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Chief executive officers of companies around the world are increasingly concerned about managing new economic realities and tackling talent issues.¹ Talent management is critical for India Inc. to maintain its economic growth and competitive advantage and to address the talent gap.² Interestingly, the world’s second most populous country, with more than 48.7 million college graduates, is facing a talent crunch that is predicted to get worse.³

To fully harness the power of all talent, organizations must recognize the business case for gender diversity and assess the effectiveness of their diversity and inclusion efforts in developing and advancing women as well as men. Benchmarking provides an opportunity to compare and contrast one’s organization to industry peers and other organizations on:

- The scope of diversity programs, policies, and initiatives being offered and
- Statistics regarding women’s representation at executive, managerial, and pipeline levels.

These metrics can help organizations assess where their strengths lie and where there is room for improvement in diversity and inclusion efforts.

The 2010 India Benchmarking Report is based on the participation of 56 companies—including India-headquartered (India-HQ) and India subsidiaries of European and North American headquartered companies (India-Subsidiary)—across eight industry sectors.⁴

4. Industry sectors included Consumer Products, Energy and Utilities, Financial Services, Industrials, Information Technology—Products and Services, Information Technology—IT enabled services (Ites) and Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), and Professional Services Firms (including Accounting and Management Consulting). In the Healthcare and Pharmaceuticals sector, we had participation from one company. To maintain data confidentiality we do not provide an industry breakout for the sector.
Presentation of Findings

The report offers insights into critical aspects of talent management, and wherever applicable and relevant, we present findings by region headquarters—to emphasize similarities and differences between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies. The report is organized into the following sections:

- **The Numbers**: Workforce representation, attrition, and promotion by gender and leadership levels, including executives/management, senior managers, and managers/directors in corporate India. Data included in this report are as of the end of the companies’ fiscal year 2009 or the most recent fiscal year available.
- **The Strategies**: Strategies for women’s advancement, including leadership development, retention, and recruitment.
- **The Programs**: Diversity programs, including mentoring initiatives, employee resource groups (ERGs), and work-life effectiveness programs.
- **The Success Factors**: Additional detail on the success factors for diversity programs, including accountability and engaging men as diversity champions.

Key Review Questions

As you review this report and compare your organization to other organizations, including industry peers, keep the following questions in mind:

- Is the business case for gender diversity clearly defined and communicated in your organization?
  - How can you enhance and strengthen the business case?
- In what areas does your organization excel? How can you capitalize on these strengths?
  - In what areas does your organization lag?
  - Are there organizational barriers that block diversity efforts?
- Is there senior leadership support for diversity and inclusion initiatives and programming?
- How effective are your current diversity and inclusivity efforts?
  - Are programs meeting or exceeding their goals?
  - Do you have tracking mechanisms in place to measure the effectiveness of programs and policies?
  - Are you holding senior leaders and people managers accountable for reaching, or failing to reach, diversity and inclusion goals?

We also provide the following additional materials on our website:

- **Benchmarking Across Industry Sectors**: This snapshot captures baseline information for strategies organizations use for women’s advancement, diversity programs, and success factors across the eight industry sectors.
- **Diversity & Inclusion Practices**: Cutting-edge practices from the Aditya Birla Group, HSBC India, and IBM India to showcase effective programs for harnessing all talent, including women.
- **Methodology**: Background information that highlights key survey questions, mode, and the timing of data collection.
- **List of Participating Companies**: An alphabetical listing of companies that have agreed to be publicly identified.

Profile of Participating Companies

Fifty-six organizations representing eight industries participated in the 2010 India Benchmarking study. Industry sectors included Consumer Products, Energy and Utilities, Financial Services, Industrials, Information Technology–Products and Services, Information Technology–IT enabled services (ITes) and Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), and Professional Services Firms (including Accounting and Management Consulting). In the Healthcare and Pharmaceuticals sector, we had participation from one company. To maintain data confidentiality we do not provide an industry breakout for the sector. Table 1 profiles respondent and characteristics.

