

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365635892>

ACHIEVING HR DELIVERABLES WITH HR SCORECARD: A CASE STUDY OF SEL MANUFACTURING CO. LTD, LUDHIANA (INDIA)

Article in *British Journal of Administrative Management* · April 2022

CITATIONS

0

READS

109

3 authors, including:



Sandhya Mehta

punjab technical university india GNIMT

55 PUBLICATIONS 167 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Vidhu Gupta

11 PUBLICATIONS 2 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

ACHIEVING HR DELIVERABLES WITH HR SCORECARD: A CASE STUDY OF SEL MANUFACTURING CO. LTD, LUDHIANA (INDIA)

Dr. Sandhya Mehta,

Principal, Department of Management
IKGPTU (Guru Nanak Institute of Management & Technology) Ludhiana, India
mehta_sandhya @yahoo.com

Dr. Nidhi Sharma,

Asst. Professor, Department of Management
IKGPTU (Guru Nanak Institute of Management & Technology) Ludhiana, India
nidhi20003@rediffmail.com

Vidhu Gupta,

Asst. Professor, Department of Management
IKGPTU (Guru Nanak Institute of Management & Technology) Ludhiana, India
vidhumahajan685@gmail.com

Abstract-

The belief that doesn't contribute to organizations' strategy can only be transformed with HR metrics which effectively gauge, govern, and upgrade the strategic role of the HR in the organization. An attempt was made to delineate a detailed analysis of HR scorecard at SEL Manufacturing Co. Ltd, Ludhiana a Corporate conglomerate. The present case captures key deliverables which are crucial to benchmark the core HR functions at the unit level. The case study expounds insights on appraising the existing model of HR Scorecard that is implemented to establish linkages between the HR policies, processes & practices. It highlights how the HR function adds value by becoming accountable qualitatively & quantitatively to affect the organizational effectiveness and build a brand image of the company.

Key words: *HR scorecard; policies; processes; practices; measurement*

1. Introduction

HR's role as a strategic business partner has been at the forefront for more than two decades now. The contribution of HR to the overall corporate strategy cannot be undermined anymore. This evolution of the HR function has been instrumental in providing HR with a 'seat on the table' in many progressive and forward-looking organizations.

The book titled 'The HR scorecard' was published in 2001 by Becker, Huselid & Ulrich aiming at making HR more accountable in every respect. It was earlier perceived that since HR function operates at a qualitative level hence its contribution to the business strategy cannot be quantified. The same no longer holds correct. The HR scorecard is a measurement mechanism. It aims at quantifying and enhancing the image of the HR function hence giving it the status of a strategic business ally. HR Scorecard aims to

establish linkages between all functions of HR by establishing measurable analytics. The core objective is to ensure that the strategic goals of the organization can be measured and accounted for. In the process of identifying the HR deliverables, the policies, practices and processes of HR play a key role. The identified key performance indicators of HR function are referred to as the key deliverables or key performance indicators.

HR has to contribute relentlessly in creating a brand image of the company. HR scorecard introduces metrics and analytics to all processes carried out by HR including recruitment, selection, training and performance management to name a few. For example, in the contribution of HR, to hire qualified professionals it shall have to target at making recruitment into a marketing function so that the prospective employee is attracted towards the organisation, despite the fiercely competitive job market. Starting from talent acquisition to talent retention, HR shall have to embed all practices and processes into the system in such a manner that they are linked with the corporate strategy. If the HR strategy is not aligned with the corporate strategy the HR cannot establish its credibility in the organization. In that case, the HR activities may be viewed as liabilities by short-sighted businessmen. It is therefore imperative that to enhance its acceptability and indispensability, the HR metrics are linked to the business strategy.

Identification of how HR can be linked to the business end results, HR scorecard creates a strategic roadmap to provide a direction. The strategy guidelines help to ascertain how HR can facilitate business outcomes. The identification of HR practices that drive the strategic goals of the company becomes imperative. To quantify the qualitative HR functions, HR deliverables chalk a strategy layout and through HR scorecard, the company identifies the leading measurements for business success.

