

This is a pre-publication edition. Do not copy, quote or distribute without express written permission from the authors, Robert W. Eichinger and Michael M. Lombardo.

The ROI on People— The 7 vectors of research

Robert W. Eichinger, CEO and Michael M. Lombardo, Director of Research,
Lominger Limited, Inc.

...These seven vectors are all coming to a single point. They are all pieces to a bigger puzzle. How can we maximize the ROI on People? How can we maximize our most important asset?

The answers are clear. It can be done. It is being done.

The principles are easy to understand but hard to implement. The top leaders and HR heads who figure out how will reap the benefits. The rest will be also-rans.

Air traffic controllers working at peak times. Incoming planes, limited runways, all those passengers aimed at a single destination. How do they all get safely to the terminal? Vectors.

Compass vectors, to be specific. Vectors are multiple directions around a single point. Pilots and controllers use them to bring everyone safely home. "Vector" is both noun—a heading issued to an aircraft for the purpose of providing navigational guidance—and verb. An air traffic controller vectors a plane by telling it which way to fly.

Corporate leaders need vectors, too. To guide a company through competitive challenges and tough economies requires tools to maximize the investment in people, those two-legged assets often considered the organization's biggest asset and expense.

Clichés abound: Our company is our people; our capital goes down in the elevator every night; people make the difference. Yet the difference they make has seldom been documented—until now.

Thanks to the work of many individuals and teams working independently, we now know not only that investing in people pays, but also how much. Putting this knowledge to use, however, requires aggregate wisdom, the assimilation of the latest research, and best guesses in seven different areas—vectors, if you will—none of which can be ignored if the bottom line is to be robust. The research itself may be controversial, but investing in people boosts the bottom line. And now we can tell you when, why, and how.

Seven vectors, or streams of research on the return on investment in people (ROIP), are currently underway. So far they have evolved relatively independently. But just as vectors help air traffic controllers get all their planes to the same destination, these seven vectors are destined to meet in the middle. There they will form a complete and incontrovertible picture of the return on investment in people.

The seven vectors are:

Does anything we do with people make a bottom-line difference?

1. *Enterprise-wide people systems*

Does anything we do with people make a bottom-line difference? Do all of the systems, practices, processes, and procedures that enterprises use to manage people really pay off? The answer is yes.

2. *Smaller packages of people applications and practices*

Can a packet of practices increase the bottom line in a smaller unit? How about the quality of people practices in one unit, one store, one part of the country? Can the bottom-line impact be demonstrated? Yes.

3. *Single people practices*

Can single applications or practices (like a training program or a selection system) have a demonstrable impact on the bottom line? Yes.

4. *Measures and metrics*

Can the return on investment in people truly be tracked and measured? Yes.

Are there best people practices? Yes and no.

5. *Best practices*

Are there best people practices? Yes and no. There are best practices but not just one set. A three-ringed best people practices binder that holds all the answers will probably never exist. It's a bit more complex than that.

6. *HR excellence*

To make any of the above happen, an above-average HR function is essential. Do we know what one looks like? Do we know what effective HR professionals look like? Do we know what they need to do in order to reap a higher return on your investment in people? The answers are all yes.

Do we know what leaders need to look like?

7. *Leader excellence*

Do we know what leaders need to look like to reap a higher return on investment in people? A resounding yes.

VECTOR 1.

ENTERPRISE-WIDE
HR SYSTEMS: CAN
THEY IMPACT THE
BOTTOM LINE?

Many researchers have documented differences in bottom-line performance linked to differences in the quality of entire people systems (recruiting, selection, training, development, pay, etc.).

According to one long line of research (Huselid et. al.), differences in the quality of enterprise-wide people systems can increase a firm's market value by as much as \$73,000 per employee.

Typically, high-performance people systems are those that include, according to Becker and Huselid (1998), "rigorous recruitment and selection procedures, performance-contingent incentive compensation systems, management development and training activities linked to the needs of the business, and significant commitment to employee involvement." When they studied the strategic impact of these kinds of systems, they found that for every standard deviation of change, the firm's market value increased by about 10 percent, or anywhere from \$38,000 to \$78,000 per employee.

Becker and Huselid found that for every standard deviation of change, the firm's market value increased by about 10 percent.

This impact was strongest when its people systems were below par and the company needed to catch up, or when it was already performing well and needed to get ahead of the pack. This process takes time; for a company to catch up to standard performance for its industry, identify its best practices, then align and integrate its strategies to outperform the competition typically takes about three years.