---

5. Percentages might not add up to 100 due to rounding.
### TABLE 1
Participating Organizations’ Profile and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY HEADQUARTERS</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (India-HQ)</td>
<td>34% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe and United States (India-Subsidiary)</td>
<td>66% (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY INDUSTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products and Services</td>
<td>20% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Utilities</td>
<td>11% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>16% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare and Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrials</td>
<td>13% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology—Products and Services</td>
<td>21% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology—IT Enabled Services (ITes) and Business Process Outsourcing (BPO)</td>
<td>9% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>9% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than INR 500 Crores</td>
<td>18% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between INR 501 and INR 2500 Crores</td>
<td>18% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than INR 2500 Crores</td>
<td>64% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY REVENUE LISTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes Global 2000 Companies</td>
<td>66% (37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

representation:
Representation captures the number of employees in an organization, by gender and level. It includes counting the actual number of employees in the organization at a point in time.

Representation of women at the managerial and executive levels was relatively better in the India-Subsidiary compared to the India-HQ companies.
Attrition rates track organizations’ success at retaining employees by gender and level. These rates indicate whether or not members of certain groups are leaving companies or firms at disproportionate rates relative to other groups.

Attrition was nearly double at the entry-level for the India-HQ companies relative to the India-Subsidiary companies. However, at the manager/director and senior manager levels, attrition was higher for women in India-Subsidiary companies compared to women in the India-HQ companies.

---

Attrition statistics were calculated across all companies by dividing the total number of attrited employees stratified by gender and level by the total representation of employees stratified by gender and level. As with the workforce statistics, comparisons of attrition statistics over time (i.e., across years) must be made with caution, because the resulting statistics are drawn from two separate samples that are not directly comparable.
Promotion statistics were calculated across all companies by dividing the total number of promoted employees stratified by gender and level by the total number of employees and total number of attrited employees stratified by gender and level. As with the workforce statistics, comparisons of promotion statistics over time (i.e., across years) must be made with caution, because the resulting statistics are drawn from two separate samples that are not directly comparable.

At the executive level, the promotion rates for women and men at the India-subsidiary companies were inflated due to outliers. Our final calculation excluded the outlier data to arrive at the reported numbers.

Overall, India-Subsidiary companies reported higher percentage promoted compared to India-HQ companies. Percentage promoted for executive women was the highest in both India-Subsidiary and India-HQ companies. At the pipeline level, only 2 percent of women were promoted in India-HQ companies—the lowest percent promoted in the sample—compared to 8 percent for the India-Subsidiary companies.

8. Promotion statistics were calculated across all companies by dividing the total number of promoted employees stratified by gender and level by the total number of employees and total number of attrited employees stratified by gender and level. As with the workforce statistics, comparisons of promotion statistics over time (i.e., across years) must be made with caution, because the resulting statistics are drawn from two separate samples that are not directly comparable.

9. At the executive level, the promotion rates for women and men at the India-subsidiary companies were inflated due to outliers. Our final calculation excluded the outlier data to arrive at the reported numbers.
In India-HQ companies, women’s promotion rates lagged men except at the executive and senior manager levels, whereas in the India-Subsidiary companies, women’s promotion rates outstripped men at every level. However, please note that since the representation of women in the workforce is considerably lower than men (as shown in Figure 1), the percent women promoted is sensitive to any movement in the absolute number of women promoted. Therefore, companies must continue to strengthen and showcase their commitment to the development and advancement of women to benefit from all talent.

**FIGURE 3A**
Percent Promoted in India-HQ Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives/Management</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/Directors</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline (Entry to Manager/Director)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3B**
Percent Promoted in India-Subsidiary Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives/Management</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/Directors</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline (Entry to Manager/Director)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advancement of women strategies include programs and practices aimed at the development and advancement of women, including targeted recruitment and retention strategies, career development, leadership development, network groups, mentoring/sponsorship, and work-life effectiveness efforts.

