Top Companies measures key areas that impact women in technology, including representation, policies and programs, and workplace experience. In gathering this information, we learn what methods companies are using to increase representation, and how these efforts are changing over time.
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ABOUT TOP COMPANIES

Top Companies for Women Technologists is a national program from AnitaB.org that identifies key trends around the representation of women technologists in the workforce. First launched in 2011, the program helps organizations identify areas where they can improve, and signals a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion that women look for in an employer.

While other benchmarking programs exist, Top Companies is the only benchmarking program that measures technical employees using a rigorous, standardized definition of the technical workforce. All participating organizations agree to utilize this standardized definition, and all comparisons made across technical employees are based on a shared understanding of what constitutes a technical employee.

At a time when women are significantly underrepresented on teams that are building technologies that shape every aspect of modern life, Top Companies helps point the way to a more diverse, equitable and inclusive future.
2018 PROGRAM SCOPE

Top Companies measured a technical workforce of well over half a million technologists.

80 participating companies
628,000+ technologists
150,000+ women technologists

Companies of different sizes face different challenges in growing the number of women in technical roles. In 2018, we segmented some data by the size of the technical workforce. This allowed us to look at how company size plays a role in building more diverse teams.

This year’s participating companies came from many different industries, including:

- hardware & software
- business services
- consulting
- financial services
- insurance
- media
- research
- retail

In 2018, technical employees ranged from small to large portions of each company’s workforce.

We measured companies with technical workforces of

- 17 COMPANIES <1,000
- 49 COMPANIES 1,000 – 10,000
- 14 COMPANIES >10,000

6.3% TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES

AVG. 43.6%

0% 100%
TRENDS IN THE REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN TECHNOLOGISTS

Overall Representation Grew

With growth of 1.1% over 2017, this number is moving gradually in the right direction. It’s important to remember that this increase represents thousands of jobs held by women who are now bringing their expertise and ideas to tech.

Representation grew at all levels from the prior year. The increase was highest at the executive level. Download our white paper, *Advancing Women Technologists Into Positions of Leadership*, to learn more: AnitaB.org/Resources.

Representation by Career Level

- **EXEC**: 15.0% 2015, 15.4% 2016, 16.4% 2017, 18.0% 2018
- **MID**: 19.7% 2015, 21.2% 2016, 22.0% 2017, 23.6% 2018
- **ENTRY**: 24.8% 2015, 25.8% 2016, 27.8% 2017, 29.5% 2018
- **SENIOR**: 15.7% 2015, 16.8% 2016, 17.5% 2017, 18.5% 2018
Recruitment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women Recruitment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in 2017, the overall recruitment rate of women technologists rose over the prior year. This tells us that more women are entering companies’ pipelines, which is a good sign for improving representation in the years to come.

Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Leaving</th>
<th>Men Leaving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in 2017, more women technologists made voluntary departures than their male colleagues. This data helps explain why the low representation of women in technology is as much about retaining experienced women as it is about bringing more entry-level women into the pipeline.

$p < 0.001$ significance

Advancement Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Promoted</th>
<th>Men Promoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in 2017, women were promoted at a higher rate than men, which indicates that companies are taking action to promote more women leaders in order to reap the benefits of greater gender diversity in leadership positions.

$p < 0.014$ significance

Board of Directors Representation

Extensive research links female board representation with better company performance. In 2018, we began asking companies to provide information about their board representation by gender. We did not find any correlations in our data this year, but will continue to measure it in years to come.

- 0% women: 10.0%
- 1-10% women: 10.0%
- 11-20% women: 28.8%
- 21-30% women: 32.5%
- 31-40% women: 16.3%
- < 40% women: 2.5%
Every organization that participates in Top Companies becomes part of a coalition helping to drive change by measuring what matters. We salute the organizations that gathered this data, which contributes to a key industry benchmark that can be used in seeking solutions for increasing the representation of women in technical roles.
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CONGRATULATIONS
These companies scored highest in their respective categories. Names are listed in alphabetical order.

