SmarterReward™

THE TOP 10 WAYS

your partner compensation system undermines collaboration and how to fix them

Introducing SmarterReward™

Heidi Gardner • Michael Roch • Ivan Matviak

October 2025

Content

Executive summary

This white paper examines how partner compensation systems in professional services firms often undermine collaboration and outlines practical ways to fix them. Drawing on Dr. Heidi K. Gardner's research and expertise on collaboration and Michael Roch's expertise in partner remuneration design, this paper uncovers that while most firms claim to value collaboration, their reward systems continue to prioritize individual performance. This misalignment prevents partners from working together effectively, weakens client service and limits long-term firm growth.

The paper finds that fewer than five per cent of partner compensation systems are designed with collaboration in mind. Most focus on measurable individual outputs such as revenue or billable hours, leaving collective performance undervalued. The paper identifies ten common ways these systems discourage collaboration:

- **Solo scorecards** – overemphasizing personal results while neglecting shared outcomes
- **Mismatched aims** – building strategy around individuals rather than collective goals
- **Credit wars** – creating conflict by treating shared client work as a zero-sum game
- **Short-termism** – linking equity and reward too closely to current-year results
- **It's all about cross-selling** – focusing incentives on business development instead of the full client value chain
- **Cash is king** – overlooking non-financial motivators such as recognition and feedback
- **Star culture** – rewarding individual heroes instead of collaborative teams
- **Rogue committees** – allowing remuneration decisions to favor high billers over collaborators
- **Murky processes** – using opaque systems that enable partners to game outcomes
- **Skills gap** – failing to equip partners with the know-how to collaborate effectively

The paper also proposes methods for transformation in firms, which include:

- Aligning strategy and reward so that shared goals are valued alongside individual accountability
- Designing incentives that recognise collaboration across the entire client lifecycle
- Balancing financial and non-financial reward to reinforce joint success and mutual trust
- Strengthening governance by ensuring compensation committees act transparently and consistently
- Building collaborative skills through training, feedback and support for cross-practice teamwork

The paper concludes with the introduction of SmarterReward™, co-developed by Michael Roch, Dr. Heidi K. Gardner and Ivan Matviak. SmarterReward™ is the first diagnostic that uncovers how partner compensation systems enable or inhibit collaboration. It delivers clear priorities for change, comparative benchmarking and measurable progress over time, helping leaders align reward with shared success.

By integrating collaboration into compensation, governance and partner development, firms can strengthen performance, enhance client value and achieve sustainable long-term success.

The TOP 10 ways your partner compensation system undermines collaboration and how to fix them

The long-term success of most organizations depends on effective collaboration of their best people. In the professional services sector, sophisticated clients require teams of partners to land and service them. Two decades of research at Harvard University and with hundreds of organizations globally shows that firms engaging in smarter collaboration perform higher in terms of revenues, profits, client satisfaction and sustainability and talent attraction and retention.[1]

Those outcomes are why more than 80% of the firms' strategies we've reviewed have collaboration at their core. Yet when we ask managing partners why it is so difficult to get partners to work together for a common goal, they always refer to "partner compensation" as a Top 3 problem; often it is mentioned first. Most will point to one or two specific details of their partner compensation system that undermine collaboration, yet partner compensation systems are part of a more complex social system. MHPR Advisors estimates that fewer than 5% of the world's partner compensation systems were designed specifically around collaboration. Most partner compensation policies tend to focus on the performance of the individual partner with collaboration as an afterthought or as a minor element that is drowned out by simple-to-measure production data.