HR department understands that achievement of HR deliverables can act as a differentiator in enhancing the image of the company and in adding to its brand value, giving HR a strategic role. Strong well-laid policies which aim at branding the organization will help in building a strong reputation that will help the organization to become an 'employer of choice'. Hence HR, is a staff and line function both. An effective HR communication system across all the other departments will ensure expeditious action, which can facilitate smooth functioning.

HR policies, processes, and practices when measured can create a synergistic effect enhancing the organizational effectiveness. They act together to create symbiosis for the HR deliverables. HR Scorecard also focuses on aligning HR systems and practices designed for accentuating effectiveness. Configuring the HR system is about aligning different HR practices to create synergy. To quote Ulrich: "I often start with a question with business leaders or HR leaders. What is the most important or best thing HR can give an employee? It's an interesting question because it triggers a dialogue. The answers are usually a sense of purpose, a sense of belonging, opportunities to learn, compensation, teamwork. And my answer is: you've missed it. The most important thing HR can give an employee is a company that wins in the marketplace."

The HR scorecard cannot limit itself to only its functional expertise; it has to be on the fore-front in an enabling role. It has to be instrumental in building competitive advantage aiming at driving business results. The investments on HR initiatives should clearly boost its deliverables

The HR balanced scorecard

The balanced scorecard was first published about by Kaplan and Norton in the early '90s. A balanced scorecard is a management tool that measures the strategy performance. It encompasses the areas related to

finance, customer orientation, employee satisfaction, innovation and learning orientation. These areas present an overview of what the organization aspires to achieve and the direction it wishes to opt. It may be termed as an organizational strategy. The HR scorecard is largely inspired by the business scorecard. The HR strategy emanates from the corporate strategy. Hence, the HR scorecard has the corporate strategy as a reference point and it identifies the HR deliverables that can lead to desirable results aided by linkages between people, strategy and the overall performance of the organization .

2. Theoretical Underpinnings

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) owes its genesis to Robert Kaplan and David Norton (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Since then it has received significant attention among the management and business circles.

HR Deliverables with HR Scorecard

It has evolved in the last two decades (Hoque, 2012, 2014; Bible, Kerr, & Zanini, 2006; Braam & Nijssen, 2004; Cooper, Ezzamel, & Qu, 2012). It has been referred to as one of the most noteworthy management ideas & tools used by managers (Sibbet, 1997: 12; Rigby & Bilodeau, 2009, 2011, 2013) worldwide. A considerable number of literature reviews (Abdel-Kader, Moufty, & Laitinen, 2011; Banchieri, Planas, & Rebull, 2011; Hoque, 2014) have been carried out. Several authors have endeavoured to define & comprehend it in totality (Perkins, Grey, & Remmers, 2014; Soderberg, Kalagnanam, Sheehan, & Vaidyanathan, 2011).

Today, research on the BSC has extended to various sectors like tourism industry (Palatková, 2015; Sainaghi, Phillips, & Corti, 2013; Vila, Costa, & Rovira, 2010), education (Karathanos & Karathanos, 2005; Sayed, 2013), the health sector (Trotta, Cardamone, Cavallaro, & Mauro, 2012; Voelker, Rakich and French, 2001) and the public sector (Drevetton, 2013; Northcott & Taulapapa, 2012) R&D (Eilat, Golany and Shtub (2008) & Textile sector (Cebeci, 2009). Amaratunga, Haigh, Sarshar and Baldry (2002) made a study on the effectiveness of the Balanced Score Card (BSC).

Brignall and Modell (2000) carried out a multidimensional study on performance measurement. The study included the role and measurement of key stakeholders of the organizations. Studies have been conducted to develop models of Balanced Score and benchmark organizational goals (Punniyamoorthy and Murali, 2008; Amaratunga and Baldry, 2003; Bilderbeek, 1999; Kerssens, Drongelen and Cooke, 1997) Tseng (2010) investigated evaluation system with multi-dimensions considering four aspects of the Balanced Scorecard. There were 22 criteria discussed for the BSC. The results highlighted the significant impact of the BSC on the performance.

Maltz, Shenhar and Reilly (2003) attempted to evaluate the frameworks used for measuring the performance in various firms and to propose the effective tool for performance control. The study included 12 baselines for designing the system and that of five perspectives including financial and operations.

