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Overview
Staff mobility will allow UN to...

- More effectively meet its mandate
- Provide broader advancement opportunities
- Ensure equal opportunities
Research Questions

Q1 Does mobility have a positive impact on career performance & advancement?
- Is the breadth of experience important?
- Are there gender differences in mobility, performance, promotions, and duty locations?
- Will it impact women adversely if hardship experience is set as a criterion for advancement?
- What would be a typical mobility profile of a top performer?

Q2 UNICEF re-introduced a managed mobility system in 2016, whereas UNDP currently does not have one. Is there a difference in terms of
- mobility
- promotions
- advancement
- application success
Key Findings

Mobility is beneficial for career advancement.

No gender differences in preference for hardship locations, but women tended to prefer family-friendly locations.

UNICEF saw a higher application success rate than UNDP.

Recommendations

1 | Set the policy for career advancement to more senior positions as "having experiences in both UN Headquarters and a hardship location (at least a B hardship rating)"

2 | Prioritize family friendly locations for females and people with families

3 | Reintroduce Managed Mobility System, which would also facilitate rotations to field and HQ postings
Methodology
Methodology

1. Cleaned data in R and Excel
2. Created new variables
3. Analyzed data in R and SPSS
   - ANCOVA, t-test, multiple regression, decision tree & chi-square
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Mobility</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Job Promotion</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Position Changes</td>
<td>hedges' g &gt; 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Index</td>
<td>(at least moderate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings
1 | Mobility is beneficial for an employee's career

Test: ANCOVA
Results: p < 0.00 R = .11

For any two employees with the same average performance, an increased mobility (as defined by the number of position changes) is associated with a greater number of promotions. This result does not differ in gender.

Furthermore, the estimated marginal means for the number of promotions peak at 5 position changes. Any more changes in the number of position changes past 5 is associated with a lower number of promotions, presumably because of a lack of adaptability.
Test: Using a series of t-tests to test whether prior work experiences in headquarters or field locations (hardship ratings of A or more, of B or more, and of C or more) alone contributed to greater performance and advancement outcomes (application success rate, number of promotions, speed of promotions, number of position changes, mobility index, and average performance rating).

\[ HQ + F \geq B \]

Results: The best predictor of career success is experiences in both headquarters and a field location of at least a hardship rating of B.
1 | Mobility is beneficial for an employee's career

- **Average No. of Position Change**
  - HQ & Field Hardship (at Least B) Before: 3
  - Other Employees: 0

- **Mobility Index**
  - HQ & Field Hardship (at Least B) Before: 0.6
  - Other Employees: 0

- **Average No. of Promotion**
  - HQ & Field Hardship (at Least B) Before: 2.5
  - Other Employees: 0.5

- **Average Performance**
  - HQ & Field Hardship (at Least B) Before: 2
  - Other Employees: 1
1 | Mobility is beneficial for an employee's career

Response Variable: Average Performance Rating
Organization: UNDP = 0, UNICEF = 1

Decision Tree Analysis

UNICEF Top Performer Profile
- Headquarter Before
- At Least 1 promotion

UNDP Top Performer Profile
- Mobility Index > 2.5
2 | Prioritize family friendly locations for women and people with families

**Test:** Chi-square test to examine if there are differences in the genders of personnel who currently have both HQ and hardship B experiences.

**Results:** No such gender difference was found (phi coefficient=.001).
2 | Prioritize family friendly locations for women and people with families

**Test:** Chi-square

**Results:** A weak positive association (phi coefficient=.177) between gender and family rating of locations, such that women tended to prefer family-friendly locations.
**Test:** A series of t-test were conducted to examine if there are gender differences in average hardship ratings of locations, average performance ratings, application success rate, number of promotions and position changes, mobility index, and speed of promotions.

**Results:** Females have a higher application success rate ($p < .05$, Hedges’ $g = .57$)
Additional Analysis - HQ/ Field Preference

84.7%
Proportion of HQ Employees who have not worked in the field

87.8%
Proportion of Field Employees who have not worked in HQ

Employees tend to stick to either Headquarters or Field locations.
Test: A series of t-tests were used to examine differences between the two organizations in terms of the number of promotions, the number of position changes, speed of promotion, mobility index, average performance rating, and application success rate.

Results: UNICEF saw a higher application success rate than UNDP, (p< 0.00, Hedges’ g=.69). The finding stands even after controlling for performance.
Recommendations
1 | Mobility is beneficial for an employee's career

Set the policy for career advancement to more senior positions as "having experiences in both UN Headquarters and a hardship location (at least a B hardship rating)"

- Encourage employees to do cross-rotations
- Greater communication on the benefits of cross-rotations
2 | Prioritize family friendly locations for women and people with families

We do not expect women to be disadvantaged if a mobility criterion is set. However, we recommend a prioritization of family friendly locations to minimize adverse impact.
Recommendations

3 | Reintroduce Managed Mobility System

This would also help with the rotation of personnel across different field and HQ postings
Summary

1 | Encourage cross-rotations

2 | Prioritize family friendly locations for women and people with families

3 | Reintroduce Managed Mobility System

• More effectively meet its mandates

• Provide broader advancement opportunities

• Ensure equal opportunities
Appendix A | Decision Tree Analysis

Response Variable: Average Performance Rating
Organization: UNDP = 0, UNICEF = 1

```
In [111]: from sklearn.metrics import mean_squared_error
   ...
   y_train_pred = dt.fit.predict(X_train)
   y_test_pred = dt.fit.predict(X_test)
   ...
   train_acc = mean_squared_error(y_train, y_train_pred)
   test_acc = mean_squared_error(y_test, y_test_pred)
   ...
   training loss: 0.10231884715951974
   testing loss: 0.15897171309278994

In [88]: random_guess = np.random.uniform(1.5, 2.5, len(y_test))
   ...: mean_squared_error(y_test, random_guess)
   ...
   Out[88]: 0.34206213527526624
```