

C E



**Center for
Effective
Organizations**

HR SUPPORT FOR CORPORATE BOARDS

**CEO PUBLICATION
G 05-17 (489)**

EDWARD E. LAWLER III

*Center for Effective Organizations
University of Southern California
Marshall School of Business*

JOHN W. BOUDREAU

*Center for Effective Organizations
University of Southern California
Marshall School of Business*

December 2005

HR Support for Corporate Boards
Edward E. Lawler III and John W. Boudreau
University of Southern California

Corporate boards in the United States are changing as a result of new regulations and performance demands (Gandossy and Sonnenfeld, 2004; Green, 2005; Nadler, Behan and Nadler, 2006). As a result of these changes, the HR function has an opportunity to provide the board with key strategic services and to add value beyond the administrative work it has traditionally done. But in order to do this, it has to have the right structure, competencies and expertise. The activities of corporate boards and the HR function are increasingly connected. Board decisions affect and are affected by the HR function. Board decisions also affect the organization's HR policies and practices. In addition, boards have to make staffing, compensation, and process decisions that are central to their effectiveness. Nonetheless, top HR officers are rarely board members in their own organizations, nor do board members from outside the organization typically have in-depth expertise in HR (Conger, Lawler, and Finegold, 2001; Lawler and Finegold, 2006; Lorsch, 1989).

The absence of HR experts on the board does not necessarily mean that boards have no access to HR expertise. The board may draw upon both internal and external HR expert resources when they need to deal with HR issues. Supporting the board may in fact be a way for an HR function to substantially add strategic and operational value in the organization. In addition, it can acquaint members of the HR function with the key strategic issues that the board faces, as well as build the credibility of the HR function if it does an effective job of supporting the board.

If the HR function provides the board with key strategic services, it will be better positioned to add value beyond administrative activities, which are the dominant work of most HR functions (see e.g., Lawler, Boudreau and Mohrman, 2006). But does the board actually call upon the HR function for help, advice and input? What conditions are associated with the board calling on the HR function for expert advice and assistance? Answers to these two questions can help us understand how HR can act as a strategic partner and a high-value added function.

Study

The data reported here were gathered as part of the fourth in a series of triennial surveys examining changes in the human resources organizations of large corporations (Lawler, Boudreau, and Mohrman, 2006). The data for the present study were collected in 2004. Surveys were mailed to over 900 HR managers in large and medium sized companies. It was supported by the Human Resource Planning Society (HRPS) and is the first study to gather data about the presence of HR at corporate board meetings.

A three-step data collection procedure was used. First, in August 2004, surveys were mailed. Second, four weeks after the initial mailing, reminder letters were mailed to all firms that had not returned completed surveys. Third, sixty days later, a second questionnaire was sent to firms that had not yet responded. A total of 101 useable surveys were returned by HR executives. A complete copy of the 2004 survey with frequencies, means, and variances for each item can be found in Lawler, Boudreau and Mohrman (2006).

Data also were collected from non-HR executives. Three copies of an executive's survey were mailed, with the HR survey, to each HR executive. A cover letter asked the HR executive to distribute the survey to executives who were not in HR, but were in a position to evaluate the

function. At least one executive questionnaire was received from 77 companies. When multiple executive responses were received from a company a mean response for the company was computed and used in all the data analyses.

What Does HR Do For the Board?

There are a number of areas where HR can provide expertise to corporate boards and help them with their decision making and operation. Table 1 shows how frequently HR executives report the board calls on HR for support help. They can roughly be categorized as: (1) dealing primarily with the internal operation of the board or (2) dealing with organizational strategy, effectiveness, and change.

Not surprisingly, the greatest help involves support for HR issues that are decided by the board. The highest rated issue is executive compensation, followed by executive succession. Board compensation also receives a high rating, which is not surprising given the importance of compensation to the board members themselves.

All other items are rated much lower, including change consulting, risk assessment and corporate governance. The pattern of responses indicates that in these companies HR is primarily used as a resource when it comes to issues of compensation and talent management. It is called upon much less as an expert resource when it comes to organizational effectiveness and general organizational performance. This reflects the traditional role of HR, and while it is an important role, the potential exists for HR to play a much larger role with boards. Since HR already is in the board room because of its expertise in HR, it may be able to extend its role beyond just traditional HR talent management issues to one that includes business strategy and organizational effectiveness.