Having advised dozens of market leaders across the globe on transforming reward systems to support collaborative practices, this white paper explains our Top 10 ways your partner reward system undermines collaboration and how to fix them:

Solo scorecards
Your partner reward system overemphasizes personal results

Mismatched aims
Your strategy is built around individuals

Credit wars
Sharing "credits" is a zero-sum game

Short-termism
Your "equity" isn't a true long-term incentive

It's all about cross-selling
Your incentives don't consider the whole client value chain

Rogue committees
Your Partner Compensation Committee doesn't believe in partner collaboration

Star culture
You worship heroes, not teams

Cash is king
You ignore the power of non-monetary reward

Murky compensation processes
Too much opacity and rewarding gamesmanship undermine collaboration

Skills gap
You fail to develop collaborative know-how among your partners

1 *Gardner & Matviak, Smarter Collaboration: A New Approach to Breaking Down Barriers and Transforming Work, Harvard Business Review Press, 2022*

1. SOLO SCORECARDS: your partner reward system overemphasizes personal results

Without question, a firm needs to generate a profit. Some firms consider how partners contribute to profit directly, for example by measuring personal billable hours, revenues billed, gross profit on projects managed or cash collected. Other firms consider a partner's contribution to profit through a broader framework or by evaluating results against objectives.

There is nothing wrong with holding partners accountable for personal results. Yet too much unbridled personal accountability can undermine partner collaboration in at least two ways.

> TO FOSTER TRUE COLLABORATION, PARTNER COMPENSATION MUST REWARD COLLECTIVE ACHIEVEMENTS, NOT JUST INDIVIDUAL FINANCIAL RESULTS.

First, some professional service firm (PSF) compensation systems overtly overemphasize individual results. For example, the partner compensation policy makes it clear that the only thing that matters is personal numbers. Partner dashboards typically show a range of personal measures sliced in different ways. Yet, there is little or no accountability for group outcomes (e.g. client teams, service lines, sectors). Collective measures that seek to understand team or group results don't exist or are drowned out by personal financial data. Any dialogue with firm leaders revolves around personal numbers and the Partner Compensation Committee (PCC) explains its decisions using personal data.

More difficult to spot are partner compensation systems that covertly overemphasize personal financial outcomes. The compensation policy explains how profit shares are based on a broad basis of expected partner contributions. Partner dashboards show personal measures and some collective measures about team and group results. Yet any partner information that goes beyond personal numbers either isn't well-prepared or is just too difficult to sift through. Perhaps firm leaders speak publicly about collective successes. Yet in one-on-one business planning discussions with partners, the main emphasis is on personal numbers; partner meetings discuss personal results, too. And the PCC reverts to personal financial data because that is the "safe" option to avoid conflict.

If it is a priority for partners to achieve results collaboratively, all aspects of your firm's partner compensation system (profit-sharing architecture, partner contribution management, reward governance and decision-making) must align to enable profit-sharing based on collaborative achievements. Partners need to be held accountable for shared, group-level goals (client teams, service lines, sectors) as well as for individual goals.

How does your firm's partner compensation system as a whole, balance rewarding partners for individual and collective results?

2. MISMATCHED AIMS: your strategy is built around individuals

If a firm's strategy is rooted in collaboration, its partner reward system must support that strategy. Too often, however, we see professional services firms' strategies rely on a few high-performing "rainmakers" or on a bottom-up approach that merely aggregates individual efforts. While these models may suffice for boutique or early-stage firms, they often fall short in fostering long-term, collective success.

What's the issue? When strategy centers on individual performance, compensation systems tend to follow — rewarding personal production over contributions to the broader partnership. This misalignment hinders the development of a resilient firm, almost certainly undermines client service and leaves untapped revenue potential on the table.

In contrast, firms that set strategic goals requiring partner collaboration tend to achieve greater sustainability. A review of leading organizations — including the Big 4+2 accounting firms, Global 100 law firms and top-tier consulting firms — reveals a consistent pattern: market leaders expect partners to work together to accomplish ambitious, shared objectives.

