

Alternative Session Type without Multiple Papers
Formatting and Sample Proposal Title Page

- See [Title Page Template](#) for instructions
- Remember to include a 500 character description if your proposal contains [reproducible research](#) or [multidisciplinary content](#).

Body of the Proposal Document

- A summary with a minimum of 900 words to a maximum of 3,000 words (excluding references) that describes the session in enough detail so reviewers can evaluate it effectively.
- Please describe the focal topic or theme, the distinguishing and novel attributes of the new format and how they will benefit the audience, and provide a specific rationale for why and how the topic/theme is well aligned with this session type.
- Please clearly indicate in your description specifically what qualifies your submission as an alternative session.
- Consider whether this qualifies as an “Alternative Session Type with Multiple Papers” or “Alternative Session Type without Multiple Papers”
- Sessions may be 50 or 80 minutes long.
 - Proposals should describe the structure of the session and how the time will be spent, especially if requesting 80 minutes for the session.
- Should not be prepared for blind review.

SUBMISSION TYPE

Alternative Session Type without Multiple Papers

TITLE

Analytics Stories of Partnership: IGNITE + Panel Session Combo

SHORTENED TITLE

Analytics Stories of Partnership

ABSTRACT

Four organizations will share stories of analytical support tailored to address strategic line management concerns. As important as the analyses themselves are the lessons of partnership across functions these organizations will share are even more valuable. After IGNITE intros (based on 20 automatically advancing slides every 15 seconds), the format shifts to interactive panel discussion with the audience.

CITATION

Brooks, C. M. (Chair), Barden, K. L., (Panelist), Dekas, K. (Panelist), Futrell, D. (Panelist), Katzman, S. (Panelist), & Valenti, M. V. (Panelist). (2022). Analytics Stories of Partnership: IGNITE + Panel Session Combo [Alternative Session Type]. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Annual Conference, Seattle, WA, United States.

WORD COUNT

2950

Analytics Stories of Partnership: IGNITE + Panel Session Combo

In the end, the goal of I/O practice is to influence decisions and change behavior. Arguably the most successful interventions do not start simply with problems we identify. In making an impact, solving business issues trumps addressing HR concerns. Five panelists from four organizations have come together to illustrate several components for effectively “starting with the end in mind” – starting with needs of line management and helping them perform better. These components include:

- Partnership outside of traditional HR silos
- Creative methods, metrics and analysis to address custom questions
- Refinement of effective tools, as well as setting aside ineffective ones
- Working within the framework of the organization’s strategy
- Playing to the organization’s “climate for metrics”
- Creating a compelling, analytics-based case or story

The four organizations included in this panel—Eli Lilly, Google, KPMG, and Starwood—each represent different industries. And they range in age from less than 15 years to more than 140. Yet the concerns addressed here (service, sales, growth, and talent) are universal. As outlined below, the structure of this session will involve crisp overviews of four organizational challenges and solutions, followed by an interactive, audience-centric panel discussion.

Presentation Segment

The session will begin, IGNITE-style, fast-paced and highly produced. Each organization is given five minutes to deliver his or her message, locked on target with 20 slides, auto advancing every 15 seconds. This forces the presentations to be rehearsed, focused, and artfully

executed. Based on the unprecedented success of the first SIOP IGNITE session at the 2011 conference, and popular events this past year, SIOP has encouraged using this format for 2013.

The presentations will be loosely structured around the employee life-cycle—bringing employees quickly up to speed at Google, clarifying the service-focus that defines performance at Starwood, incenting performance at Eli Lilly, and clarifying the dynamics of retention and long-term career outlook at KPMG. More specifics of these cases are below.

Google

At the start of 2011, a very real question arose for Google: As the company stared down what was likely to be their biggest hiring year ever, how would they onboard thousands of new employees, representing a huge segment of the employee population, and get them acculturated and productive as quickly as possible? Google's People Analytics team was asked by business leaders to figure out: 1) what "being onboard" looks like at Google, 2) the key levers to pull to help new employees make this transition more quickly, and 3) how to measure whether efforts were successful. The numbers are dramatic: Google onboarded more than 8,000 new employees during 2011.