Does the Corporate Strategic Focus Affect HR's Role with the Board?

It seems reasonable that the more an organization is trying to gain competitive advantage by approaches that emphasize human capital, the more the board will rely on HR for strategic input. When the emphasis is on human capital, HR is an obvious source of advice, not only about the condition of the organization's human capital, but about the overall implementation of the business strategy and its effectiveness.

Table 2 shows the relationship among six strategic focuses and the degree to which the board asks for support in six organizational effectiveness areas. The six strategic focuses are based on a three-item index for each focus. They were developed by a statistical analysis of the item clusters.

All strategic focuses show significant relationships with an overall index of HR support. The more organizations have a strong emphasis on a particular strategy, the more likely they are to use HR as a resource. This seems to be particularly true of risk assessment and information about the work force. This probably occurs because when an organization has a clear strategy, the board better understands what questions to ask and what kind of help it needs from HR.

There is a particularly strong relationship between the degree to which an organization has a knowledge-based human capital strategy and the degree to which the board asks HR for help. The knowledge-based strategic focus included items concerned with talent management and intellectual capital management. Every kind of help is strongly related to the degree to which the organization is pursuing this strategy. The same is true for organizational performance, although the correlations are not as strong.

statistically significant correlations here: one involves knowledge-based strategies and the other involves organizational performance. This suggests that when an organization emphasizes knowledge-based strategies or organizational performance, HR leaders feel that the board is more satisfied that they get the kind of HR that they need, and thus rate HR more highly.

Does HR Decision Support, Analytics and Data Affect Board Support?

Boudreau & Ramstad (1997) have noted the need for a decision science for that logically connects human capital to strategic success, and its value in guiding HR decision making, data and measurement (Boudreau & Ramstad, 2004; 2005). In our survey of HR and non-HR leaders, we asked about several decision and analytical support strategies and examined their relationship to HR support for the board.

The results in Table 3 show strong relationships between the HR strategy of the organization and the degree to which the board asks the HR function for support. All of the HR strategy items show strong correlations to all the support areas. Particularly strong are the relationships between HR partnering with line management in developing business strategy, making rigorous decisions about human capital, driving change management, and providing data to support change management, integration with business strategy, and analytic support for business decision making. The overall pattern of results clearly supports the view that when HR is a player in strategy development, implementation and relevant measurement, it is called upon by the board to help in a variety of areas concerned with strategy and organizational effectiveness. Perhaps the best way of summarizing this point is to state that when HR has expertise in strategy and analysis to support it, boards recognize this and call upon HR for help.

The top row of Table 3 shows that when all the decision and analytic strategies are combined into one scale, the overall extent of decision and analytic emphasis in HR is very highly correlated with all areas of board support, and with the extent to which HR is seen as meeting board needs. Moreover, every HR decision and analytic element is also highly correlated with the combination of all HR areas of board support, and meeting board needs. HR partnership with the line and driving change management are particularly highly correlated with all types of board support, but integrated HR and business strategies, data-based and analytic decision support and rigorous talent decisions are also highly related. The only exception to this pattern is “data-based talent strategy,” which has somewhat lower correlations with some areas of board support.

Results concerning the degree to which HR meets the needs of the board and HR strategy show a number of significant relationships. The more HR strategy emphasizes change management, rigorous data and other strategic emphases, the more it meets the needs of the board. When this finding is combined with the use of HR, the obvious conclusion is that if HR is going to meet the needs of the board and be a strategic partner, it needs to have a strategy that emphasizes talent, business strategy, analytic support and data. When an HR organization does this, it can expect to be used by the board and to meet the needs of the board.

Overall, the results suggest very strong support for the potential value in adopting a data-based, analytical and decision-focused approach to strategy, as a way to enhance HR’s active support of boards. It appears that HR organizations that have advanced their decision science are more likely to also enjoy significant roles in board decisions.

Does the Design of the HR Organization Relate to HR Board Support?

Some interesting trends exist with respect to the structure and design of the HR function in large corporations. Among other things, service teams are being used more often, as are information technology and HR talent development (Lawler, Boudreau and Mohrman, 2006).