The most effective strategies rest on two key principles:

- **Mutual success mindset**
  Partners embrace the belief that "I can't succeed unless you do." This culture fosters trust, shared accountability and collective achievement.
- **Strategic goal alignment**
  Leadership links individual partner goals to the firm's broader priorities — such as cross-service growth, industry specialization, innovation and client longevity. This alignment motivates partners to pursue personal success in ways that advance the firm's long-term vision.

FIRMS ACHIEVE LONG-TERM SUCCESS WHEN PARTNER REWARD AND GOALS ARE ALIGNED TO COLLECTIVE, STRATEGIC PRIORITIES RATHER THAN INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE.

Ultimately, firms that reward collaboration — not "healthy competition" — build stronger strategies and execute them more effectively.

Is your strategy built on partner collaboration? Does your compensation system recognize contributions toward shared goals?

3. CREDIT WARS:
sharing "credits" is a zero-sum game

Many professional services firms operate a "credits" system that partners must navigate to earn high profit shares. In firms where partners function independently — each acquiring and servicing their own clients — such systems can work well if soundly implemented.

However, poorly designed credits systems often undermine collaboration, especially when credits must be shared. For example, many firms use a simple form of origination credits: granting one credit per dollar brought in ("winner takes all"). If two partners jointly land a project worth $100,000, they may be required to split the credit — that is, $50,000 each. This may be acceptable if both contributed equally, but problems arise when one partner "owns" the relationship and brings in another for their expertise. The relationship partner may feel they're "giving away" $50,000, even though they couldn't have won the work alone. To avoid this perceived loss, they may game the system — pressuring the other into a smaller share or sourcing the expertise externally to retain full credit.

One solution is double-counting certain credits, allowing both partners to claim 100%. While accounting teams may object — since credits don't reconcile with booked revenue — this misses the point: credits are for informing profit shares, not for financial reporting.

A better approach often involves redesigning the credits system. A single origination credit may be too blunt. Instead, firms can distinguish between acquiring new clients, expanding services to existing ones and growing strategic relationships. Partners can then claim different types of credit, appropriately reflecting their contributions.

CREDITS SYSTEMS MUST BE DESIGNED TO FAIRLY RECOGNIZE JOINT CONTRIBUTIONS, OTHERWISE THEY CAN UNDERMINE COLLABORATION.

Firms using credits systems should establish clear defaults to minimize constant negotiation. An escalation mechanism — such as the Partner Compensation Committee or a separate partner committee — helps calibrate claims. Crucially, partners who aggressively maximize their position should be held accountable for how their behavior affects the partnership.

Is your credits system zero-sum or accretive?

4. SHORT-TERMISM: your “equity” isn’t a true long-term incentive

For partners to collaborate effectively, they need to believe that their income isn’t at risk. Partners won’t send work to others unless they’re confident they can still maintain their lifestyle.

In many firms struggling with collaboration, “equity” is simply a euphemism for current-year profit shares tied to individual financial performance. Each year resets the clock and if a partner falls short of prior-year results, their share is quickly reduced — sometimes even mid-year. This model may suit firms where partners operate in silos or where cash is tight.

However, such systems discourage short-term risk-taking for long-term gain. If current-year originations are the primary driver of “equity,” partners will chase “quick wins” and underinvest in visionary, multi-year opportunities. They’ll gravitate toward smaller projects and clients they can handle alone, rather than collaborating to win strategic accounts or expand existing relationships.

PARTNERS ONLY COLLABORATE WHEN PROFIT-SHARING BALANCES SHORT- AND LONG-TERM REWARD, RATHER THAN TYING INCOME SOLELY TO IMMEDIATE PERSONAL RESULTS.

By contrast, leading firms build profit-sharing architectures with both long-term and short-term components. The long-term equity portion is earned over time based on broader merit — not just personal financials — and isn’t easily revoked due to a single bad year. It’s only adjusted after sustained underperformance. These firms also separate long-term goals from short-term achievements, avoiding the trap of reducing everything to immediate results.[1]

Is your firm’s “equity” truly long-term — or just a share of this year’s profits?

