



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.



# Benchmarked Companies

Data was collected via 1:1 teleconference conversational interviews in October-November 2021

6 companies

13,000-2,200,000 employees

10%-90% employees outside of the US

4 Industries represented (Professional Services, Retail, Multi-industry Conglomerate, Defense)

Company	Employees	% Outside US
Company 1	600,000	90%
Company 2	140,000	10%
Company 3	175,000	65%
Company 4	350,000	60%
Company 5	2,200,000	25%
Company 6	13,000	30%

## Executive Summary

We engaged 6 CAHRS partners in 1:1 interviews about DE&I data collection (US & Global), DE&I KPIs, external reporting, and accountability. Conversations focused primarily on diversity representation data (as opposed to more advanced inclusion data analytics).

### Summary of Findings

- All 6 companies interviewed collect and report publicly on US Race/Ethnicity & Gender data via a self-published Diversity Report or on the company website (aligned to EEO-1).
- All 6 companies interviewed collect Disability, Military Service, Gender Identity, and Sexual Orientation data in the US, but none of the 6 report on it externally.
- 4 of 6 companies interviewed collect Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity data in a limited set of countries, treading carefully due to legal and data privacy considerations.
- All 6 companies interviewed report externally on global Gender data..
- All 6 companies interviewed collect DE&I data within their system of record (Workday).
- All 6 companies interviewed have representation aspirations, but only 4/6 have identified internal goals, and only 3/6 have externally published goals.
- Companies have various philosophies and are at various stages of maturity in holding leaders accountable to DE&I KPIs.

# US Data Collection & External Reporting

The below table summarizes our finding on what demographic representation data is collected on US Employees, and which of that data is reported externally

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gender	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER
Race	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER
Sexual orientation	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO
Gender Identity	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO
Disability	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO
Veteran	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO	IO

<b>Key</b>	<b>ER – Externally Reported</b>	<b>IO – Internal Use Only</b>	<b>NC – Not Collected</b>
------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

# Novel Examples of US Data Collection

Most demographic data collection is standard, but there were a few novel examples we'd like to highlight

## Novel Data Collection

- External reporting on the intersectionality of Race/Ethnicity & Gender in form of reporting externally on Women of Color
- Disaggregated external reporting of Gender and Race/Ethnicity by hourly employees, salaried employees, and VP+ employees
- Disaggregated external reporting of Gender and Race/Ethnicity by Business Unit
- External reporting on slate diversity (Gender & Race/Ethnicity) for roles at the executive level (5% of employee population)
- External reporting on Age (broken down into 5-year blocks) and average age of hourly and salaried employees.
- Future plans to report Disability and Veteran representation externally once self-ID completions cover 30% of employee population. (Currently 15% of employees have self identified.)
- One company moved in 2021 from historically asking "Are you a member of the LGBTQ+ community?" to asking separate questions on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity.

# Global Data Collection & External Reporting

The below table summarizes our finding on what demographic representation data is collected on Employees outside of the US, and which of that data is reported externally

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Gender	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER	ER
Race	ER*/IO*	NC	NC	IO*	IO*	IO*
Sexual orientation	IO*	NC	IO*	IO*	IO*	IO*
Gender Identity	IO*	NC	IO*	IO*	NC	IO*
Disability	IO*	IO*	IO*	IO*	IO*	IO*
Veteran	IO*	NC	NC	IO*	NC	IO*

<b>Key</b>	<b>ER – Externally Reported</b>	<b>IO – Internal Use Only</b>	<b>NC – Not Collected</b>
------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

# Global Data Collection - Detail

Some data collected outside the US is collected in select countries only, as detailed below.\* In some cases the data is collected centrally in a global system of record. In other cases, it is collected, stored, and managed locally.

Countries where data is collected	
Gender	Virtually all
Race & Ethnicity - ER	South Africa, UK, Canada
Race & Ethnicity - IO	Brazil, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Ireland
Sexual orientation and Gender Identity	LATAM, Canada, UK, South Africa, Philippines, India, Australia, New Zealand, Turkey, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore
Disability	LATAM, Canada, UK, South Africa, Philippines, India, Australia, New Zealand
Veteran	Israel, Canada, UK, Australia, New Zealand, Greece, South Korea

<b>Key</b>	<b>ER – Externally Reported</b>	<b>IO – Internal Use Only</b>	<b>NC – Not Collected</b>
------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------

# Global Data Collection – Future Plans

Most companies interviewed are considering expanding data collection in the future.