Table 4 shows the relationship between the design and management features of the HR function and the degree to which the board asks for support. A statistical analysis of twenty items produced the five design features for the HR function shown in the table. Four of these features are significantly correlated with the degree to which the board asks for help. The highest correlations involve HR service teams at the corporate level. The more corporate centers of expertise that exist, the more the board asks for help in all of the areas studied. A possible explanation of this is that with corporate centers of expertise, the board feels that it knows where it can get help on specific issues and that it is likely to get the kind of specialized help that it needs, particularly if such centers are within the corporate HR organization that interacts regularly with the board. This conclusion is reinforced by the finding that decentralized HR, which includes allowing business units to manage their own HR, was unrelated to HR use by the board. This is understandable, given that boards primarily tend to deal with the corporate entity and corporate staff.

The presence of information technology and its use in the HR function is the second area that is strongly related to corporate board use of the HR function. The key item in this scale is having an efficient and accurate human resource information system. When this was present, boards were particularly likely to use HR. Again, this follows from the needs of boards for accurate human capital data and for it being available at the corporate level. It also clearly

reinforces the earlier finding that HR organizations with more developed decision sciences for talent and data-based talent analysis are more likely to provide board support.

Resource efficiency was significantly but not highly related to the use of HR by the board. The key item in this scale was the centralized administrative processing of HR data in order to gain efficiency. It was the only item in this scale that related to board support. This finding again supports the idea that boards use HR when there is a strong centralized HR function with the right data.

The results of the item concerning the degree to which HR is meeting the needs of boards were similar to those for the use of HR by corporate boards. HR functions are particularly likely to meet the needs of boards when they use information technology and have centers of excellence with service teams.

Overall, it appears that HR enjoys a more supportive role with boards when it has centers of excellence that are relevant to the strategic issues the board is focused on. It also needs to have information technology and databases that can help provide answers to the key questions that boards ask about organizational effectiveness and performance.

Does HR Metrics and Analytics Effectiveness Relate to HR Board Support?

HR executives were asked to rate the effectiveness of their metrics and analytics activities.

Table 5 shows the relationship between these metrics and analytics ratings and the degree of board support. There are large numbers of significant relationships shown in Table 5. There is also a clear pattern with respect to the items that have a high correlation and those which do not. The more highly correlated items involve how effectively HR decisions and practices are linked to strategic decisions and organizational effectiveness. For example, identifying where talent has

the greatest potential strategic impact is significantly related to the board asking for all types of help. Even higher correlations are present when the issue is assessing the feasibility of new business strategies. Other strong relationships include supporting organizational change and assessing improvement and improving the human capital strategy of the company.

There are some significant correlations involving assessing and improving the HR department's operations. The effectiveness of metrics in these areas appears to be associated with organizations asking for help in strategic readiness and change consulting, workforce capability, and executive succession, but they are not related to boards asking for information about board effectiveness and risk assessment. This, once again, follows the pattern of boards being less likely to ask for help simply because an HR function has metrics and analytics with which to assess its own effectiveness.

The lowest correlations involve the effectiveness of metrics that simply assess HR programs and pinpoint HR programs that should be discontinued. Perhaps the most obvious conclusion here is that boards are not as interested in HR programs as they are in metrics and analytics that address broader organizational effectiveness issues.

It is clear from the correlations concerning the degree to which HR meets the needs of the board that the critical issues involve the effectiveness of metrics and analytics concerning organizational performance. The only non-significant correlation involves metrics that assess HR programs. The obvious conclusion here is that if HR wants to meet the needs of the board, it needs to develop effective metrics and analytics concerning human capital that allow for more effective management of it and illuminate its relationship to strategy and organizational effectiveness. Much less relevance to its perceived effectiveness are metrics and analytics concerning the operation of the HR function itself.

Does Satisfaction With HR Skills Relate to Board Support?

Both HR executives and executives rated their satisfaction with the skills of the HR function.

Table 6 presents the correlations between skill satisfaction and the degree to which HR supports the board. In general, the correlations for both HR executives and executives show significant relationships. However, the correlations for the HR executives are consistently lower than those for other executives. This may reflect the possibility that the executives' satisfaction ratings more closely reflect the board's assessment of HR skills, while HR leaders have a more functional focus.