Sixty-eight percent of companies reported having a formal advancement of women strategy. India-Subsidiaries were more likely to have a formal strategy (84 percent) compared to India-HQ companies (37 percent).  

10. The difference between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies was significant at p<.05.
Strategies included engagement surveys and roundtables for gathering feedback, targeted retention and recruitment efforts, and skills training for recognizing and avoiding gender stereotyping.

Although general leadership development programs were widely offered, few India-HQ companies tracked utilization (which is a critical aspect of successful implementation) of general leadership programs (22 percent) or offered targeted leadership development programs for women (17 percent).11

11. The comparison between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies for utilization and targeted leadership development for women were significant at p<.05.
The concept of formal mentoring is not new, but the ways in which smart companies conceptualize, track, and leverage these relationships is constantly evolving. Research shows that diverse groups have reduced access to mentors when compared to their colleagues, and that most organizations are not taking full advantage of mentoring for career development or taking adequate steps to ensure strategic metrics and accountability measures are in place.\textsuperscript{12}

Seventy-one percent of companies reported having a formal mentoring program; India-HQ companies (79 percent) more than India-Subsidiary companies (68 percent).\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Sarah Dinolfo, and Julie S. Nugent, \textit{Making Mentoring Work} (Catalyst, 2010); Nancy M. Carter, and Christine Silva, \textit{Mentoring: Necessary But Insufficient for Advancement} (Catalyst, 2010).

\textsuperscript{13} We report descriptive statistics that are not statistically significantly different but illustrative to capture baseline information regarding the presence of formal mentoring programs in the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies.
Of those with companies mentoring programs, programs for high potentials were most commonly offered (68 percent), followed by programs for all employees (46 percent), and women and new employees (45 percent respectively).

Tracking mentor/mentee participation and surveying mentors/mentees were commonly used mechanisms for measuring the impact of mentoring programs. Just one-third of participating companies reported tracking mentee promotion/retention rates.
Mentoring champion
A champion is a supporter and advocate of mentoring programs in the organization. As a champion, support ranges from securing funding to organization-wide communication of the business case to role-modeling positive behaviors.

Seventy-six percent of the companies reported having an organization-appointed senior-level champion/sponsor for their mentoring programs—80 percent in India-HQ and 73 percent for India-Subsidiary companies.14

Of those companies, more than half reported having a top-of-the-house mentoring champion, including the CEO (23 percent) and one level from the CEO (33 percent). Additionally, 24 percent reported the mentoring champion to be in a line role, 36 percent in a staff role, and 40 percent in roles that are both line and staff.15

FIGURE 10A
Percent of Companies by Senior-Level Mentoring Champion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 10B
Percent of Companies by Senior-Level Mentoring Champion by Region HQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>India-HQ</th>
<th>India-Subsidiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 10C
Percent of Companies With Mentoring Champion Leadership Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEO is the Champion</th>
<th>One Level from CEO</th>
<th>Two to Three Levels from CEO</th>
<th>Four to Five Levels from CEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 10D
Percent of Companies Reporting the Role of the Mentoring Champion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Both Line and Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. We report descriptive statistics that are not statistically significant but illustrative to capture baseline information regarding the presence of mentoring champions in the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies.
15. Line functions are those making or selling the company’s products or services and thus responsible for profit (e.g., manufacturing, production, marketing, and sales). Staff functions support the business operations (e.g., human resources, corporate affairs, legal, and finance).
Employee Resource Groups

Employee Resource Groups (ERGs)—also known as networks, affinity groups, or caucuses—are a valuable resource for individuals, organizations, and the surrounding community. These groups help develop and advance women by providing opportunities to interact with role models and mentors, giving individuals leadership experience, identifying high-potential talent, supplying career-planning advice, and improving performance.¹⁶

Sixty-four percent of responding companies reported having ERGs, India-Sub companies (81 percent) more than India-HQ companies (32 percent).¹⁷

Employee resource groups for women were most common (78 percent), followed by resource groups for all employees (42 percent).