1 *We recognize the constraints of pass-through legal structures in building equity based on firm value. Still, long-term economic equity can be fostered by minimizing fluctuations in partner holdings. Stay tuned for a future white paper on the value of true capital ownership in professional partnerships.*

5. IT'S ALL ABOUT CROSS-SELLING: your incentives don't consider the whole client value chain

In recent years, "collaboration" has too often become shorthand for "bringing in work and handing it off." At worst, it means crude "cross-selling" to boost revenues, with little regard for the client experience. But in the best professional services firms, collaboration is defined far more broadly — encompassing how partners work together to serve clients at various points of the relationship. This shift has profoundly influenced partner compensation systems.

Low-margin, transactional work is not rewarded in the same way as high-margin, long-term mandates, that enhance the firm's reputation and resilience.

Importantly, these firms understand that the value chain extends well beyond business development. Once work is won, it must be delivered profitably and to a high standard — ensuring quality, compliance and risk management.

TRUE COLLABORATION MEANS PARTNERS JOINTLY BUILDING AND DELIVERING LONG-TERM CLIENT VALUE, WITH REWARD SYSTEMS THAT GO BEYOND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.

Business development → Service delivery → Innovation → Talent development

Leading firms have built reward structures that actively support joint business development. Their incentives encourage partners to grow client relationships together, not just individually and to focus on building long-term, value-adding relationships. They avoid credit systems that penalize those who share clients and they recognize that not all revenue is created equal.

The firm must also innovate to stay relevant and it must continually develop its talent. That includes integrating lateral hires quickly and effectively, with incentives that encourage partners to involve new colleagues in their client relationships instead of sitting back and waiting for the lateral "to figure things out and deliver on their business case."

Does your partner reward system truly incentivize collaboration across the full client value chain — or does it stop at revenue generation?

6.CASH IS KING:
you ignore the power of non-monetary reward

Many professional services firms (PSFs) operate under the assumption that a perfect partner compensation policy will automatically elicit the right behaviors. This belief often leads to an overreliance on financial incentives, while overlooking other, less tangible motivators that are often more effective.

To be clear, financial incentives can support collaboration provided that joint results are valued as highly as individual ones and that individual contributions to joint results are well-considered (see above).

RECOGNITION, GAMIFICATION AND FEEDBACK CAN AMPLIFY COMPENSATION AS A DRIVER FOR COLLABORATION.

Yet financial rewards, while important, have diminishing impact — especially when partners already earn among the highest incomes in their market. Reputation and recognition often carry greater incremental motivational weight than an extra dollar once partners' income reaches a typical level. Profit shares that affirm a partner's standing often are more powerful than the monetary value itself.

A well-designed compensation policy, broadly supported by partners, is a cornerstone of any firm's social system. But it should be complemented by non-financial mechanisms that reinforce desired behaviors and results. For example:

- **Peer recognition.** Unlike (often annual) compensation decisions, peer effects operate continuously, shaping behavior through daily interactions. Leading firms use peer recognition to spotlight collaborative achievements. For example, a service line leader might highlight how a team of partners opened a new client segment, landed a strategic account or developed a firm-wide offering. Recognition has the most impact when focused on team outcomes, not individual performance. Encouraging recognized partners to name those who contributed further amplifies the effect.
- **Gamification**. Some firms go further by gamifying recognition — giving partners a set number of tokens to award peers who've supported them. These tokens, physical or virtual, could be tied to a dedicated reward pool if the right cultural preconditions exist, yet they tend to work better in the form of ad hoc allocations throughout the year. Importantly, they should not feed directly into general profit-share determinations, which risks distorting their purpose.
- **Feedback.** The best PSFs in the world have embedded constructive feedback into their firm's culture. The simple collaborative act of one partner providing a useful suggestion to another partner encourages more collaboration with each other. Moreover, the trust built through peer feedback is essential for collaboration with higher stakes — such as working jointly to develop and serve clients.