The data from HR executives show different relationships depending on the kinds of skills. The highest correlations involve HR technical skills, organizational dynamics, and metrics skills. This finding supports the argument that HR needs to be able to manage itself in order to be respected by and be perceived as meeting the needs of the rest of the organization. An implication of this is that a successful HR function cannot simply have good business partner skills to be a successful strategic partner. In order to be effective, it needs technical skills, administrative skills, and business partner skills, at least when it comes to meeting the needs of the board.

Notable is the lack of a significant correlation between HR executives' satisfaction with HR administrative skills and board support, given that a significant correlation exists between non-HR executives' satisfaction with HR administrative skills and board support. Boards are less directly affected by the administrative skills in the HR function, yet executives' ratings of these areas are related to board support. Again, it may be that the executives' ratings better reflect the board requirements for HR administrative skills, and the fact that a well-run HR organization is an important baseline for an effective corporation. HR ratings on administrative

skills may be more functionally focused, and reflect elements that are not as directly relevant to board concerns.

Somewhat surprising is the relatively low relationships involving the HR executives' ratings of business partner skills, particularly business understanding, since this is a skill set that can have a direct impact on the degree to which the HR function can respond to the requests from the board. Perhaps because boards still see HR in traditional terms, business understanding is not critical to HR meeting their needs.

Does The Quality of the Strategic Talent Logic Relate to Board Support?

The skills and insights of HR leaders are particularly critical when it comes to working with boards on issues of talent management. They typically are the interface person with boards, and in some cases sit in on board meetings as an expert resource when human capital is discussed.

A key element of strategic partnership for HR is the degree to which leaders throughout the organization have a strong understanding about how human capital connects to business strategy. This does not simply mean believing that human capital is generally important. Rather, it relates to the depth and logic of understanding concerning why human capital makes a significant difference in organizational effectiveness (Boudreau & Ramstad, 2005a).

Table 7 shows the results of three questions designed to gauge the overall quality of the logical connections between human capital and strategy among both HR executives and executives. The first question focused on the ability of HR leaders to identify unique insights by making logical connections between talent and strategy, or what Boudreau and Ramstad (2005b) called a "talent decision science." The second question focused on the ability of HR leaders to understand where and why human capital makes a big difference in the business. This has been called "talent segmentation" (Boudreau & Ramstad, 2005a). Finally the third question asked

about the ability of business leaders to understand talent segmentation. We focused on the ability of business leaders as well as HR leaders because the vast majority of key human capital decisions are made outside the HR function (Boudreau & Ramstad, 2005b). The highest correlations with board support occur with the ratings of executives. Their ratings of whether HR adds unique insights, and ratings of the quality of the strategic human capital logic of both HR and non-HR leaders all correlate very highly with perceptions of whether HR meets the needs of the board.

The ratings of HR executives of the quality of HR leaders' unique strategic insights correlate highly with meeting board needs, while HR leaders' ratings of their own and their line leaders understanding of talent segmentation are not as highly related. Again, this may reflect the fact that the executives' perspective on these issues more closely match the board's.

These findings suggest that HR's opportunity to support corporate boards depends not only on the quality of the HR decision science and talent logic used by HR leaders, but even more on the success of HR leaders in enhancing the quality of the talent decision science made by executives outside the HR function. The same pattern has been seen before in more mature decision sciences such as marketing and finance, which gained strong strategic prominence as leaders outside the marketing and finance areas embraced and skillfully applied logical principles to connect financial capital and customers to strategic success (Boudreau & Ramstad, 2005b).

Conclusion

The degree to which the board asks HR for support with issues that involve strategy and organizational effectiveness varies significantly from firm to firm, but it does not vary randomly. There are a number of factors that show a strong relationship to the degree to which the board

asks for help. One key factor is the strategic focus of the organization. The more it involves issues of human capital and knowledge, the more the board asks HR for help.