Brockbank and Ulrich (2002) found that human resource agendas and activities, taken as a whole, impact business performance by about 10 percent.

Pfeffer (1998) found that in banks, differences of one standard deviation in the quality of enterprise-wide people practices were linked to 38 percent better economic performance.

People systems must be aligned to the business proposition. When each people system element—high-performance work systems, leadership style, corporate strategies, culture, effectiveness of the overall HR function—is aligned, the firm will have a 27 percent greater return.

According to Edward Lawler and Susan Mohrman (2003), only 24 percent of companies report that they have a competency system aligned to their business strategy.

These ROIP findings hold true whether the company is nonprofit or for-profit, John Delaney and Mark Huselid pointed out in a 1996 study.

Brockbank and Ulrich (2002) found that human resource agendas and activities impact business performance by about 10 percent.

All in all, there is sufficient evidence to document the potential impact of all people practices bundled together in an enterprise. One significant criticism of this work is the question of causation; it could be that all we have found is that better companies have better people practices.

Huselid and his colleagues have acknowledged this possibility and offered a rebuttal. The debate is still open. But it would be hard to deny that the quality of people practices impacts results.

Look for further research that tries to determine, among the multitude of people practices, which ones have bigger impacts on results.

VECTOR 2. SMALL-
SCALE PEOPLE
SYSTEMS: CAN
BETTER PEOPLE
PRACTICES IN
SMALLER UNITS BE
TRACED TO THE
BOTTOM LINE?

In the early 1990s, Sears, reeling from a decade-long downturn that seriously threatened the century-old institution, was suffering losses in the billions of dollars. Future CEO Arthur Martinez, hired as head of merchandising in 1992, closed stores, dumped the catalogue, and launched a “softer side of Sears” theme to regain the patronage of its predominantly female shoppers. But all that wasn’t enough. What would happen to sales, the company asked itself, if employee attitudes changed, making Sears a better place to shop?

Sears adopted a three C’s (make Sears a Compelling place to work, shop, and invest) and three P’s (Passion for the customer, People add value, Performance leadership) strategy. Figuring that more engaged employees might lead to more satisfied customers who might buy more, the company surveyed its employees. Did they like their work? Did it give them a sense of accomplishment? Were they treated well? Did they feel good about the future and about how Sears planned to meet its business challenges? Did they understand the connection between what they did in their jobs and what the company was trying to do?

Sears assessed and provided feedback and development planning to all store-level managers. They held storewide meetings to communicate the strategy and help every employee understand where they fit in the performance equation.

The company found that for every five-point improvement in employee attitudes, customer satisfaction increased by 1.3 percent, and revenue for the store increased by half a percent. Sears developed what they called Total Performance Indicators (TPIs) that told management how and when 300,000 employees at more than 2,000 locations would boost the bottom line. By 1997, independent surveys were reporting that national retail customer satisfaction had fallen for several years. Yet in the past 12 months, Sears employee satisfaction, according to TPIs, had risen by 4 percent, and customer satisfaction had improved by almost 4 percent. That translated into more than \$200 million in additional revenue—which in turn increased market capitalization by nearly \$250 million.

At Sears, the three C’s initiative was implemented in sequence, so at first it impacted some stores but not others. Those that had not yet been touched by the initiative showed no change in Total Performance Indicators. Unlike enterprise-wide initiative research, here there was, in essence, a control group, which made it easier to determine causality.

At Georgia-Pacific, executives focused on 40 box plant managers, removing half of them and hiring—for higher pay—managers who demonstrated more talent and strength in leadership, strategic thinking, work ethic, and financial results. In two years, profitability went from \$20 million to \$80 million per box plant. Here again, causality is clear. The gains were found only in the plants with new, better managers.

Having adopted a strategy similar to that at Sears, GTE (now Verizon) provides another example. Theorizing that customer valuation of service drives market share, the company created what they called an Employee Engagement Index (EEI), based on the results of seven survey questions focused on behaviors. According to Brian Becker, Mark Huselid, and Dave Ulrich (2001), the company found that for every 1 percent increase in the EEI, customer satisfaction increased by half a percent.

And at Taco Bell the 20 percent of stores with the lowest employee turnover yielded twice the sales and 55 percent greater profits than those with high turnover.

Much research has also been done on teams. Quite simply, well-staffed, focused, and skilled teams outperform other teams. And the research indicates that team performance can be improved with a linked impact on results. A superior team is 30 percent more productive than an average team (Spencer, 2001).