The unique mix of financial and non-financial incentives forms the cultural glue that binds high-performing partnerships. Behavioral science shows that when money becomes the primary — or only — signal of employer appreciation, people tend to value it more; in the absence of constructive feedback or other forms of recognition, cash becomes king.

How does your firm leverage non-monetary rewards to incentivize collaboration?

7. STAR CULTURE: you worship heroes, not teams

In many firms, recognition disproportionately favors rainmakers and high-billing "superstars," while the collaborative teams that drive sustained success risk being overlooked. This imbalance can undermine morale and discourage the very behaviors that fuel long-term performance.

Even worse, when mere practice size is the primary (or sole) criterion, the individual's behaviour might directly conflict with the goal of promoting collaboration: some high performers succeed by using "sharp elbows" and advancing themselves at the expense of others.

FIRMS SHOULD RECOGNIZE AND ELEVATE COLLABORATIVE LEADERS — NOT JUST STRONG INDIVIDUALS.

Re-thinking leadership selection

While financial rewards matter, being entrusted with leadership responsibilities can be more motivating than a bonus. To foster a culture of collaboration, consider non-monetary incentives such as:

- Assigning partners to high-impact, visible projects
- Appointing collaborative partners to leadership roles
- Celebrating team contributions in firm-wide communications

These gestures reinforce the value of working together and signal that collaboration is a pathway to influence and advancement.

Identifying collaborative leaders

To build a leadership bench that reflects collaborative values, firms should assess candidates based on their track record of teamwork and inclusive leadership. Key questions to consider include:

- How do they motivate and inspire others?
- How do they achieve results with peers, not just individually
- How do they share credit for collective success?
- How do they deliver feedback that strengthens the team?
- How do they hold colleagues accountable in a constructive way?

The goal is clear: elevate leaders who consistently model collaborative excellence — not just personal achievement.

Does your current selection process spotlight those who build others up, or only those who stand out alone?

8. ROGUE COMMITTEES: your Partner Compensation Committee doesn't believe in partner collaboration

The best partner compensation system — with well-balanced incentives, a thoughtful approach to managing partner contribution and a strong track record of showcasing successful partner teams — is only as good as its Partner Compensation Committee (PCC). This is true whether the PCC makes profit-sharing decisions on behalf of the partnership or recommends profit-sharing outcomes that are later subject to partner confirmation.

More often than not, the PCC operates as a separate power center from the firm's elected leaders. For example, the firm's leaders may aim to reward partners who excel both as individual contributors and as collaborators. Meanwhile, committee members may push to allocate greater profit shares to high billers because they feel pressure to represent those constituencies, chase benchmarks (imaginary or real) or react to partners threatening to leave if they don't get this or that.

Particularly in partnerships that elect compensation committee members with the specific aim of mitigating the power of management, we see this disconnect leading to all sorts of problems. A common issue is outcomes that reward individual performance at the expense of collaborative success. This disconnect becomes a breeding ground for partner cynicism that, if left unchecked, invariably focuses partners on their own results, even where the firm's incentives are intended to support collaboration.

EVEN THE BEST-DESIGNED PARTNER COMPENSATION SYSTEMS FAIL IF THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE ALWAYS PRIORITIZES HIGH BILLERS OVER COLLABORATIVE OUTCOMES.

Does your Partner Compensation Committee actively support collaborative outcomes or does it unintentionally undermine them?

9. MURKY COMPENSATION PROCESSES: too much opacity and rewarding gamesmanship undermine collaboration

Firms vary widely in their approach to transparency around partner compensation and how much energy they invest in the quality of the firm's most important governance committee.

The cost of too much opacity

Some firms prioritize openness, while others operate a "black box" — a closed-door process where partners are informed of their compensation but receive little to no explanation of how decisions were made, what was valued, or how those factors were prioritized.