Huselid and Ulrich (2001) developed a performance measurement system called Human Resource Scorecard. focusing more on human resource measurement systems linking people, strategy, and performance. According to Becker et.al (2001), Human Resource Scorecard is a measurement system that assesses the contribution of human resources in the creation of value in the company. Further Boudlaie et.al (2020) conducted a qualitative study to identify the strategic objectives to create a strategy map of the HR scorecard for Ksh Free Zone Organization based on the company culture perspective. Balogh & Golea

(2015) highlighted the benefits of HR scorecard and mentioned that highlights the links between the HR scorecard and the balanced scorecard.

The Case organization

SEL is a leading corporate conglomerate which traces its origin in 1969 as a small garment manufacturing plant by the promoter Sh .R.S.Saluja as its Chairman. It is engaged in various textile segments comprising the process of backward and forward integration of spinning, knitting, processing of yarns and fabric, to value-added products viz. Terry towels and ready-made garments. SEL ventured into spinning in the year 2005 and thereafter, into terry towels in, 2008. Today, its production activities are spread over varied geographic locations in Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Haryana and Madhya Pradesh. SEL's manufacturing operations have ultra-modern machinery, state-of-the-art technology, sound operating systems and energetic workforce.

Europe's top 100 Yarn & Thread Suppliers has ranked it as the 10th largest & it has been ranked 8th as per Total Income in the textiles sector in Dun & Bradstreet's India's Top 500 Companies 2014. In the year 2014, SEL Manufacturing Co Ltd was ranked 249 in Fortune India's top 500 companies

3. HR Scorecard At Sel Manufacturing Limited

3.1.1. Objectives

The primary objective of HR scorecard is to ensure that the HR function of SEL moves uniformly as per HR guidelines & directions. HR scorecard monitors the achievement of HR deliverables that have been specifically generated from Organizational Vision & strategy, as the Unit achieves these deliverables, to match the objectives.

A secondary objective of HR Scorecard is to review Unit HR performance at regular intervals, encouraging the outperformers, affixing HR benchmarks & providing area-specific feedback for improvements.

HR Deliverables with HR Scorecard

3.1.2. The Structure of Scorecard-

The scorecard consists of 22* qualitative & quantitative HR deliverables (**Table 1 & Table 2**) these deliverables are specifically rated as A++, A+, A & B based on their strategic importance.

Table 1

HR SCORECARD							
HR deliverable	Quantitative Indicators/Drivers (Proposed)	Target Performance	Unit Performance (Current)	Category of Deliverable	Maximum Score	Score Attained By Unit	Narrative To Support performance
Employee /worker Satisfaction *	• Average Score attained by staffs through staff satisfaction survey	Above than 75 % of employees should fall in 'satisfied' & above category		A+	8		
	• Average Score attained by workers through satisfaction survey						
Communication	• Worker-Management Communication Committees **	6-8 Types of Different Committees to exist (to cover all work areas & related aspects)		B	3		
	• Departmental Communication Meetings (For Staff levels)	1 per Quarter					
	• Grievances Recording & Handling System***	Formal Recording and 24 hours Redressal Mechanism					
Adherence to Statutory Compliance	•Complete adherence to all statutory requirements	Complete Compliance		A	5		

Social Compliance (Applicable only for TTD)	•No. of Major NCs indicated during external Audits (per Qtr)	Zero					
	•No. of cases of first time clearance (Per Qtr)	100%					
	• Rating Provided by auditor	Green (or whichever is highest)					
Work force Mapping & Rationalization	• Deviation between Sanctioned and Posted* Deployment per day (*Average Deployment per day) (Production + Engg. + Maint.)	0			A++	10	
	• Deviation between Sanctioned and Posted On Roll (Production + Engg. + Maint.)	less than 10 %					
	• % of skilled workers	90%					
	• Ratio of Male : Female workers	65:35					
	• Man Hours of machine detention due to manpower shortage	0					
	• Efforts of Manpower Rationalization	Decrease of 1 % workers deployment per quarter					
Administration	• % of employees provided with I cards	100%			B	3	
	• % of eligible employees having bank accounts	100%					
	• % of workers provided with uniforms	100%					
	• % of employees getting salaries through bank accounts	100%					