So, working to improve one unit at a time has an impact that can be measured.

At Taco Bell, the 20 percent of stores with the lowest employee turnover yielded twice the sales and 55 percent greater profits than those with high turnover.

VECTOR 3. SINGLE
APPLICATIONS FOR
INDIVIDUALS, ONE
AT A TIME

What difference does individual talent make? Tiger Woods? Shaq? Frank? Aretha? Welch? Gandhi? Mandela? Quite a bit.

Attracting, developing, and deploying talent pays off—one person at a time.

What difference does talent make in the business world? One literature search study by Hunter, Schmidt and Judiesch (1990) found that in non-sales jobs, one standard deviation better performance yielded better results—19 to 48 percent better. In sales jobs, which are easier to track, the better results range was 48 to 120 percent. The researchers looked at salespeople in 44 firms. Those who performed one standard deviation better than average salespeople produced 123 percent better results. That translated into added revenue of \$3.7 million per better-than-average salesperson.

The general rule of thumb is that top performers outperform average performers by 40 to 50 percent.

...top performers
outperform average
performers by 40 to 50
percent.

Computer programmers offer another example. Spencer (2001) found that, on average, the “stars” (two notches—two standard deviations—above the average) delivered 64 lines of high-quality debugged code per month. The “high performers” (one standard deviation lower but one notch above the average) delivered 16 lines. The “average” programmers delivered 5 lines. The “laggards” (one notch below average) programmers delivered only a single line of debugged code. The difference between a laggard and a star? 1,272 percent!

Put another way, if you needed 640 lines of final debugged code in order to complete a new product on time, you could use 10 stars, or 40 high performers, or 128 average or mixed programmers, or 640 laggards. Which would you choose?

How do you deploy better talent? You could hire it to begin with. Many studies of successful and most admired companies list attracting talent as one of their major advantages. In order to hire well, you have to know what talent looks like, and you have to have a company culture and pay practices that attract talent.

The difference between
a laggard and a star?
1,272 percent!

If you can't attract top talent (a buy option), then you need to build talent internally. You would need assessment, feedback, and development people practices that work. You could also bring performance-management best practices to bear. Provide timely feedback on what employees are doing right and what's not working, along with a plan for performance improvement. If they're given a chance to improve and fail to respond, remove them (a practice currently called top grading).

Also, you can help collections of people perform better together. A whole set of proven best practices for high-performing teams can be brought to bear.

Spencer (2001) has looked at each of those individual people practices and studied their relative impact, if implemented correctly. He reports:

- Feedback on mission-critical skills—those that really make a difference—can generate a 10 percent of one standard deviation performance improvement. Apply that statistic to the one-standard-deviation-above-average salespeople who produced \$3.7 million more than the average: Targeted feedback alone could deliver \$370,000 in revenue per salesperson.
- Better selection can contribute 20 percent—or \$740,000.
- Better training can get you 46 percent—\$1.7 million.
- Better performance management (including getting rid of those who do not respond to coaching) can get you 60 percent—\$2.2 million.

VECTOR 4. BEST
PRACTICES: IS
THERE ONE BEST
WAY TO DO IT?

So, everything we do well with people can make a difference. Some of the things we do—one person at a time—make a documentable difference.

Huselid and Becker (1999) asked, “Is there an optimal way to organize an HR management system and set of practices that, if adopted by the firm, will result in improved financial performance?” Answering their own question in 2003 (“Measuring HR? Benchmarking is NOT the Answer,” *HR Magazine*), they made the same point many others are making: The practices need to fit the specific circumstance. Just because a particular practice works in one place doesn’t make it a best practice for another.

Why would you be interested in best practices? Because they can lead to the results suggested in Vectors 1–3 above.

What is a best practice? For a practice to be a best practice, it would need to:

- Be scientifically sound. Research must demonstrate that the assumptions underlying the practice are real and have been documented. Structured interviewing is an example of a scientifically sound practice. Handwriting analysis isn’t.
- Be implementable. That means that in the real world of work, the practice can be implemented; people can be taught to do it. There is always a lag between science and practice; many scientifically sound findings have not found their way into everyday use.
- Be able to help produce the outcomes the organization is seeking. When implemented, the practice must work.
- Be cost-effective. Whatever it costs to implement, the practice must return more.
- Fit with the organization’s operating culture and be in line with its values.