Tracking participation and surveying participants were commonly used mechanisms for measuring the impact of ERGs.

---

FIGURE 11A
Percent of Companies With Formal ERGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 11B
Percent of Companies With Formal ERGs by Region HQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India-HQ</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India-Subsidiary</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 12
Percent of Companies by Type of ERG

- Women: 78%
- All Employees: 42%
- Employees on Leave: 11%
- Working Parents: 11%

FIGURE 13
Percent of Companies by Mechanisms for Measuring the Impact of ERGs

- Track Participation of Network Members: 67%
- Survey Participants: 44%
- Track Promotion/Retention of Network Members: 6%
- Do Not Assess Impact of ERGs: 11%

17. The difference between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies was significant at p<.05.
ERG champion
A champion is a supporter and advocate of ERGs in the organization. As a champion, support ranges from securing funding, to organization-wide communication regarding the business case, and role-modeling positive behaviors.

Of those companies with ERGs, 100 percent reported having a senior-level champion/sponsor. Slightly more than half reported having a top-of-the-house champion/sponsor for ERGs—either the CEO (16 percent) or one level from the CEO (41 percent).

Forty-two percent reported the champion to be in a line role, 23 percent in a staff role, and 34 percent the champion’s role had both line and staff functions.18

FIGURE 14A
Percent of Companies by ERG Champion Leadership Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Champion Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO is the Champion</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Level from CEO</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to Three Levels from CEO</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to Five Levels from CEO</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 14B
Percent of Companies by Role of ERG Champions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Line and Staff</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORK-LIFE EFFECTIVENESS EFFORTS
In corporate India, inflexible organizations and familial/societal gender role expectations continue to pose challenges for working women.19 Flexibility is often understood as an employee benefit or accommodation, whereas Catalyst’s work-life effectiveness approach is built on a mutually beneficial partnership between businesses and employees that aims to identify solutions to common challenges such as lack of business agility, team inefficiencies, and employee burnout.20

Seventy-five percent of companies reported having a formal, written flexible work policy, including more India-Subsidiary companies (84 percent) than India-HQ companies (58 percent).21

18. Line functions are those making or selling the company’s products or services and thus responsible for profit (e.g., manufacturing, production, marketing, and sales). Staff functions support the business operations (e.g., human resources, corporate affairs, legal, and finance).
21. The difference between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies was significant at p<.05 level.
Flexible Work Programs
Flexible arrival and departure (87 percent), telecommuting (73 percent), and reduced work/part-time work (62 percent) were commonly offered flexible work programs.

Relative to India-Subsidiary companies, India-HQ companies were less likely to offer reduced work/part-time options (20 percent India-HQ and 75 percent India-Subsidiary companies) and telecommuting (50 percent India-HQ and 82 percent India-Subsidiary companies).22

22. The difference between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies was significant at p<.05 for both the reduced work/part-time program and the telecommuting program.
Utilization of Flexible Work Programs

Of those companies offering flexible work programs, slightly more than 40 percent of companies reported less than 15 percent utilization for telecommuting (45 percent), reduced work/part-time work (44 percent), and compressed work week programs (41 percent).

Of those companies offering flexible work programs, a limited number reported greater than 25 percent utilization for programs—flexible arrival and departure (32 percent), telecommuting (11 percent), and reduced work/part-time work (7 percent).

Companies were also lacking in tracking utilization for the various flexible work programs offered—job share (81 percent), compressed work week (59 percent), reduced work/part-time work (41 percent), flexible arrival/departure (37 percent), and telecommuting (33 percent).