	• % of workers provided with safety gadgets (as applicable)	100%					
	• % of advance payments	5%					
	• No. of complaints received about medical/transportation/canteen facilities at plant/ Housekeeping (Recorded)	Relative					
Absenteeism & Attrition	• % of absenteeism in Skilled Workers (per Quarter)	3%		A++	10		
	• % of absenteeism in Trainees (per Quarter)	5%					
	• % of absenteeism in Staff : Assistant and above	1%					
	• % Attrition/turnover rate of skilled workers	2 % per Month					
	• % Attrition/turnover rate of Trainees	5 % per Month					
	• % Attrition/turnover rate of Staff : Assistant to E2 Level	1 % per Month					
	• % Attrition/turnover rate of Staff : M1 and Above	1 % per Month					
Cost Optimization	•% Reduction in wages/kg	1 % Per Quarter on Equated Production (i.e. constant variables)		A	5		
	• % Reduction in salary/kg						
	• % decrease in hands per Kg						
HR Policy Adherence	• No. of cases of policy deviation (HR audit)	0		A	5		
	• Rating given by HR audit team	Green					
Behavioral & Functional Training	• No. of technical/ Functional areas identified for Skill analysis Exercises	1-2 Per Quarter		A++	10		
	• No. of technical/ Functional	1-2 Per Quarter					

****	areas covered through programs						
	• No. of behavioral areas identified through behavioral analysis	1-2 Per Quarter					
	• No. of behavioral areas covered through programs	1-2 Per Quarter					
	• No. of man-hours spent upon behavioral training of workers	Relative					
	• No. of Workers who attended behavioral training programs (any worker who attended more than one program to be counted as 1 only)						
	• No. of man-hours spent upon behavioral training of Staff						
	• No. of Staff who attended behavioral training programs (any Staff who attended more than one program to be counted as 1 only)						
	• No. of man-hours spent upon technical/Functional training of workers						
	• No. of Workers who attended Technical training programs (any worker who attended more than one program to be counted as 1 only)						
	• No. of man-hours spent upon technical/Functional training of Staff						
	• No. of Staff who attended technical/Functional training programs (any Staff who attended more than one						

	program to be counted as 1 only)						
	• No. of Managerial training programs conducted for staff: M1 & Above	1 Per Quarter					
	• % of Internally Promoted Workers (Production)	80%					
	• % of Internally Promoted Workers (Engineering)	50%					
	• % of Internally Promoted Workers (Maint.)						
Talent Upliftment	• No. of cases of multiskilling/ Job enrichment/ Job enlargement	1-2 Per department per quarter (For Staff & Workers Both)		B	3		
	• No. of awards given for performance/creativity/talent	1-2 per quarter (For Staff & Workers Both)					
Employee Welfare	• No. of sports/cultural programs conducted in premises (recorded)	1-2 per Quarter		B	3		
	• No. of benefited employees (Record to be maintained)	15%					
CSR	• No. of social welfare programs conducted (Recorded)	1 per Quarter		B	3		
	• Estimate benefited population (Recorded)	Relative					
SMOP (Safe management and operational practices)	• Cases of accidents/ Incidents	0					
	• Type of safety drills conducted	2		B	3		
	• No. of safety drills conducted per quarter (Detail of participants to be recorded)	3					

	formally)						
Responsiveness	• Speed & Accuracy in responses of HR team	Relative		B	3		
Customer Orientation	• No. of programs conducted for the employees for spreading the awareness about company's Vision, Culture, quality policy, philosophy, future plans, environment policy, CSR, HR policies etc	2 per quarter (For Workers & Staff Both)		B	3		

Table 2.