Best practices can be studied in a number of ways. Dess and Picken (1999) studied the most admired companies to see what practices they have in common. What differentiated them from the less admired? The researchers found that the top organizations are alike in these six areas:

1. *Recruitment, development, and retention of top talent.*
2. *Use of technology to leverage people.*
3. *Effective structure.*
4. *Incentives and controls.*
5. *Leadership.*
6. *Learning culture.*

According to Pfeffer (1998), high-performing companies share a set of general practices that lead to superior economic results:

- In these companies, employees feel assured of employment security—not a lifetime guarantee, but reasonable certainty that their jobs won’t go away if they follow the company plan and perform. They believe their efforts will be rewarded with continued employment.
- Hiring is very selective. The firm makes an effort to attract and retain the best employees (see number 1 above).

- Pay is higher, which attracts better employees, retains them longer, and delivers better results (see number 4 above).
- Teams and decentralized decision making characterize a high-performing firm, as do reduced status distinctions, which allow employees at all levels to build camaraderie and make company goals their own.
- Extensive training contributes to overall success and the bottom line. Extensive information-sharing also is essential; this practice is what keeps the gears meshing to run the profit-maker.
- Finally, in the best companies who have adopted the best (for them) practices, there is a link between performance and reward.

The way to find *best* practices is to compare practices side by side.

The other way to identify best practices is to compare the practices side by side. Huselid, Spencer, and Pfeffer, among others, have tried to do that. Vector 3, for example, shows that focusing on better performance management has a bigger payback than better selection.

That said, there are probably not now, nor will there be in the near future, a single set of specific best practices that fits all. There are probably multiple best practices in each of the people applications. There are multiple best ways to recruit, select, train, and evaluate performance. Which of those qualify as best practices depends upon the organization, its culture, and the results it seeks.

Most experts agree that no one set of specific best practices exists. Some work better in one industry than another, or when aligned with a certain strategy or goal.

The trick is to select the right fit best practice. See Vector 6 for more on that concept.

VECTOR 5. METRICS
AND
MEASUREMENT:
CAN THE SOFT
PEOPLE STUFF BE
MEASURED?

The volume of metrics and measurements applied to investment return on “soft people stuff” has exploded.

The best-known effort at the enterprise level is Kaplan and Norton’s Balanced Scorecard. These researchers have developed a strategy map for linking human capital to firm performance. In addition to focusing on such traditional people measures as experience and years of education, they look at how well workers’ performance lines up with company strategy. What impact do their individual contributions make?

Conventional accounting systems require people-related investments, unlike capital investments, to be expensed in the current year. Managers aren’t depreciating these intangible assets over the “useful life” of an employee’s contribution.

Good employees, however, do make long-term contributions, and such intangibles are increasingly important in today’s evolving economy. They occur at all levels, and they can and should be managed—and measured. Ulrich and Smallwood (2003) report that intangible measurement—mostly the soft leadership and people stuff—is entering the mainstream as investors and analysts try to value organizations.

Both hard and soft measurements should be considered. According to Ernst & Young in their paper, “Measures That Matter”, non-financial performance drives at least 35 percent of a company’s evaluation by analysts and investors. The more uncertain the business situation, the more the analysis depends on intangibles. The more non-financial information the analysts use, the better their forecasts tend to be.

Some of those soft measurements include the quality and execution of a stated strategy and the ability to attract talent and to innovate. Is executive compensation tied to results? What is

the market share now, and what is it expected to be? Is the company a leader in research? And what is the quality of its operations?

Fitz-enz (2000, 2002) has published two books full of ways to measure human capital. Journals are now covering the topic with greater frequency. Metrics conferences are popular. *HR Magazine* (2003) recently included an article, "Metrics Maze: HR Searches for Ways to Measure Human Capital," that described this trend. False starts occur and lessons are learned along the way, but progress is being made.

Many years ago, experts agreed that the soft stuff couldn't be measured. Then they decided that measuring is possible, but difficult. Then measurement became easier in theory, but hard to implement in practice. Now we're trying to decide which of the many proven soft ROIP metrics we should use, and what it is we need to measure.

Whether the soft people stuff can be measured is no longer debated. How to measure it is nearing consensus. Which specific ways work best for any given application is still in play, as is determining which measures work the best overall.

VECTOR 6. HUMAN
RESOURCES

EXCELLENCE: WHAT
KIND OF
PROFESSIONAL
DOES IT TAKE TO
PULL THIS OFF?

While Vectors 1–5 are not totally dependent upon the HR function, most parts of them are. In general, the vectors are people practices. The domain of the HR function. Any organization needs a strong HR function to implement sound people practices.

