ul> <li>ER is pulled in for termination; Managers do the notification of termination</li> <li>Partnership with legal is performance and policy.</li> <li>Legal will pull in HRBP for remediation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Case management system (CMS) shared with compliance group.</li> <li>Legal system with low user friendliness</li> <li>Reporting out to HRBPs by business on case volume, type, outcomes, names, repeat offenders</li> <li>ER does training for mnagers</li> <li>No org wide training (case by case)</li> </ul>		
С	<ul> <li>25 ER Team 55,000 serves</li> <li>Admin ER Team outside US</li> <li>Aligned by business unit with regional leads</li> <li>No lawyers (previous or current)</li> <li>Average tenure is 15 yrs of ER experience</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Still struggling with this</li> <li>Difficult or uncomfortable, clients automatically assume its ER</li> <li>Legal and Compliance handle ethics complaints (work closely with them)</li> <li>Human aspect of crisis (i.e. COVID, natural disaster, riots, etc.)</li> <li>Any company initiated term is reviewed by ER (ensures objective review)</li> <li>Title VII triggers ER immediately</li> </ul>	Global ER COE Teams of all sizes Global COE filters down, but ER teams do not report into the COE.	ER doesn't have to manage the issue, they can just coach	<ul> <li>Legal and ER have visibility into cases.</li> <li>Reporting on: types of matters, case load (for assignment), patterns within certain business, YOY case numbers, trend analysis, levels of individuals who are the subjects of investigation.</li> <li>ER owns training (not ideal) and partners with employment lawyer</li> <li>Avg case load is 15 open cases</li> </ul>		

## Employee Relations – External Market Research

Company	ER Structure	Scope of ER v. HRBP	Global Structure	Case Ownership	CMS, Training and Case Load
D	Sits under People Operations (which includes HR Systems, L&D, AskHR, Labor Relations/Complia nce/Employee)     They have Step guidelines for their cases: timelines, actions, what happens if they don't comply, etc.	People relations and Compliance Team Compliance responsibility, data privacy regulations, response activity to crises or social media outreach (against an employee or against the company) Make processes out of this group - clear responsive Open Line: Capability for employees to raise their concerns Trained trusted advisors Issues with manager, org or policy Creates centralized knowledge base Reduces need to go to HRBP People Leader Advisory Line (like Open Line) Centralized manager support Rewards, promos, manage individuals and performance cases Help with legal justification of reorg slates	Open Line and PLA sit in Mexico (more headcount same budget) Model only supports US & Canada currently but trying to build it globally.	Breach a business compliance rule it goes to business compliance     Investigation sometimes done by OpenLine agents     Policies are updated but not created by the People Relations and Compliance.	
Е	New structure implemented in 2017     Shared services model     95% of team in US	Traditional ER scope: Discrimination, harassment, labor relations and advisory, discipline management (partner with compliance) Performance counseling is ER with guiding principles on how to address these cases Legal is a partnership within investigation (ER will conduct this investigation)	Outside US based on need for local expertise Core team in Prague COE brings it all together to bring global consistency Region heads have a dotted line to COE; straight line to local hub manager (covers all areas)		CMS not shared with HRBP or Legal Reporting out - Trend analysis and insights by business sector, country, etc. Training Content: Sometimes its consulted out to L&D some content is owned by E&R but is accessible online.
F	No ER     Very localized	HRBPs own the ER work For Performance management, partner with managers to work through it Investigations: done by manager No guidelines on how to respond to each case type			Talent management owns the training