The HR strategy of an organization is a second factor that is related to the use of HR by the corporate board. HR functions that see human capital as a key element of their role in the organization and develop metrics and analytics to support their activities are most likely to be asked for help. Only when HR sees itself as a strategic function, which contributes to effective organization change and human capital utilization, is it asked for help by the board on a broad range of strategic and organizational effectiveness issues.

The third issue in determining whether HR is asked for help involves the actual structure of the HR organization. When HR is structured with a strong corporate center, it is more available to the board and as a result, it is used more by the board for help with strategic issues. Complementing centralization of HR is the use of information technology, which can allow HR to answer strategic questions and provide potentially useful data for decision making on the part of the board when it comes to organizational effectiveness and strategy.

Effective use by HR of metrics and analytics is strongly related to the board asking for help. This follows logically from the board needing numbers and metrics for its own decision making process, and therefore utilizing the HR function when it can provide analytics and data. Not just any analytics and data work--HR needs to have data that focus on organizational performance and business strategy, not just data about how effective the HR function itself is in delivering its services and products.

The need for analytics and metrics represents a major challenge and opportunity for HR. All too often, it finds itself either not included in board decision making or not listened to in

board discussions, because it offers opinion rather than data. The results suggest that when HR can offer data, they will be asked for help and they will be more impactful.

Closely related to the kinds of activities that HR needs to engage in, in order to be asked for help by the board, is the kind of skills it needs. HR definitely needs skills that go beyond the technical and non-technical administrative skills that are typically associated with the HR function. These are important and as the data from executives show, not to be overlooked. However, the HR function and HR leaders need skills having to do with organizational dynamics and business partnering. They need to be used to develop strategic insights that connect human capital data to business strategy. They also need to understand how human capital makes a difference in the business. When HR leaders have these skills, and when the overall HR function is able to perform effectively, then HR is more frequently asked by the board for help.

Figure 1 highlights the key factors that influence the degree to which HR supports the board when it deals with organizational effectiveness and business strategy issues. Although the causal relationships in the figure are shown as going from the practices to the board asking for help, that may represent an over-simplification of the actual relationship between HR and the board. In many cases, the relationship may best be described as a reciprocal causation relationship. When the strategy of the business is developed, and particularly when it focuses on human capital issues, the board asks for help from HR. This stimulates HR to develop the ability to answer questions about business strategy and human capital, which in turn leads to it being used by boards.

Alternatively, HR may have some capability to answer questions concerning strategy, but only after it gets acknowledgment from the board that it needs help in this area, does HR go on to develop a comprehensive capability to respond to board and senior management questions about

organizational effectiveness and business strategy. In some cases, it may not make an enormous amount of difference whether the board asks for help first or the HR function offers help first. The key is to have a back and forth relationship in which as the board asks for more help, HR is capable of offering more.

In some cases, the best way for HR to build a relationship with the board may be to be proactive. It can do some marketing of itself by letting board members know about the kind of measures and inputs it can offer. Prior to this, some market research that asks the board about the kinds of information it would find useful may be needed.

What is apparent is that HR functions can develop a relationship with boards that involve it becoming a strategic partner when it comes to organizational effectiveness and human capital management. This relationship already exists in some firms, and potentially can exist in many more, if their HR functions were to develop the capabilities and competencies valued by boards.

References

- Boudreau, J.W., & Ramstad, P.M. (1997). Measuring intellectual capital: Learning from financial history. *Human Resource Management*, 36(3): 343-356.
- Boudreau, J.W., & Ramstad, P.M. (2004). Talentship and human resource measurement and analysis: From ROI to strategic organizational change. Working Paper #G04-17: Center for Effective Organizations, University of Southern California. Los Angeles, CA.
- Boudreau, J.W. & Ramstad, P.M. (2005a). Where is your pivotal talent? *Harvard Business Review*. April, 83 (4) 23-24
- Boudreau, J.W., & Ramstad, P.M. (2005b). Talentship and the evolution of human resource management: From “professional practices” to “strategic talent decision science.” *Human Resource Planning Journal*, 28(2): 17-26.
- Conger, J.A., Lawler, E. E., & Finegold, D. (2001). *Corporate boards: New strategies for adding value at the top*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gandossy, R. and Sonnenfeld, J. (2004). *Leadership and Governance from the Inside Out*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Green, S. (2005). *Sarbanes-Oxley and the Board of Directors*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Lawler, E. E., Boudreau, J.W., & Mohrman, S. A. (2006). *Achieving strategic excellence: an assessment of human resources organizations*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Press.
- Lawler, E.E. and Finegold, D. (2006). Who is in the board room and does it matter: The impact of having non-director executives attend board meetings. *Organizational Dynamics*.
- Lorsch, J.W. (1989). *Pawns or Potentates*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Nadler, D.A., Behan, B.A., and Nadler, M.B. (eds), *Building better boards: A blueprint for effective governance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.2006.