Consensus is growing (Brockbank & Ulrich, 2003; Lawler & Mohrman, 2003) about what an HR function should look like: a better strategic partner with initiatives linked to the business strategy and customer value. But HR functions have been slow to develop the capabilities required to execute that vision.

Two major longitudinal studies track the effectiveness of HR professionals. Both are biannual surveys, one by Ulrich and Brockbank (University of Michigan) and the other by Lawler and Mohrman (University of Southern California). The surveys report on what the function is doing, how others evaluate it, and how top and bottom performers differ. In addition to these fine efforts, various professional organizations (SHRM, HRPS, and ASTD) regularly publish research and opinion pieces on what makes an effective professional. Many professional organizations are beginning to certify people for HR excellence in various specialty areas.

Most HR executives are not yet considered strategic partners, and little has changed in recent years, despite enormous changes in the business environment. In 1995, one study showed that HR executives spend 21.9 percent of their time in activities related to strategic partnership; by 2001, that percentage had risen to only 23.2 percent (Lawler & Mohrman, 2003).

To be effective, Brockbank and Ulrich suggest, HR leaders need to perform in five key areas. The first, involvement at the strategic level, accounts for 43 percent of HR's impact on business performance, far more than any other area. It includes helping to manage the corporate culture, helping to facilitate fast change, and helping to design the corporate infrastructure as well as participating in strategic business sessions.

HR leaders must have personal credibility, which accounts for 23 percent of business results. This means they must develop trusting and effective relationships, be good at personal communication, and be able to influence their internal customers, which leads to getting results.

Effective delivery of HR activities (18 percent) includes such traditional and operational categories as development, staffing, performance management, corporate structure, and HR measurement. Leaders must also have business knowledge, an understanding of the value chain (12 percent impact to the bottom line) and the ability to leverage evolving technology (8 percent).

HR leaders must have personal credibility, which accounts for 23 percent of business results.

...aligned practices boost results 27 percent over non-aligned practices.

The complaint that HR people and functions do not understand the business is a common one. Ulrich and Eichinger (1996) asked a sample of top managers what they meant by that statement. Their overwhelming response: HR people need to understand the business so that they can align what they do to what is important to me and the organization. This reflects the Huselid finding in Vector 1 that aligned practices get a 27 percent boost in results over non-aligned practices.

So 30 percent (12 percent for understanding the business plus 18 percent for understanding HR technology and delivery) of HR effectiveness can be traced to knowing what the best practices are, understanding the business proposition, and connecting the dots. Which set of the many possible best practices would work best here? Once that has been decided, HR must convince management of the wisdom of their choice. Finally, management must make sure the best practices are implemented.

A 35 percent improvement in the HR Scorecard was associated with a 10 to 20 percent increase in the firm's market value.

On the human resources side of the equation, Becker, Huselid, and Ulrich have come up with what they call the HR Scorecard, which focuses on five key questions: Are the HR managers up to the task (of finding and implementing high ROI people practices)? Are the best practices they've identified up and running? Are these practices integrated with the company's internal goals and the external needs of the business? Is employee behavior aligned with corporate strategy? Is the system cost-effective?

Analyzing nearly 3,000 firms, they found a strong correlation between what they called high-performance HR systems (ones that scored well on these measures) and shareholder value. A 35 percent improvement in the HR Scorecard was associated with a 10 to 20 percent increase in the firm's market value.

If an organization is interested in adopting more effective people practices leading to a higher ROI, it needs a strong HR function comprised of strong influential professionals. We think we know what that looks like. It can be measured and the skills can be enhanced. All this would require a strong HR leader partnering with the leaders described in Vector 7.

VECTOR 7.
ORGANIZATION
LEADERSHIP: WHAT
DOES IT TAKE TO
MAKE THIS
HAPPEN?

None of the above is going to happen without enlightened leadership. According to Day and Lord (1986), differences in the quality of executive leadership explain as much as 45 percent of an organization's performance. Hunter and Schmidt (1990) suggest that it might be 48 percent for those executives who rank one standard deviation above average. Zenger and Folkman (2002) report that the top 10 percent of leaders produce five times as much net profit as the bottom 10 percent, and twice as much as average leaders.

What does this enlightened leader look like? That debate has been going on since the invention of the printing press, and before that, since the spoken word. Does a top leader fit a single pattern? No. Do top leaders have some elements in common? Yes.

All of the research to date can be summarized in six Qs.