HR deliverable	Qualitative indicators/performance drivers	Target Performance (Measurement Through Internal Audit)	Unit Performance	Category of Deliverable	Maximum Score	Score Attained By Unit	Narrative To Support performance
Responsibility & Accountability [#]	• Clearly Written Job Descriptions of all employees (Yes/No)	Yes		A	5		
	• updation of Job Description in Q2 (April-June) & Q4 (October-December) (Yes/No)	Yes					
	• Display of clear reporting structure (Yes/No)	Yes					
	• updation of Reporting Structures in Q2 (April-June) & Q4 (October-December) (Yes/No)	Yes					
CPI (Continues practices)	•No. of Suggestions made for improvement in processes	Relative		B	3		
	•No. of awards given for	Relative					

improvement)###	creativity/ Innovation						
	• Name of the department that achieved "Cost excellence" award						
	• Name of the departments that achieved "Quality excellence" award						
	• Name of the departments that achieved "Production excellence" award						
Employee Development ###	• No. of workers promoted to staff level	Relative		B	3		
	• No. of staff promoted to officer level	Relative					
	• No. of Cases of officers taking higher roles in organization	Relative					
Safety and Security ^s	1. Safety of workers and staff in plant	Green		B	3		
	2. Safety of workers and staff in buses	Green					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Overall security of plant	Green					
Cleanliness and appearance ^s	<input type="checkbox"/> Workers colony maintenance	Green		B	3		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff colony maintenance	Green					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Workers canteen maintenance	Green					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cleanliness of workers washrooms	Green					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Cleanliness of staff washrooms	Green					
	<input type="checkbox"/> Office up keep	Green					

	<input type="checkbox"/> Horticulture	Green				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Housekeeping	Green				
General Discipline ^s	<input type="checkbox"/> General discipline of employees	Green		B	3	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Mannerism and courtesy in workers	Green				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle maintenance	Green				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of notice boards at all required places	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of compliant boxes and operating mechanism	Yes				
Certifications and compliance	<input type="checkbox"/> Complete adherence to statutory compliance	Yes		B	3	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Quality Certifications	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 S certified	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Kaizen practices	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> TPM practices	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> TQM practices	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> SA-8000	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of detailed reporting structure in plant	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of formal exit interview protocol	Yes				
	<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of formal grievance handling protocol	Yes				
<input type="checkbox"/> Existence of formal cultural and social activity calendars	Yes					
					100	

2. The maximum score that can be achieved over the scorecard is 100. Bifurcation of maximum marks is given below-

Category	No. Of Deliverables	Maximum Score/Deliverable	Maximum Score for the category
A++	3	10	30
A+	1	8	8
A	4	5	20
B	14	3	42
Total Score			100

Various Units of the company compete with one another for getting a maximum score in each category of the scorecard. Evaluation system to identify the excellent performers is described below.

3.1.3. The evaluation criteria-

The scorecard is divided into 4 sections depending upon the 4 categories i.e. A++, A+, A & B.

Each category has a cut off value; if any unit gets a score lower than the cut-off score in any particular category then overall score achieved by the unit gets penalized by 10 scores. Cut off scores of each category are given below-

Category	Maximum Score for category	Cut off %	Cut Off Score
A++	30	60%	18
A+	8	50%	4
A	20	40%	8
B	42	40%	17

Keeping the above mentioned cut off values into consideration, it is observed that 47 is the minimum score to be attained out of 100 for any unit to stay in the competition. To resolve the stringent scoring requirements, every unit gets a position through REST mechanism of the final evaluation.

REST stands for Relative Evaluation & Scoring Technique.

The evaluation key of REST is given below-

REST- Relative Evaluation & Scoring Technique

If Target is X & Unit performance is Y, then-

1	If Y is 0 % - 10 % Deviated from X, then the unit will get 100 % marks for the indicator *
2	If Y is 11 % - 30 % Deviated from X, then the unit will get 75 % marks for the indicator *
3	If Y is 31 % - 50 % Deviated from X, then the unit will get 50 % marks for the indicator *
4	If Y is 51 % - 75 % Deviated from X, then the unit will get 25 % marks for the indicator *
5	If Y is 76 % - 100 % Deviated from X, then the unit will get 0 marks for the indicator *

* If a deviation is 0 % from the target, then the unit will get 2 Bonus points that will be added in total score

Deviation Allowed	Rating Based Indicators	Affirmative Indicators	Relative Indicators	Score Obtained
0 % - 10 %	Green	Yes	Relative Marking	100%
11 % - 30 %	Pink	No	Relative Marking	75%
31 % - 50 %	Yellow		Relative Marking	50%
51 % - 75 %	Blue		Relative Marking	25%
76 % - 100 %	Red		Relative Marking	0

On the criteria mentioned above, units will get a particular score based on which they will be placed in ranking order.