Over the months that followed, the team developed an approach that drew on academic research but was highly customized to the cultural and structural environment at Google. One of the main tactics the team used was to implement three behavioral “nudges” – small interventions that had the potential to make a big difference – based on research on decision-making and employee socialization. With each nudge the team targeted a different facet of the onboarding process at Google, namely the structure, managers, and new employees themselves. Based on a longitudinal survey of new employees and their managers, the results were compelling: new employees who were part of the nudge test conditions showed significantly more onboarding

progress as rated by both themselves and their managers than did employees in the control condition. During this presentation, we will share an overview of the project, our findings, and key things we learned related to implementing nudges in practice.

Starwood Hotels and Resorts

The metrics evolution at Starwood has shifted linkage research from examining whether relationships exist, to tailoring analytics to key business segments that highlight specific opportunities for change and action. Over the past two years, Starwood has brought together a cross-functional, global team to align metrics across the organization and optimize our data sources. The guest survey was the first program for the team to deconstruct and redesign with focus shifting from measures of satisfaction to drivers of expectations. Other organizational measures have since been aligned with the new guest experience index to create a more holistic view of Starwood's key outcomes. These metrics include quality assurance ("mystery shopper") scores, guests' own ratings and reviews of their stays, formal guest complaints received post-stay, and associate engagement scores.

With better metrics, the conversations with business leaders have become more focused and directive. Based on analytics, clear priorities for taking action emerged. Hotel cleanliness, measured both through quality assurance and guest experiences, is the top priority. For hotels below a specific threshold, the focus must be on "getting clean" and ensuring associates are delivering a consistently clean experience for guests. For hotels which are clean, service is the next priority. Linking associate engagement survey data to guest experiences has provided targeted information to further assist business leaders in action planning on specific priorities. In addition, isolating and analyzing the associate engagement survey data from Housekeeping and Front Desk teams, which are critical functions for driving hotel cleanliness and service,

respectively, has provided specific actions for these top focus areas. As the associate survey program evolves at Starwood, we plan to expand our focus on overall engagement to more surgically monitoring the most robust links between associates and guests.

Eli Lilly and Company

The pharmaceutical industry has been changing rapidly for the last several years. Major external changes to the healthcare industry related to payers, patient privacy, availability of data, and access to physicians have caused us to re-evaluate the role of the pharmaceutical sales representative. The sales organization essentially runs its own incentive compensation system without input from Lilly's compensation group or anyone from HR. In 2012, this group commissioned a project to evaluate and revise the system used to "motivate" sales representatives. This was framed as Six-Sigma project and was led by an internal black belt. The team also engaged outside consultants who called themselves "behavioral economists." These economists were good at generating ideas for rewards and incentives, but as the project progressed, the team observed that most of the proposed new incentives were directly or indirectly dependent upon a measure called "National Sales Rankings." This individual measure is an assessment of the sales rep's sales results compared to a target (i.e., a quota). With so much riding on this single measure, the project's sponsor contacted our I/O team to see if we could evaluate the quality of this measurement process.

We obtained these National Sales Rankings for all sales representatives ($N > 3,000$) for a 3-year period and found that the correlation of these rankings from year-to-year was essentially zero. Having dealt unsuccessfully with similar situations in the past, we knew that presenting a table of correlations would not help line management see that the system was broken. This kind of information does not help them because they have no context for what the year-to-year

correlation of performance should be. Instead of showing them the correlations directly, we obtained some performance data that was more easily understood: sports statistics. We downloaded major league baseball data (batting average and home runs) and NBA basketball data (average points/game and free-throw percentage) for a 3-year period and created a type of colored “heat map” of the results. These data tend to have a moderate positive year-to-year correlation. If a player is in the top 10% in one year, they are likely to be somewhere in the top 30% the following year. Barring injury, players do not move from the top 10% to the bottom 10% in a single year. When we presented the results to line management, we started with the sports data to give them an external context, then showed performance ratings data from Lilly Non-Sales jobs using the same format. These data behaved almost exactly like the sports data. Finally, we showed them the National Sales Ranking data. We did not have to say anything; when the leaders saw these data, they actually gasped. And they took action. The incentive system will no longer have any compensation linked to these individual sales rankings.