Striking the right balance on the continuum between transparency and confidentiality is delicate. Normally, we advocate providing a combination of (1) clear criteria of what is expected and (2) transparency into how one's own results have resulted in a profit-sharing outcome. How much transparency to provide about others' profit shares is a trickier question. In general, fully "open book" systems often create unnecessary friction because partners lack the level of detail that the Partner Compensation Committee (PCC) uses to make nuanced decisions.

No matter where your firm lands on this continuum, a PCC needs to explain how agreed contribution factors affected reward outcomes — or else partners may perceive the criteria as inconsistent or unclear. Without a clear articulation of how discretion is applied, legitimate leadership judgment can be misinterpreted as favoritism, bias or hidden agendas. Partners may misinterpret differences in compensation, fueling unnecessary competition and perceived inequity.

On rewarding gamesmanship

When the rules of the game are unclear, trust erodes and collaboration begins to feel risky. Partners may respond by gaming the system, focusing on individual optimization based on what they perceive is valued rather than collective success.

Often, it is the highest billers who game the system every step of the way with two dire outcomes:

1. If leaders call them out, the rainmakers threaten to leave or threaten the leader's authority. Or,

2. If leaders fail to call them out, this silence is taken as tacit approval. Other partners notice and that poor behavior becomes the cultural standard.

Critically, firm leaders need to work closely with the PCC. Strong leaders and compensation committee chairs will start by providing a consistent, joint message along the lines of "we love what you do, but please change how you do it." The partner compensation policy should allow for a way to reduce a badly-behaving partner's profit share, followed by showing them the path to the door.

In our experience, most firms will survive the exit of a poorly behaving partner, yet they don't survive the corrosive effect of rewarding partners who game the system. In fact, many firms have discovered that a presumed rainmaker was less instrumental to a client relationship than they'd insisted; after their departure, the door opened for other partners to flourish as part of the client service team.

Building a trusted Partner Compensation Committee

All of this assumes that the firm's PCC is committed to governance excellence and integrity. A PCC that lacks perceived integrity can undermine collaboration in several ways:

- **Short-termism:** Partners prioritize personal gain over long-term, firm-wide growth.
- **Diluted incentives:** Collaboration-focused rewards lose credibility if outcomes seem arbitrary.
- **Cynicism and mistrust:** A lack of confidence in the PCC can stall even the earliest signs of cultural change.

To support a collaborative culture, partners must view the PCC as a principled and integral part of firm governance. That means believing:

- Profit-sharing decisions are made in good faith
- Outcomes reflect the firm's agreed compensation philosophy
- PCC members act in the best interest of the firm — not just their own groups or allies

Investing in governance maturity

The most effective PCCs go beyond basic process — they invest in governance maturity. These committees:

- Conduct **kick-offs and After-Action-Reviews** for each compensation cycle
- Provide **comprehensive onboarding** for new members
- Offer **ongoing training** in data analysis, decision-making tools and cognitive bias mitigation

> MOST FIRMS WILL SURVIVE THE EXIT OF A POORLY BEHAVING PARTNER, YET THEY DON'T SURVIVE THE CORROSIVE EFFECT OF REWARDING PARTNERS WHO GAME THE SYSTEM.

- Follow **a consistent decision-making framework**, even when subcommittees are involved
- Ensure **rotating independence** within subcommittees to prevent entrenchment

A strong PCC Chair plays a pivotal role — raising issues respectfully, using benchmarks judiciously and testing preliminary conclusions within the committee before sharing externally. Many leading firms also include an external, non-executive member to help maintain objectivity and reinforce credibility.

How does your firm invest in the governance maturity of its Partner Compensation Committee — and in the clarity of its partner communications?

---

10. SKILLS GAP: you fail to develop collaborative know-how among your partners

Even the best partner reward system will struggle to support collaboration if partners lack critical underlying capabilities.

