

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.



CAHRS Benchmarking Executive Summary

Talent Segmentation, Succession Planning, and Executive Development

Executive Development

- Formal assessments are a critical part of development strategy for Director level leaders and higher. Allows for targeted development tailored to the individual.
- There's a mix of employee-owned vs People Leader-owned development, with pro's and con's for both. The strategy here really depends on the broader development approach the company has implemented – the “right answer” depends on the company culture and overall talent strategy.
- Most companies have a defined catalogue of development resources, opportunities, and guidelines. In the People Leader-owned approach, they have access to the catalogue and decide what development to provide their employees. In the employee-owned approach, employees decide what development opportunities they want and the People Leader is given coaching on how to guide / coach their employee through their development journey.

Talent Segmentation

- Most companies use some sort of “High Potential” identification process to zero-in on the employees that have long-term leadership potential. There is one company that took part in the benchmarking that has moved away from identifying High Potentials as a separate process, and instead identifies potential based on an employee showing up on multiple succession plans.
- There is a mixed approach for transparency with employees regarding their potential. There is one company that took part in the benchmarking that is transparent with the designation with employees, but cautioned that this is a huge cultural shift. The biggest watchout they shared was that there is mixed capabilities within the People Leader population to communicate this well – so sometimes it either doesn't land well or sets unwanted and / or inaccurate expectations with employees.
- For the companies that do identify potential, it's an annual process that typically happens in Q1 or Q2 every year.
- The criteria is typically based on the company's leadership expectations, but determining potential is often reliant on People Leader assessment – meaning there's still subjectivity. This creates the need for calibration of these designations across the company.

Succession Planning

- Spoke to a couple of companies about succession planning – interestingly both of them shared that the incumbent of the role owns the initial draft of their own succession plan. The plan gets reviewed and approved by the People Leader before being “official”.
- One company shared that whenever a succession plan needs to be “activated” (i.e. incumbent leaves the role), all successors on the plan go through an assessment and 360 process to help 1) fill the role with the right candidate and 2) shed light on other potential opportunities for those candidates not selected.