KPMG

In 2010, KPMG, one of the Big 4 Professional Services firms, was experiencing higher levels of turnover than expected. In particular, the higher levels of turnover at the Senior Associate and Manager levels within our Audit, Tax, and Advisory services group was causing disruptions to the business. Leaders of the services group came to HR seeking advice on how to stem the tide of turnover. Among other things, these leaders would cite conventional wisdom: “Don’t these young professionals know that if they stick around a bit longer, they’d have much greater opportunities.”

Human Resources reacted by conducting a study to test this conventional wisdom. Working with our business leaders, we distributed a survey that was completed by over 2,000

KPMG alumni. The results clearly “proved” the conventional wisdom – the more experience you gained at KPMG, the better off you will likely be over the course of your career. The results were striking. Equating for years of experience as well as other factors, the results showed that professionals who stayed longer before leaving KPMG made, on average, as much as 36% more than professionals who left earlier in their career, and as well as experienced other positive career outcomes.

Over the course of 2011, HR and the business leaders worked together to get the message out. A communications campaign ensued. The compensation differences discovered in the study were translated to millions of dollars in career earnings, clearly getting the attention of our young professionals. And, although the study and ensuing communications campaign were certainly not the only factor, turnover in 2011 was markedly reduced. This was an example of the business coming to HR with an issue, HR using a creative research design to study the issue, and HR and the business working together to find a solution.

Panel Discussion Segment

A fair criticism of the IGNITE format is that it can be a fire-hose blast of disconnected stories without integration. This session addresses this concern by having fewer presentations organized around a more coherent theme. Additionally, after the presentations, we will transition to an interactive panel discussion format to work through the meta-lessons of each organization. The chair will then begin the dialog, loosely structured by the Discussion Issues listed below. A lively discussion of the issues is anticipated, with ongoing give-and-take from the audience.

In the last ten minutes, the chair will wrap up the by asking each panelist for their 1-2 most important lessons and the top 1-2 things yet to learn. The chair will also ask one or two audience members the same question, and will summarize into a “top 5” points of the day.

Discussion Issues

The following discussion issues may be touched upon in the initial presentations, and will help frame the conversation during the panel discussion portion:

1. How were these projects chartered? How did the line management questions or challenges emerge?
2. How was this project the same or different from other I/O work? What were the biggest challenges of the project?
3. What was the impact and how do you know? How does the rest of the organization know?
4. What lessons emerged from this project (spawned from a line management challenge) that colors how other projects are designed and executed?

In structuring the dialog, we will follow the energy of the audience and the panelists, and not walk lock-step through the questions above. The panelists do not all agree on the answers to the questions above, ensuring lively debate and controversy. They do all agree, however, to be civil.

The Chair/Panelists

Participants in this session are: chair Scott Brooks (OrgVitality), Kathryn Dekas (Google), Matt Valenti and Kira Barden (co-presenting for Starwood Hotels and Resorts), David Futrell (Eli Lilly), and Steve Katzman (KPMG). Bios for the panel are listed below.

Scott Brooks is a partner and vice president of consulting at OrgVitality, a management consulting firm based on data-based organizational change. With twenty years experience, Scott consults with organizations and individuals to drive strategic improvement based on surveys, HR

metrics, and research that illuminate the connections between leadership, operations, customer loyalty and business results. Prior to OrgVitality, he led the consulting group within Kenexa's survey practice and was the West Coast General Manager and an executive consultant for Gantz Wiley Research. He also worked internally within organizational development for Mervyn's, a division of Target. He has authored numerous presentations and publications based on strategic human resources, linkage research, surveys and other job attitude and measurement topics. In particular, he coauthored a chapter on strategic surveys in a recently released SIOP book on global practices in I/O. Scott holds a Ph.D. in I/O from The Ohio State University and a BA from Cornell University.