TABLE 1 – AMOUNT OF SUPPORT HR PROVIDES TO THE BOARD

Areas of Support:	Little or No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent	MEAN
Executive compensation	4	5	7	32	52	4.2
Board compensation	18	17	7	25	33	3.4
Developing board effectiveness / corporate governance	33	20	21	17	8	2.5
Addressing strategic readiness	19	24	22	25	9	2.8
Executive succession	4	14	18	29	34	3.8
Change consulting	24	22	35	13	6	2.6
Risk assessment	27	28	29	12	3	2.4
Information about the condition/capability of the work force	10	10	37	27	15	3.3

TABLE 2 – STRATEGIC FOCUSES AND HR SUPPORT								
Strategic Focus	Areas of Board Support							
	Addressing Strategic Readiness	Executive Succession	Change Consulting	Developing Board Effectiveness	Risk Assessment	Info about Workforce Capability	Overall Support ¹	HR Meets Needs ²
Growth	.12	.30**	.07	.13	.20*	.21*	.21*	.11
Core Business	.09	.20 ^t	.08	.16	.17 ^t	.22*	.22*	.13
Quality and Speed	.22*	.19 ^t	.35***	.13	.22*	.17 ^t	.22*	.07
Information-Based Strategies	.19 ^t	.06	.30**	.18 ^t	.28**	.22*	.21*	.04
Knowledge-Based Strategies	.32***	.32***	.33***	.31**	.45***	.44***	.43***	.26*
Organizational Performance	.24*	.20*	.22*	.26**	.32***	.29**	.29**	.26*

Zero order correlation: ^t $p \leq 0.10$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

¹Index of All Support Area Items

²Rating of HR Meeting Needs of Board (1-10 Scale)

HR DECISION AND ANALYTIC STRATEGY	Areas of Board Support							
	Addressing Strategic Readiness	Executive Succession	Change Consulting	Developing Board Effectiveness	Risk Assessment	Info about Workforce Capability	Overall Support ¹	Meets Needs ²
Combined strategy items	.47***	.44***	.56***	.50***	.45***	.48***	.54***	.36***
Data-based talent strategy	.20 ^t	.22*	.37***	.33***	.27**	.19 ^t	.30**	.20 ^t
Partner with line in developing business strategy	.55***	.49***	.49***	.45***	.44***	.41***	.55***	.33**
A human capital strategy that is integrated with business strategy	.42***	.38***	.40***	.42***	.37***	.38***	.45***	.34***
Provides analytic support for business decision-making	.42***	.31**	.38***	.40***	.34***	.33***	.41***	.23*
Provides HR data to support change management	.38***	.36***	.37***	.33***	.31**	.37***	.40***	.30**
HR drives change management	.44***	.47***	.52***	.37***	.38***	.49***	.52***	.38***
Makes rigorous data based decisions about human capital management	.36***	.30**	.42***	.37***	.35***	.33***	.42***	.31**

Zero order correlation: ^t $p \leq 0.10$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

¹Index of All Support Area Items

²Rating of HR Meeting Needs of Board (1-10 Scale) by HR Executives

TABLE 4 – HR DESIGN AND BOARD SUPPORT								
	Areas of Support							
HR Organization Design	Addressing Strategic Readiness	Executive Succession	Change Consulting	Developing Board Effectiveness	Risk Assessment	Info about Workforce Capability	Overall Support ¹	Meets Needs ²
HR Service Teams	.32**	.40***	.37***	.33***	.30**	.38***	.41***	.31**
Decentralization	.03	.05	-.09	-.02	.01	-.08	-.01	-.07
Resource Efficiency	.19 ^t	.21*	.26*	.27**	.19 ^t	.20 ^t	.24*	.21 ^t
Information Technology	.22*	.25*	.38***	.35***	.31**	.21*	.33***	.25*
HR Talent Development	.22*	.31**	.19 ^t	.17 ^t	.12	.24*	.29**	.01