Company	Future Considerations
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Expand Disability collection to some countries in Europe due to legal mandates</li><li>• Expand sexual orientation &amp; gender identity collection to additional countries (sometimes outside of system of record when that is easier from a data privacy standpoint)</li><li>• Considering collecting data in future on refugee status, faith/religion, social mobility (UK), and class structure</li><li>• Working to add non-binary gender profile option where required by law</li></ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not considering any additional data collection due to legal &amp; data privacy considerations</li></ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Not considering any additional data collection due to legal &amp; data privacy considerations</li></ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N/A – question was not asked during interview</li></ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Currently on 5 HR Systems globally. Working to consolidate and get better data integrity to improve reporting on Gender, add global reporting on Age, and expand collection of other data where possible</li></ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• N/A – question was not asked during interview</li></ul>



# A Note on Inclusion Metrics

Although our interviews focused primarily on demographic representation data collection, a few examples of collection and analysis of Inclusion data also came up in conversation, which we would like to share here.

Company	Inclusion Data
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assess talent movement by gender (hires, promotions, retention/attrition)</li><li>• Reporting externally on slate diversity for executive roles in the US (Race/Ethnicity &amp; Gender) and globally (Gender)</li><li>• Reporting internally on diversity of talent in succession plans</li><li>• Tracking what % of diverse HiPos have development plans</li></ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assess talent movement by Race/Ethnicity and Gender</li></ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Periodically ask employees a set of Inclusion questions on pulse surveys</li></ul>

# Representation Goals

Although all companies interviewed have representation aspirations, not all companies have representation goals. Those with goals express varying degrees of formality and specificity.

Company	Goals
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Global - 50/50 gender parity of employee population by 2025 (published)</li><li>• Global - 30% women Executives by 2025 (published)</li><li>• Country-specific public goals for race/ethnicity in US, South Africa, UK (published)</li><li>• Goals on Disability in various countries, driven by government requirements (currently not published, considering publication)</li></ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Goals on Disability in various countries, driven by government requirements (internal)</li><li>• Only the directional goal to “get better” – no specific targets internally or publicly</li></ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public goals on gender, race, and diverse slates are set by each Business Unit CEO</li><li>• Goals on Disability in various countries, driven by government requirements (internal)</li></ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Global goals on gender for executives, pipeline, BU level, region, and country</li><li>• Separate goals for Technical resources</li></ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No goals - not a federal contractor and has determined they are not protected by affirmative action policies.</li><li>• Aspire to reflect the diversity of customers and communities served.</li><li>• Benchmark selves against DoL data, Diversity Inc Top 10, customer representation data</li></ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Goals are internal, not publicly reported.</li><li>• Corporate goals around Gender, Race &amp; Ethnicity, set by the corporate DE&amp;I leader</li><li>• Function-specific goals set by function-specific Diversity Business Partners and DE&amp;I councils for Gender and Race &amp; Ethnicity</li></ul>

# Accountability

Companies interviewed take a variety of approaches to hold executives accountable to DE&I goals/KPIs.

Company	Accountability Mechanisms
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Executives have access to a dashboard of their DE&amp;I metrics, with goals shown in the same dashboard.</li><li>• Goals are global or specific to market/business unit depending on seniority of the leader</li><li>• DE&amp;I KPIs are part of leaders' balanced scorecard for performance and incentives</li><li>• DE&amp;I leaders review metrics monthly with leaders</li></ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DE&amp;I goals are assessed as part of overall performance</li></ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DE&amp;I KPIs are reviewed monthly with the CEO of each Business Unit.</li><li>• DE&amp;I KPIs are reviewed alongside financial, operational KPIs as part of a scorecard</li></ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CEO drives accountability. Requires that DE&amp;I metrics are part of performance review and pay</li></ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review Gender and POC breakdown of all employees vs. breakdown of VP+ with Board of Directors</li></ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• DE&amp;I KPIs are included in corporate annual performance metrics.</li></ul>