TECHNICAL WORKFORCE OF <1,000
HBO Inc.
Morningstar, Inc.
Securian Financial
ThoughtWorks
XO Group

TECHNICAL WORKFORCE OF 1,000 - 10,000
Airbnb
Blackbaud
GEICO
State Farm
Ultimate Software

TECHNICAL WORKFORCE OF >10,000
Accenture
Bank of America
Google
IBM
SAP

How Companies are Scored
Organizations that participate in Top Companies are scored based on seven metrics: The rates of recruitment, retention, and advancement; and the representation of women at entry, midcareer, senior, and executive levels. We use a statistical methodology in which data is normalized for comparability using a Z-score. A Z-score is calculated based on deviation from the mean divided by the standard deviation. Companies receive a Z-score for each metric, measuring how that organization compares to the overall participant pool. The sum of all seven metrics gives the total score, which is used to determine the Top 5 companies.

Every company is scored on the same seven metrics.
There is no weighting, and no subjective or black-box data. Just the numbers.
We analyzed all 80 participating companies’ data, looking for programs and policies that distinguished the best in class in the areas of recruitment, retention, and advancement. Specifically, we compared the top 25% of companies to the bottom 25% of companies in each of the areas.

Here’s what the data tells us:

1. Regular executive review drives results
2. Sponsorship programs make a significant difference
3. Mandatory diversity training is not a panacea

In the pages that follow, we’ll provide greater detail on each of these three areas.
Top-performing companies in recruiting have executives review diversity data frequently.

---

**EXECUTIVES REVIEW WORKFORCE DIVERSITY DATA AT LEAST 1X/MONTH**

- **Top companies in recruiting:** 40.0%
- **Bottom companies in recruiting:** 0%

*p < 0.002 significance*

---

**Guidance:** Companies determined to achieve greater diversity know that setting goals isn’t enough. Set workforce diversity reviews as a monthly priority.

---

**Cultivate Awareness**

Companies that hire the greatest number of women technologists are significantly more likely to have a formal policy aimed at eliminating gender bias in performance reviews. This suggests that companies where diversity is woven into policies, programs, actions, and decision making have a more diverse workforce.

**Have a policy aimed at eliminating gender bias in performance reviews**

- **Top companies in recruiting:** 65.0%
- **Bottom companies in recruiting:** 26.3%

*p < 0.025 significance*
Companies with the highest rates of retention have a significantly higher rate of sponsorship programs.

**#2: Sponsorship programs make a difference**

Focus on Senior Level

Our data indicates that sponsorship programs are especially important for retaining women technologists at the senior level.

Have a sponsorship program specifically for senior women technologists

### Guidance:

Our data confirms well-documented research on the importance of sponsorship in retaining and advancing women technologists. Create a culture of sponsorship in which senior leaders become actively engaged advocates for women (not just mentors or allies).
#3: Mandatory diversity training is not a panacea

Companies with the highest promotion rates have significantly lower rates of mandated diversity training.

Address Company Culture

**Mandatory training is not a stand-alone solution for the lack of diversity in technology.**

This finding illustrates the importance of company culture. Companies that are doing poorly at advancing women might be more likely to implement mandatory gender diversity training, hoping it will help.

It’s important to understand that bad culture starts long before companies implement training. Mandatory training could backfire and may be insufficient to drive positive change.

**Guidance:** Although gender diversity training could be a negative influence, and findings by others show similar correlation, it’s difficult to prove causation. Make training optional and reward those who choose be part of creating greater diversity in the workplace.

---

**Top companies on advancement**

- **17.6%**

**Bottom companies on advancement**

- **42.9%**

\( p = 0.056 \) significance
WOMEN OF COLOR: RACIAL DIVERSITY AMONG TECHNOLOGISTS

Of the 80 companies that participated in Top Companies 2018, 71 companies contributed data on race. As a result, we were able to look at racial diversity across more than 50,000 women technologists in companies of different sizes. The significance of this critical benchmarking data on race cannot be overstated. For the first time, the technology industry has a clear, data-driven picture of the abysmal lack of representation of Black, Hispanic, Native American, Pacific Islander and Multiracial women.

As evidence grows for the importance of intersectionality in diversity discourse, companies need to look no further than this Top Companies data for places where they can and must focus their recruiting efforts.

The benefits of gender diversity are well documented, but its full benefits will not be realized until the voices of more non-white, non-Asian women are represented at the table. This is critical in every part of the organization, including senior and executive levels.

---

**All Technical Employees**

- **45.2% WHITE**
- **39.5% ASIAN**
- **5.5% BLACK**
- **4.9% HISPANIC**
- **2.3% UNKNOWN**
- **2.0% MULTIRACIAL**
- **0.3% NATIVE AMERICAN**
- **0.2% PACIFIC ISLANDER**

**Note:** When analyzing racial disparities in the technical community, we acknowledge that there are a number of ethnic variables within racial groups. The chart provides a general demographic breakdown of racial groups. For example, Asian subgroups, including Southeast Asians and South Asians, were not segmented in 2018.
PROGRAM & POLICY TRENDS

For the past 3 years, Top Companies has focused on providing guidance to companies on what they can do to recruit, retain, and advance more women. The following are the policies and programs that continue to show the most promise in relation to increasing the representation of women technologists.