Kathryn Dekas is a manager in Google's People Analytics department, and has worked with the group since May 2008. In her current role she oversees Google's employee voice initiatives, which includes Googlegeist, Google's annual employee survey, and other methods through which Googlers voice their opinions to peers, managers, and leaders. Prior to Google she worked in the HR Learning & Communications group at Qualcomm, as well as the Talent & Organizational Performance consulting group at Accenture. Kathryn holds a Ph.D. in Business Administration (focus on Organizational Behavior) from the University of Michigan's Ross School of Business, and a B.S. in Economics & Psychology from the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School. Her graduate research focused on organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) and other forms of individual proactivity at work, and her research has been published in journals such as *Research in Organizational Behavior*, and *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*.

Matt Valenti is Director, Global Market Research at Starwood Hotels & Resorts, where he is responsible for its global guest and customer tracking programs, online guest community, and

syndicated research efforts. Matt leads Starwood's metric alignment and service-profit-chain efforts across operating functions. Matt joined Starwood in 2004, and has held several Talent Management roles involving the development and implementation of global sales selection assessments; measuring the ROI of Starwood's service culture training investment; leading the associate engagement survey; and overseeing the global performance management, 360 feedback, and talent review processes. Prior to joining Starwood, Matt was a consultant with Watson Wyatt in which he led employee survey projects for over 20 companies that included survey design, data collection, reporting, and action planning efforts. During that time, Matt also led Watson Wyatt's normative benchmarking efforts of US workforce attitudes. Matt received his doctoral degree in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from New York University, and undergraduate degree from Duke University.

Kira Barden joined Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide in December 2010 in the Global Talent Management team. Her primary responsibility is leading the global associate engagement program. In 2012 & 2013, she is leading the company's efforts to redesign and launch a refreshed associate survey program. Prior to her role at Starwood, Kira was with AXA Equitable in various roles from August 2006. At the time Kira left AXA, she was an HR Business Partner to the Finance Organization. Her career started at AXA in the HR Measurement and Research team with responsibility for survey programs including the annual employee engagement survey, exit surveys, and internal customer surveys. Kira also specialized in diversity and inclusion and workplace flexibility metrics. During her tenure, she was recognized as the 2010 HR Rising Star Nominee and received the AXA Innovation Award in 2009 for her work with the workplace flexibility program. Kira received a Bachelor of Arts from Agnes Scott College with a double major in psychology and women's studies. She did her graduate work in

the Doctoral Program for Industrial-Organizational Psychology at CUNY Graduate Center and Baruch College. While in graduate school, Kira was awarded a CUNY Teaching Fellowship and taught undergraduate psychology courses as an adjunct at both Baruch and Purchase Colleges.

David Futrell is a Workforce Research Advisor at Eli Lilly and Company. He is responsible for the design and validation of a variety of global selection, assessment, and survey programs. David is also an adjunct faculty member at Butler University where he teaches organizational behavior and statistics in the MBA program. His areas of expertise include selection, turnover/retention, survey research, and data analysis. His previous work experience includes six years as a process improvement consultant at QualPro and three years at Saturn Corporation, where he helped design and implement the system used to select the first 5,000 manufacturing employees. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from the University of Tennessee/Knoxville in 1992.

November 2012 will mark Steve Katzman's thirteenth anniversary with KPMG LLP. Steve currently directs two departments within KPMG's Human Resources practice. In his role as Director of Organizational Effectiveness, Steve has used his expertise in organizational psychology and measurement to help develop and manage employee and partner surveys, the upward feedback process, diversity metrics and other initiatives in support of the firm's strategic priority of being a High Performance Culture and an Employer and Partnership of Choice. In 2010, Steve added to his responsibilities by taking on the direction of the Performance Measurement Group (PMG) within KPMG's Business School (KPMG's internal training and development function). PMG is responsible for measuring the effectiveness of training in enhancing skills and determining whether training is a worthwhile firm investment. Prior to KPMG, Steve was an HR Consultant with Applied Psychological Techniques of Darien, CT,

providing advice and counsel to clients in the areas of employee selection, performance management, training, and litigation support. Prior to his entry into consulting/industry, Steve held the positions of Assistant Professor of Psychology at the Illinois Institute of Technology and Baruch College, CUNY. Steve holds a Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from the State University of New York at Albany and a B.A. in psychology from Binghamton University.