FIGURE 17
Companies’ Utilization of Flexible Work Programs

- **Flexible Arrival and Departure**
  - Do Not Track: 37%
  - 15% or Less: 20%
  - 16% – 25%: 12%
  - Greater than 25%: 32%

- **Telecommuting**
  - Do Not Track: 33%
  - 15% or Less: 33%
  - 16% – 25%: 11%
  - Greater than 25%: 11%

- **Reduced Work/Part-Time**
  - Do Not Track: 41%
  - 15% or Less: 44%
  - 16% – 25%: 7%
  - Greater than 25%: 7%

- **Compressed Work Week**
  - Do Not Track: 41%
  - 15% or Less: 41%
  - 16% – 25%: 7%
  - Greater than 25%: 19%

- **Job Share**
  - Do Not Track: 81%
  - 15% or Less: 19%
Employee Leave Programs
Companies offered a variety of leave options, including maternity leave (paid and unpaid beyond legislatively determined time), adoption leave/assistance, paid paternity leave, and sabbaticals.

FIGURE 18A
Percent of Companies by Type of Employee Leave Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Leave</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid maternity Leave (Beyond Legislated Time)</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Maternity Leave (Beyond Legislated Time)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Leave</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Paternity Leave</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Leave</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Paternity Leave</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Care Leave</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilization of Employee Leave Programs

Of those companies offering employee leave programs, a large number reported less than 15 percent utilization for sabbaticals (59 percent), adoption leave (53 percent), paid maternity leave beyond legislated time (47 percent), and unpaid maternity leave beyond legislated time (44 percent). Of those companies offering employee leave programs, nearly one-quarter reported greater than 25 percent utilization for paid paternity leave, followed by paid maternity leave beyond legislated time at 18 percent.

A majority of companies did not track utilization for dependent care leave, unpaid paternity leave, and volunteer leave programs. Close to 40 percent did not track utilization for adoption leave and unpaid maternity leave programs.

FIGURE 18B
Companies’ Utilization of Employee Leave Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave Program</th>
<th>Do Not Track</th>
<th>15% or Less</th>
<th>16% – 25%</th>
<th>Greater than 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Maternity Leave (Beyond Legislated Time)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Maternity Leave (Beyond Legislated Time)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption Leave</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Paternity Leave</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Leave</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Paternity Leave</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Care Leave</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Return Rate from Maternity and Paternity Leave**

Slightly more than half of companies reported a greater than 25 percent return rate from maternity leave (paid and unpaid) and paid paternity leave. Fifty-eight percent of companies reported not tracking return rate from unpaid paternity leave, followed by unpaid maternity leave (41 percent).

**FIGURE 19**

Percent of Companies Reporting Return Rate from Maternity and Paternity Leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return From Unpaid Maternity Leave (Beyond Legislated Time)</th>
<th>41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Track</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% – 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return From Paid Maternity Leave (Beyond Legislated Time)</th>
<th>56%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Track</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% – 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return From Paid Paternity Leave</th>
<th>57%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Track</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% – 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return From Unpaid Paternity Leave</th>
<th>58%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do Not Track</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16% – 25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-four percent of companies reported not offering any family care options such as on-site/near-site child care, emergency child care, or referral and support services for child and elder care.

Twenty-seven percent of companies reported not offering any support programs for employees returning from leave such as career counseling, skills training, or networking opportunities.

FIGURE 20
Percent of Companies by Other Employee Support Programs

- No Family Care Programs Offered to Employees: 34%
- No Support Programs Offered to Returning Employees: 27%
Increasingly, organizations are realizing that the implementation and sustainability of their diversity strategies depends not only on the introduction of programs and policies, but also on holding executives and managers accountable for the implementation and results of these initiatives.

There are various accountability mechanisms that organizations employ to showcase and reward the progress of successful efforts, as well as track those that fail to meet critical diversity goals. Connecting particular goals with consequences—either rewards for progress or penalties for a lack of progress—is one of the ways in which organizations reinforce the importance of diversity efforts.
Sixty percent of companies had manager/partner accountability mechanisms in place to measure progress toward meeting diversity goals. India-Subsidiary companies (69 percent) had more than India-HQ companies (41 percent).25

**FIGURE 21A**
Percent of Companies With Manager/Partner Accountability for Diversity Goals

- Yes: 60%
- No: 40%

The most commonly held accountable aspects of diversity included the retention of diverse talent (45 percent) followed by the promotion of diverse slates and/or appointments (32 percent).