Leadership Development

- Does your company have formal leadership development programs specifically for women technologists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Diversity Training

- Does your company offer formal training programs that address the value of gender diversity and/or the barriers to achieving diverse and inclusive teams?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formal Pay Equity Policy

- Does your company have a formal pay equity policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88.2% of companies with a formal pay equity policy reported that they hold themselves accountable through formal audits.
## ADDITIONAL PROGRAM & POLICY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Leave</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full paid time off for birth mothers</td>
<td>9.8 weeks</td>
<td>12.9 weeks</td>
<td>13.8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full paid time off for additional parent</td>
<td>4.9 weeks</td>
<td>6.0 weeks</td>
<td>7.0 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional caregiver leave...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>92.5% / 8.1 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>97.5% / 9.4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrogacy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>53.8% / 9.6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>57.5% / 9.5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly Care</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42.5% / 8.7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Care</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48.8% / 9.4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of formal policy for all technical employees</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those companies with a formal policy...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working remotely</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible hours during the day</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible work schedule (e.g., 4 days/wk)</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of formal policy to eliminate gender bias in performance reviews</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ bonuses based on progress on their diversity goals</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive team reviews workforce diversity data...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per month</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per quarter</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of formal policy that requires pay equity by gender for similar jobs</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the companies with a policy, regularly scheduled audits are performed...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biannually</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 2 years</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 3 or more years</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No routine audits</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.10 significance / Response rate is calculated out of the companies that responded yes/no. Companies that responded “Unknown” were considered as a non-response and not included in the statistic.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Development Program</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer formal leadership development programs specifically for women</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the companies with a leadership development program, the program is offered to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Level</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Level</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The duration of programs for Mid-Level participants...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 week</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 month</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer than 1 year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Level participants are selected by...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt-in/volunteer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination process</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer formal training program that address the value of gender diversity and barriers to achieving it</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For companies with a program, the duration of programs...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 week</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 month</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer than 1 year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is mandatory</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of formal career sponsorship program for women technologists</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the companies with a sponsorship program, the program is offered to...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Level</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures retention and advancement of participants</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We designed the Workplace Experience Survey to uncover the voices and beliefs behind the numbers. We first conducted and reported on the survey in 2016, but not in 2017. This year, we conducted the survey again. Four companies participated.

1,530 out of 5,289 technical employees from 4 companies

652 women | 878 men

The survey used stratified sampling to ensure that the overall technical population was representative of the overall company population in terms of age, tenure, job level, and manager status. It was sent via Ultimate Software’s Perception Platform.

THE PERCEPTION GAP:
Men still believe the myth of meritocracy

In a meritocracy, men and women would have equal opportunities at work. Those opportunities would be based on merit, not gender. If an organization’s culture were indeed a meritocracy, we’d expect that the people who worked there would say that men and women had equal opportunities. However, this data shows that men believe in meritocracy (equal opportunity) significantly more than women. Women view their gender as a significant disadvantage (fewer opportunities than men).

WHEN ASKED TO SHARE THEIR BELIEFS, PARTICIPANTS SAID:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women have fewer opportunities than men</th>
<th>Women have more opportunities than men</th>
<th>Men and women have equal opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN 38.3%</td>
<td>WOMEN 2.2%</td>
<td>WOMEN 59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN 10.8%</td>
<td>MEN 14.4%</td>
<td>MEN 74.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < 0.001 significance

Guidance: Change requires a shift in thinking

Ask this question in your company. If you see the same trend, implement a gender ally program to educate men and women about the differences in perception and how they can come together as allies for the benefit of all.
Other survey data indicates that this perception gap extends beyond workplace opportunities.

**Men place less value on mixed-gender teams**

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed with a list of five statements about the benefits that might result from mixed-gender teams.* Women were significantly more likely than men to agree with all statements, a trend consistent with our findings in 2016. The biggest differences we saw were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-gender teams make better decisions</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-gender teams are more successful</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.001 significance

**Why the difference in perception matters**

Research has demonstrated that mixed-gender teams produce a variety of business benefits, most notably greater innovation. If men don’t know or believe the research, it seems highly unlikely that they will be strong advocates and champions for more gender-diverse teams.