Reward-

A unit that achieves the first rank will be awarded a trophy. This is going to be a rolling trophy that will be given to the winner of every succeeding year.

Unit with second-highest performance will also get a consolation trophy. This trophy is again going to be a rolling trophy that will be given as consolation prize in every succeeding year.

3.1.4. Timeline of evaluation-

Primarily this is an annual exercise, but annual results will be based upon quarterly reviews of the scorecard. Timeline of evaluations is given below-

Periods of Quarterly Review	Last Date of Receiving Data from units	Date of Sending Quarterly Feedback to Units
January-March	6th of April	15th of April
April-June	6th of July	15th of July
July-September	6th of October	15th of October
October-December	6th of January	15th of January

Units need to fill the block of “Unit performance” & “narratives to support performance” & send the filled scorecard to the corporate office before 6th of April, July, October and January. Quarterly feedback will be given to units latest by 15th of April, July, October and January.

Based on quarterly feeding of inputs, final results will get compiled in January & winners will be awarded at Yearly HR conclave.

Period of Annual Review	Dates of compilation & Analysis	Annual Result
January- December	Jan/Feb	Feb

1.

HR Audits may also be arranged by the Corporate office in between the quarters affixed above, simply to verify the narratives given by the Unit in preceding quarters of review. These audits will intend to confirm that performance inputs given by the Units on various deliverables (especially qualitative) are factual.

Notes-

While giving coloured ratings to the qualitative deliverables, units are advised to provide detailed narrative in the support of rating given to avoid penalties of 10 scores during HR audits.

The quarterly inputs (from units) & outputs (from the corporate office) may not be possible to be treated as deliverables of Employee satisfaction. These deliverables will be evaluated only on an annual basis & quarterly feedback report will not include its contribution. Employee satisfaction surveys are prescribed to be completed in the second or third quarter of evaluation.

Important Notes	
HR deliverable	Guiding Remarks
*Employee/worker Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 surveys per year to be conducted for staff and for workers both, surveys will be on standard scale and will cover different areas of employee satisfaction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each survey will cover at least 30 % of staff/workers as sample • Surveys to be conducted by summer trainees (appointed by corporate office) or any other external/internal Teams (appointed by corporate office)
**Worker-Management Communication Committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A formal Procedure for conducting a fixed No. of meetings (of each Committee) per Qtr to be in place • Minutes of each meeting (of each Committee) should be formally recorded on a register along with the respective actions taken • Attendance of each meeting should be recorded with the names of participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All recordings on the register should be verified and signed by HR Head
***Grievances Recording & Handling System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All reported grievances need to be formally recorded on a register, with the <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name and signature of the petitioner 2. Date 3. Description of grievance 4. Action taken 5. Date of action • Each grievance and its respective action is required to be verified by appropriate HR authorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Summary report will be required during the Quarterly analysis
**** Behavioral & Functional Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal Record of attendance to be maintained for all programs separately
# Responsibility & Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job Descriptions of all employees are required to be formally written and maintained with HR at any point of time
## CPI (Continues practices improvement)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for giving awards should be well stated during the review and all the suggestions/ complaints and respective action's details should be formally recorded and maintained with HR

<p>### Employee Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion Criteria should match Company's Policy of Promotion and Promotion of workers/staff/officers may come from a rational, gradual and recorded performance evaluation
<p>§- Rating Details</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Stands for Excellent • Purple Stands for Very Good <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pink Stands for Good • Yellow Stands for fairly Satisfactory • Blue Stands for Somewhat Satisfactory • Red Stands for Unsatisfactory

IV. Conclusion

The HR scorecard at SEL Manufacturing Ltd aims at creating linkages among the human assets, the vision and mission of the company and the key performance areas. It aims at establishing cohesion between the clearly defined departmental objectives and the performance to the company’s strategic business goals; at the level of every Unit of the organization. It is monitored and executed by the corporate HR team. It realizes that the adoption of sound metrics around the HR activities will enhance the accountability of the HR department. It endeavors to become a strategic business partner and aspires to enjoy the status of a credible mentor; by having a respected voice in the organization. At SEL, the human resource balanced scorecard has tried to serve by focusing on human resource activities, for all units of the company, that support the company’s goals. It demonstrates the strategic value of HR by defining and measuring its contribution to concrete and clearly defined terms. Corporate HR and Unit managers share joint accountability for the implementation of a scorecard. According to the Corporate President, Mr Manuj Mehta “Corporate HR is responsible for developing a framework of deliverables, and the Unit HR managers are responsible for providing feedback on whether the strategies are successful. The measurement system of the HR scorecard contains understandable metrics, aligned to the objective and can be supported with data”.