**FIGURE 22**
Percent of Companies Reporting Manager/Partner Accountable Aspects of Diversity

- Retention of Diverse Talent: 45%
- Promoting Diverse Slates/Appointments: 32%
- Mentoring Efforts: 25%
- Work-Life Efforts: 21%
- Allocation of Work Assignments: 20%

The most commonly used mechanism for holding managers accountable was performance goals and/or ratings (43 percent).

**FIGURE 23**
Percent of Companies Reporting Mechanisms for Holding Managers Accountable

- Through Performance Goals/Ratings: 43%
- Through Negative Penalty: 18%
- Through Links to Bonus Pay: 7%
- Through Links to Compensation: 7%

25. The difference between the India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies was significant at p<.1 level.
Gender Goals and Review
Fifty percent of companies reported having specific goals and targets for the recruitment, development, and advancement of women. India-Subsidiary companies (54 percent) reported having more than India-HQ companies (41 percent).26

Senior human resources leaders were most likely to review gender targets (45 percent) followed by senior business leaders (39 percent).

FIGURE 24A
Percent of Companies With Gender Goals and Targets

FIGURE 24B
Percent of Companies With Gender Goals and Targets by Region HQ

FIGURE 25
Percent of Companies Reporting Gender Targets Review by Leadership

Engaging MEN AS CHAMPIONS:
Catalyst believes that men have a critical role to play in diversity and inclusion efforts, especially initiatives to eliminate gender bias.27 To better understand how organizations in India are approaching, sensitizing, and engaging male employees, we posed questions on the prevalence of gender sensitization training, frequency, and type of awareness-building opportunities.

Only 34 percent of companies reported having gender training/development opportunities for men. India-Subsidiary companies (38 percent) reported more than India-HQ (26 percent) companies.28

26. We report descriptive statistics that are not statistically significantly different but are illustrative to capture baseline information regarding gender goals and metrics for India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies.
27. Jeanine Prime and Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, Engaging Men in Gender Initiatives: What Change Agents Need to Know (Catalyst, 2009); Jeanine Prime, Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, and Heather Foust-Cummings, Engaging Men in Gender Initiatives: Stacking the Deck for Success (Catalyst, 2009). The first report in the series provided pivotal information about the cultural forces that can undermine organizational efforts to fully engage men as champions of gender initiatives. In the second report, Catalyst examined factors that can heighten or dampen men’s interest in acquiring skills to become effective change agents for gender equality at work.
28. We report descriptive statistics that are not statistically significantly different but are illustrative to capture baseline information regarding gender goals and metrics for India-HQ and India-Subsidiary companies.
Hosting internal and external speakers (20 percent), followed by facilitated discussions with subject-matter experts, and in-class training (18 percent respectively) were used for gender awareness training.

Of those companies with gender training for men, formal opportunities were given one to two times a year (55 percent) followed by five or more times (30 percent).
Of those companies with gender training for men, companies targeted senior and middle managers/directors (89 percent) followed by senior executives (79 percent).

FIGURE 29
Percent of Companies With Targeted Gender Awareness Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Executives</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Managers/Senior Directors</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers/Directors</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-Level Managers</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

The report provides insights into advancement of women strategies and the programs that promote women’s development and advancement. The report also draws attention to the actual representation of women by level. Undoubtedly, more action and accountability on the part of companies is required.

Diversity, especially at the top of companies both in the senior management team and the board of directors, is associated with enhanced financial performance. Companies that have not yet achieved full inclusion and representation at the highest levels of their organizations should question whether strategies have been effective and are driven by sustained commitment. Until then, they are unlikely to realize the full potential of their workforce or their business.

What gets measured gets done, and Catalyst believes that by tracking numbers (representation, attrition, and promotion), utilization of programs, and other metrics, gaps that exist within organizations can be identified. Leaders and decision-makers can better understand the types of change efforts that are needed to create an inclusive workplace and develop all talent successfully.
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