*Participants were asked if they believe mixed-gender teams:
1) are more productive; 2) are more creative and innovative; 3) improve morale; 4) make better decisions; 5) are more successful.

**Men differ on what causes lower numbers of women technologists**

Participants were asked to what extent they believed a list of factors contributed to fewer technical women in their organization. Men and women chose the same top two factors — but in the opposite order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconscious bias</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of social, familial, or cultural support for women interested in STEM at an early age</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.001 significance

**Why the difference in perception matters**

It is significant to note that men chose, as their top factor, something that companies have very little control over (lack of support for STEM at a young age) compared to the top factor chosen by women (unconscious bias) which is something companies have far greater ability to influence.
CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS

Both the lack of diversity and the business case for gender diversity have been well documented. At AnitaB.org, we start with the belief that greater diversity in technical roles at all levels is not just a social courtesy—it’s a business imperative. Yet, as the data in this report demonstrates, there is still considerable room for improvement. We acknowledge that increasing diversity is not quick or easy, but it’s worth the effort for companies in every industry, for the people they employ, and for their customers—all of whom benefit from the increase in innovation that intersectional diversity brings.

To grow representation of women in your technical workforce, we recommend following these three key guiding principles.

1. **Know your numbers**
   Knowledge is power. Participate in all aspects of Top Companies, including the Workplace Experience Survey. Study your year-over-year trends. Be relentless in your commitment to increase your diversity numbers. Companies that do will reap the benefits. Review your current policies and programs; some drive greater representation of women than others (see pages 8–11 and 13–15). Be agile and willing to adopt new tactics to achieve your diversity, equity and inclusion goals.

2. **Show your numbers**
   Be as transparent as possible with your Top Companies data within your own organization. Transparency creates trust, and trusted data drives change. Distribute the data to leaders at all levels in your organization and create opportunities for them to discuss how it compares to the industry benchmarking data. Where are your greatest opportunities to do better? Engage employees by letting them know about your participation in Top Companies.

3. **Grow your numbers**
   Knowledge is a powerful first step, but now it’s time to act! Let your company’s individual report (provided confidentially to each participating company) guide your next steps. Examine where your metrics fall below industry average, and refer to the guidance listed throughout this report for specific ways to improve. For more step-by-step, detailed guidance on advancing women technologists into positions of leadership, refer to our white paper at AnitaB.org/Resources.
**GUIDANCE AT A GLANCE**

- **Provide formal LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT programs for women technologists, especially those at mid-career level.**
  
  *WHY: Mid-career is a challenging time for women. These programs foster increased retention and advancement.*

- **Offer sponsorship programs that PAIR WOMEN WITH SENIOR-LEVEL ADVOCATES who will use their power and influence to help them achieve their goals.**
  
  *WHY: Women can advance further when they have internal sponsors to clear the path.*

- **Create formal policies that support FLEXIBLE WORK time and flexible work schedules.**
  
  *WHY: Women are more likely to stay in jobs that accommodate the multiple roles they play at and beyond work.*

- **Institute MONTHLY EXECUTIVE REVIEWS of workplace diversity data.**
  
  *WHY: Ongoing accountability brings clarity and urgency to improving diversity numbers.*

- **Provide formal, systematic, non-mandatory GENDER DIVERSITY TRAINING programs for people of all genders.**
  
  *WHY: People who voluntarily participate feel more invested.*

- **INCREASE DIVERSITY by seeking out women technologists during the recruitment process who are Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latinx and Native American.**
  
  *WHY: Companies report that including women from underrepresented categories drive innovation and contribute to better products for larger, more diverse audiences.*

- **73.0% of 2018 companies offer flexible work**
AnitaB.org is a nonprofit social enterprise committed to increasing the representation of women technologists in the global workforce. AnitaB.org engages with tens of thousands of women and leading organizations around the world to build diverse and inclusive workplace cultures.

www.AnitaB.org

Measure What Matters

LEARN HOW TO PARTICIPATE IN TOP COMPANIES 2019
AnitaB.org/Accountability/Top-Companies/2019-Sign-Up/

SEE MORE DETAILS ABOUT TOP COMPANIES 2018
AnitaB.org/Accountability/Top-Companies/History/

Top Companies for Women Technologists is the industry benchmark for the representation of women in technology.
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