This analytics-driven approach makes Corporate HR more credible. Making the presentation of the deliverables to the senior management and analytically demonstrating the relationship between return on investment and the outcome for each metric has made it a creditable initiative. A well laid out HR scorecard along with descriptive parameters and deadlines for achievement of the departmental goals is the starting point for implementation of HR scorecard at SEL. The HR balanced scorecard contains metrics that hold the unit HR leaders accountable for the effective implementation of the initiatives that have been identified to drive the business outcomes. Linking all aspects of the HR scorecard to strategic business outcomes helps in making it gain acceptability across all levels of the organization. The Corporate HR team communicates the value and the outcomes of the scorecard to senior and front-line leaders at quarterly review meetings. It reiterates that such initiatives must be communicated effectively amongst all levels of management so that the sustainability of the measurement processes is well accepted and its impact felt.

An attempt is made to create a competitive environment in the organization by creating competition amongst the various production units spread across varied locations. It does not only keep them on their toes but in the quarterly review meetings, every unit tries to outperform the other. It generates learning culture & promotes innovation and creativity. Consistent efforts are made to carry out employee satisfaction surveys, which positively affects the internal customer satisfaction. The measurable key deliverables pave a way for laying the foundation of balanced scorecard metrics that can be linked to the financial health of the organization. Highlighting specific and measurable objectives involving factors that are more qualitative than financial numbers are equally important & the HR scorecard includes them effectively.

The doorway to the successful execution of HR scorecard is planning and its alignment with the strategic corporate plan. It can be an extremely constructive move towards enhancing the image of the company

References

1. Abdel-Kader, M., Moufty, S., & Laitinen, E. K. (2011). Balanced Scorecard Development: A Review of Literature and Directions for Future Research. In M. G. Abdel-Kader (Ed.), *Review of Management Accounting Research* (pp. 214). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Amaratunga, D., Haigh, R., Sarshar, M., & Baldry, D. (2002). Application of the balanced scorecard concept to develop a conceptual framework to measure facilities management performance within NHS facilities. *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 15(4), 141-151.
3. Amaratunga, D., & Baldry, D. (2003). A conceptual framework to measure facilities management performance. *Property management*, 21(2), 171-189.
4. Banchieri, L. C., Planas, F. C., & Rebull, M. V. S. (2011). What has been said, and what remains to be said, about the balanced scorecard? Proceedings of Rijeka Faculty of Economics – *Journal of Economics and Business*, 29(1), 155-192.
5. Becker, B.E., Huselid, M.A., & Ulrich, D. 2001. The HR scorecard: Linking people, strategy, and performance. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
6. Bible, L., Kerr, S., & Zanini, M. (2006). The Balanced Scorecard: Here and Back. *Management Accounting Quarterly*, 7(4), 18-23.
7. Bilderbeek, J. (1999). R&D performance measurement: more than choosing a set of metrics. *R&D Management*, 29(1), 35-46.
8. Brignall, S., & Modell, S. (2000). An institutional perspective on performance measurement and management in the 'new public sector'. *Management Accounting Research*, 11(3), 281-306.
9. Braam, G., & Nijssen, E. (2004). Performance effects of using the Balanced Scorecard: a note on the Dutch experience. *Long Range Planning*, 37, 335-349.
10. Cebeci, U., & Ruan, D. (2007). A multi-attribute comparison of Turkish quality consultants by fuzzy AHP. *International Journal of Information Technology and Decision Making*, 6(1), 191-207.
11. Cooper, D. J., Ezzamel, M., & Qu, S. Q. (2012). Popularizing a Management Accounting Idea: The Case of the Balanced Scorecard. Paper presented at the AAA 2012 *Management Accounting Section (MAS)*
12. Costa, & Rovira (2010). The creation and use of scorecards in tourism planning: A Spanish example. *Tourism Management*. Volume 31, Issue 2, 232-239.
13. Dreveton, B. (2013). The advantages of the balanced scorecard in the public sector: beyond performance measurement. *Public Money & Management*, 33(2), 131-136.
14. Eilat, H., Golany, B., & Shtub, A. (2008). R&D project evaluation: An integrated DEA and balanced scorecard approach. *Omega*, 36(5), 895-912.
15. Hoque, Z. (2012). 20th Anniversary of the balanced scorecard. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*,