Zero order correlation: ^t $p \leq 0.10$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

¹Index of All Support Items

²Rating of HR Meeting Needs of Board (1-10 Scale) by HR Executives

TABLE 5 – HR METRICS & ANALYTICS EFFECTIVENESS AND BOARD SUPPORT

HR Strategy	Areas of Support							
	Addressing Strategic Readiness	Executive Succession	Change Consulting	Developing Board Effectiveness	Risk Assessment	Info about Workforce Capability	Overall Support ¹	Meets Needs ²
Connecting human capital practices to organizational performance	.27**	.09	.33***	.28**	.23*	.19 ^t	.26*	.29**
Making decisions and recommendations that reflect your company's competitive situation	.31**	.14	.33***	.37***	.30**	.37***	.34***	.35***
Identifying where talent has the greatest potential for strategic impact	.33***	.31**	.32***	.34***	.32***	.33***	.39***	.35***
Assessing HR programs before they are implemented – not just after they are operational	.15	.14	.23*	.20*	.13	.21*	.19 ^t	.14
Pinpointing HR programs that should be discontinued	.20*	.08	.18 ^t	.14	.11	.15	.16	.24*
Assessing the feasibility of new business strategies	.36***	.26*	.43***	.44***	.41***	.49***	.41***	.33**
Evaluating the effectiveness of most HR programs and practices	.30**	.19 ^t	.28**	.28**	.24*	.34***	.32**	.22*
Supporting organizational change efforts	.29**	.22*	.36***	.20*	.25*	.38***	.34***	.27*
Assessing and improving the HR department operations	.21*	.28**	.27**	.16	.12	.23*	.27**	.23*
Assessing and improving the human capital strategy of the company	.33***	.27**	.32**	.29**	.25*	.24*	.34***	.29**
Contributing to decisions about business strategy and human capital management	.37***	.17 ^t	.39***	.38***	.41***	.33***	.39***	.35***

Zero order correlation: ^t $p \leq 0.10$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

¹Index of All Support Items

²Rating of HR Meeting Needs of Board (1-10 Scale) by HR Executives

TABLE 6 – HR SKILLS SATISFACTION AND BOARD SUPPORT		
	Meeting needs of corporate board	
Skill Satisfaction	HR Executives	Executives
HR TECHNICAL SKILLS	.34**	.48***
HR technical skills	.17	.26*
Process execution and analysis	.37**	.55***
ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS	.29*	.37**
Team skills	.33*	.39**
Consultation skills	.27*	.26 ^t
Coaching and facilitation	.29*	.28*
Leadership/management skills	.18	.40**
Interpersonal skills	.09	.25 ^t
BUSINESS PARTNER SKILLS	.23^t	.41***
Business understanding	.05	.26*
Strategic planning	.30*	.34**
Organizational design	.23 ^t	.43***
Change management	.27*	.42***
Cross-functional experience	-.03	.18
Global understanding	.19	.24 ^t
Communications	.19	.37**
ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS	.15	.42***
Record keeping	.19	.35**
Managing contractors / vendors	.06	.35**
METRICS SKILLS	.32*	.44***
Information technology	.33*	.23 ^t
Metrics development	.23 ^t	.49***
Data analysis and mining	.27*	.32*

Zero order correlation: ^t $p \leq 0.10$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

TABLE 7 – QUALITY OF STRATEGIC TALENT LOGIC		
Leaders' Strategic Talent Logic	Meeting needs of corporate board	
	HR EXECUTIVES	EXECUTIVES
HR leaders identify unique strategy insights by connecting human capital issues to business strategy	.36**	.45***
HR leaders have a good understanding about where and why human capital makes the biggest difference in their business	.23 ^t	.36**
Business leaders have a good understanding about where and why human capital makes the biggest difference in their business	.22	.30*

Zero order correlation: ^t $p \leq 0.10$ * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Figure 1
HR Support for Board