Most firms assume that partners know how to collaborate. In reality, each partner often has a different understanding of what effective collaboration entails. For example, partners frequently complain about being pulled into client work without adequate context or briefing. Fixing this problem is relatively straightforward: establish firm-wide standards and provide basic training on how and when to engage others. Leaders should role model and reinforce the norms. A feedback culture is helpful here, too.

The tougher challenge is building partners' skills and confidence in leading strategic, future-focused conversations with clients — dialogues that surface complex needs and unlock opportunities for broader collaboration across practices and geographies. Even in the best firms, partners typically prefer to hold narrower conversations grounded in their own area of expertise.

The good news: the skills underlying these business-building conversations are learnable. In our experience, the best outcomes arise when client service teams get personalized, frequent coaching to build know-how and accountability for deploying it.

EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION DEPENDS ON PARTNERS DEVELOPING THE SKILLS NEEDED TO WORK TOGETHER IN A TRUSTED AND PRODUCTIVE WAY.

With the right incentive structure and support, partners will be far more inclined to devote time and effort to learning how to engage clients more expansively, paving the way for richer collaboration and stronger outcomes.

Introducing SmarterReward™

SmarterReward™ is the first diagnostic that uncovers how partner compensation systems enable or inhibit collaboration, created by Dr. Heidi K. Gardner, Michael Roch and Ivan Matviak, three global authorities on collaboration and partner compensation in the professional services sector.

It delivers 4 core outcomes:

- **Clarity** – Objective assessment of how partner compensation enables or blocks collaboration
- **Actionable Insights** – Concrete priorities and recommendations for change
- **Peer Benchmarking** – Comparative data against similar firms
- **Progress Tracking** – Measurable improvements over time

SmarterReward™ is powered by our proprietary 3-I™ Framework which evaluates your partner compensation system through the lenses of:

- **Imperatives – Strategic foundations**
  Evaluates how strategy, leadership and culture make collaboration essential to success.
- **Incentives – Results and metrics design**
  Measures whether goals and rewards drive shared achievement and collective performance.
- **Integrity – Reward system alignment**
  Tests how fairly and transparently rewards reflect contribution and firm values.

With these insights, firm leaders can:

- Drive higher-quality revenue through collaboration across teams and clients.
- Improve margins by working smarter, not harder.
- Create an environment that attracts, integrates and retains top talent.
- Enable new ways of working that benefit both people and profit.
- Deliver seamless, integrated service that strengthens competitive advantage.

Find out whether your partner compensation system enables or inhibits collaboration by **scheduling a call** with our team.

About the authors

Dr. Heidi K. Gardner

Founder & CEO, Smarter Collaboration International

Dr. Heidi K. Gardner is a globally recognized leadership expert, keynote speaker, and advisor. Named a Next Generation Business Guru, she leads executive education and helps boards drive performance through smarter collaborations. Author of **Smart Collaboration** and **Smarter Collaboration**, her research appears in the Harvard Business Review. A Fulbright fellow and former McKinsey consultant, she holds degrees from the University of Pennsylvania and the London School of Economics.

Michael Roch

Founder, MHPR Advisors

Michael Roch advises partnership boards, managing partners, and senior leaders worldwide on building strong partnerships and driving competitive growth. Co-author of **The Partner Remuneration Handbook**, he provides expert insights into profit sharing for professional services partnerships. His clients, ranging from multinational to start-ups, benefit from his entrepreneurial experience and deep expertise in partnership economics, incentives, and organizational design.

Ivan Matviak

Founder & CEO, Smarter Collaboration International

Ivan Matviak is CEO of Smarter Collaboration International and co-founder of Gardner & Co., a leading expert in transforming global business through strategy and collaboration. Co-author of **Smarter Collaboration** and a contributor to **Harvard Business Review**, he has held executive roles and advised leading firms including Bain & Company and Disney. He brings global experience and holds degrees from the University of Pennsylvania and Wharton Business School.

Get in touch