- 8(4).
16. Hoque, Z. (2014). 20 years of studies on the Balanced Scorecard: Trends, accomplishments, gaps and opportunities for future research. *The British Accounting Review*, 46(1), 33-59.
 17. Huselid M.A, and D. Ulrich, 2001 *The HR Scorecard: Linking People, Strategy and Performance* Harvard Business School Press ISBN 1-57851-136-4
 18. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard - measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*(January-February), 71-79.
 19. Karathanos, D., & Karathanos, P. (2005). Applying the balanced scorecard to education. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80(4), 222-230.
 20. Kerssens-van Drongelen, I. C., & Cooke, A. (1997). Design principles for the development of measurement systems for research and development processes. *R&D Management*, 27(4), 345-357.
 21. Maltz, A. C., Shenhar, A. J., & Reilly, R. R. (2003). Beyond the Balanced Scorecard:: Refining the Search for Organizational Success Measures. *Long Range Planning*, 36(2), 187-204.
 22. Palatková Monika & Hrubcová Gabriela (2015) Monitoring regional competitiveness using the BSC method: A case of the Czech national tourism organisation. *Czech Journal of Tourism* 3(2)
 23. Northcott, D., & Taulapapa, T. M. (2012). Using the balanced scorecard to manage performance in public sector organizations: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 25(3), 166-191.
 24. Perkins, M., Grey, A., & Remmers, H. (2014). What do we mean by "Balanced Scorecard?". *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(2), 148-169.
 25. Punniyamorthy, M., & Murali, R. (2008). The balanced score for the balanced scorecard: benchmarking tool. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 15(4), 420-443.
 26. Rigby, D., & Bilodeau, B. (2009). *Management Tools & Trends 2009*. London: Bain & Company
 27. Rigby, D., & Bilodeau, B. (2011). *Management Tools & Trends 2011*. London: Bain & Company.
 28. Rigby, D., & Bilodeau, B. (2013). *Management Tools & Trends 2013*. London: Bain & Company.
 29. Sainaghi, R., Phillips, P. and Corti, V. (2013) "Measuring hotel performance: Using a balanced scorecard perspectives' approach", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 150–159.
 30. Sibbet, D. (1997). 75 years of management ideas and practice 1922-1997. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(5), 2-12.
 31. Soderberg, M., Kalaganam, S., Sheehan, N. T., & Vaidyanathan, G. (2011). When is a balanced scorecard? *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 60(7), 688-708.
 32. Trotta, A., Cardamone, E., Cavallaro, G., & Mauro, M. (2012). Applying the Balanced Scorecard approach in teaching hospitals: a literature review and conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*.
 33. Tseng, M. L. (2010). Implementation and performance evaluation using the fuzzy network balanced scorecard. *Computers & Education*, 55(1), 188-201.
 34. Vila, M., Costa, G., & Rovira, X. (2010). The creation and use of scorecards in tourism planning: A Spanish example. *Tourism Management*, 31, 232-239.
 35. Voelker, K. E., Rakich, J. S., & French, G. R. (2001). The balanced scorecard in healthcare organizations: performance measurement and strategic planning methodology. *Hospital topics*, 79(3), 13-24.
 36. Boudlaie, H., Mahdiraji, H.A., Shamsi, S., Jafari-Sadeghi, V., & Garcia-Perez, A. (2020). Designing a human resource scorecard: An empirical stakeholder-based study with a company culture perspective. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 16(4), 113-147. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20201644>
 37. Balogh, P. & Golea, P.. (2015). Balanced scorecard in human resource management. 16. 157-161.