1. *IQ – Intelligence Quotient*

Top leaders are brighter than the rest. They have to sift through mountains of data, perhaps missing important pieces, and make decisions quickly. They have to track many simultaneous activities and streams of thought. The good news is that most of the people who get to top management positions are smart enough. There is no shortage of bright people.

2. *TQ – Technical/Operational Quotient*

Top leaders know the business. They have the functional and technical skills and knowledge necessary to make intelligent decisions and take prudent actions. They

have the operational skill to make things happen. Again, the news is good. Most who get there have this set of skills.

3. *MQ – Motivational Quotient*

Top leaders are super-motivated. They are ambitious. They make life sacrifices to climb the organizational career ladder. They work long hours. They travel a lot. They relocate frequently. They have to want it. Again, most who get there have the necessary motivation to lead and persevere.

4. *XQ – eXperience Quotient*

Top leaders have had skill-building experiences along the way. We know from extensive research at CCL (Lombardo) that specific experiences can teach specific skills. Start-ups teach different skills than fix-its. Here the record is mixed. Many people get to the top without much diverse experience. They are especially deficient on global experience. It's almost impossible to add that experience if they are already at the top.

5. *PQ – People Quotient*

Top leaders are effective with people. They are able to relate to diverse audiences. They can get things done through others. They can influence and inspire. They adapt their actions to the needs of the people with whom they are interacting. They read people accurately. They know how to motivate people one at a time, in groups, or in entire enterprises. Here the news is dismal. People like Goleman, Boyatzis, and Spencer (2001) all report that this skill set is often missing. All of the derailment studies cited above list some version of PQ deficiency as the driving cause of failure among managers and executives.

6. *LQ – Learning Quotient*

Top leaders who rank in the upper portion of success (they are more effective than other top leaders) are more learning-agile, which Bennis (2002) calls "adaptive capacity," the hallmark of effective leadership. Lombardo and Eichinger (2004) have shown that it is associated with being a high potential learner; these learners perform much better after promotion than do the average and low learning-agile. Sternberg reports that LQ has a higher correlation (relationship) to success than IQ.

What this means is that effective leaders are lifelong learners. Learners of the soft stuff. Learning agility relates to learning to think, feel, act, and believe differently based upon experience and changing circumstances. Here the news is also mixed. Probably one-third of people who get to the top are learning-agile. Studies of why people fail (Finkelstein, 2003; Dottlich, 2003; Lombardo; Bennis, 2002; Zenger, 2002) all include some version of the lack of willingness and ability to adapt and learn from experience.

To really benefit from XQ, a leader also would need LQ. If someone had LQ but did not go through career-building experiences, that person wouldn't develop the necessary skills to be considered one of the most effective leaders.

As far as implementing the first five vectors and working with Vector 6 are concerned, top leaders generally have the IQ and the MQ to understand and want to improve performance in these ways. If they see proof of what impact the vectors could have on the bottom line, most would have no trouble accepting the challenge. But most don't have the TQ or XQ to make it

happen. The concept of ROIP is relatively new for everyone. To succeed, these executives would have to learn new ways of thinking and measuring.

That brings us to LQ. For top leaders to change the way they manage, they would need LQ. PQ would play into the equation in terms of change management and leading the effort to act and measure differently. PQ would also play in working more closely with the HR head and function to make all of this happen.

Back to our air traffic controllers. Their job is to vector all of the planes to one spot. These seven vectors, pieces of a bigger puzzle, are all coming to a single point. How can we maximize the ROI on people? How can we maximize our most important asset?

Vector 7 may prove the most daunting. Over the next few years, most top managers will come to understand the evidence behind ROIP but far fewer will be able to implement it in their organizations. They are missing the LQ and PQ skills, while the HR head and function are not yet full strategic partners. But these obstacles can be overcome. It is being done. It may be tough, but it can be learned. And it works.

Back to our air traffic controllers. Their job is to vector all of the planes to one spot. These seven vectors are all coming to a single point. They are all pieces to a bigger puzzle. How can we

maximize the ROI on People? How can we maximize our most important asset?

As we have shown here, the answers are clear. It can be done. It is being done. Although the principles are easy to understand, implementing them is much harder, a challenge suited to only the best. Those top leaders and HR heads with LQ and PQ will reap the benefits. The rest, unfortunately, will be also-rans.



Lominger Limited, Inc. 5320 Cedar Lake Road South, Minneapolis, MN 55416-1643 www.lominger.com
Phone: 952-345-3610 Fax: 952-345-3601 business_office@lominger.com