Introducing the Professional Services Maturity Model™
INTRODUCTION

The Professional Services Maturity Model™ is designed to help service and project-driven organizations understand their relative performance compared to an expansive benchmark of peers. It provides visibility into critical business processes and key performance measurements so organizations can compare, diagnose and improve their own execution. It also provides prescriptive advice so organizations can pinpoint current levels of maturity and visualize the steps required to advance to the next level.

Service Performance Insight (SPI Research) first introduced the “New Professional Services Maturity Model™” benchmark report in January 2008. Since that time more than 10,000 organizations representing 2.5 million consultants worldwide have adopted the PS Maturity Model™ as a strategic planning and management framework. The 2014 benchmark report is based on completed surveys from 238 participants and provides comparative year-over-year trend analysis to the 234 participants in 2012, 216 in 2011, 214 in 2010, 225 in 2009, 118 in 2008, as well as the initial 52 in 2007.

The core tenet of the PS Maturity Model™ is service and project-oriented organizations achieve success through the optimization of five Service Performance Pillars™:

- Leadership – Vision, Strategy and Culture
- Client Relationships
- Human Capital Alignment
- Service Execution
- Finance and Operations

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE 2014 BENCHMARK

In 2013 we saw revenue growth of more than 10% for the third consecutive year, but it came at a price. 2014 has brought challenges (attrition, rate erosion, margin pressure, etc.) in a variety of areas that firms must monitor closely. Here are a few highlights from this year’s benchmark:

△ Slowing revenue growth: the leading indicators for growth — annual revenue growth, headcount increases, size of the deal pipeline and backlog — were all down in 2013 to the lowest levels since 2009. Year-over-year revenue growth (10 percent) declined from 11.5 percent the prior year.

△ Declining bill rates: Professional service organizations experienced a big falloff in rates with cloud, hardware and IT consultancies dragging down prices. Marketing and communication and management consulting rates increased reflecting strong demand for social, strategy and specialized business process consulting. The rate premium charged by embedded software and SaaS consulting organizations as
compared to independent IT consultancies widened. Software and SaaS vendor consulting rates averaged $40 per hour more than independent firms offering similar projects and skills.

△ **Too much overhead:** The percentage of non-billable staff compared to total staff increased for the first time since 2009 as professional service organizations added management overhead in anticipation of growth which did not materialize. Excessive non-billable staff in combination with declining bill rates resulted in the lowest annual revenue per person ($155,000 per year) since 2007. This extremely low employee revenue yield resulted in net losses reported by 10 percent of firms.

△ **Big drop in profits:** Slowing revenue growth, lower bill rates and increased discretionary spending resulted in a significant drop in net profit. The benchmark net profit average went down from 16.8% to 11.4% with embedded SaaS PSOs experiencing the greatest decline from 25.9% last year to a meager 4.3% this year.

2014 will be a transitional year, as markets driven by people (such as professional services) will face increased healthcare costs, higher taxes and a looming talent cliff. Organizational profitability will become increasingly difficult; meaning PS executives must place increased emphasis on talent management and streamlining business processes, to improve their use of capital. SPI Research does not expect profit levels to significantly rise from the 2012 highs but there is still plenty of room for revenue growth through market expansion.

**WHY BENCHMARK?**

The Professional Services Maturity™ benchmark was developed to help professional services organizations evaluate and compare their performance to others in similar markets. For instance, if last year a professional services organization (PSO) had a net profit of 10%, was that good or bad relative to the marketplace? If profit went up to 12% the following year, was that a significant improvement? The problem is most PS executives only understand how their own organization operates; they don’t have visibility into how the overall market is performing and how they compare.

The purpose of the benchmark is to show both averages for major key performance indicators as well as to measure year-over-year changes, challenges and trends. These annual comparisons help PS executives understand how the professional services market is growing or contracting, how their organization compares, and what the associated metrics predict about the future.

By analyzing the benchmark data by vertical market, geographic region and organization size, PS executives have an “apples-to-apples” comparison to their peers and the market at large. Over 1,500 firms have completed SPI’s benchmarking surveys over the past seven years making
this the most comprehensive study available for the professional service market.

**STORMY SEAS AHEAD?**

2013 turned out to be a tough year for the PS industry – most major PS metrics declined, propelled by slowing revenue growth (Table 1). 2013 year-over-year revenue growth (10%) slowed considerably from 2011 (13.7%) when embedded and independent professional service firms alike experienced a dramatic uptick in business after weathering the recession. The PS industry is a bell-weather for the global economy as PS engagements portend global business shifts. A case in point, for the PS industry, growth stalled but never declined during the depths of the recession in 2009; PS started a full-scale recovery in 2010 in advance of the overall economy.

A tale of two extremes underlying the benchmark average is that 38% (88 firms) of the 238 organizations in the 2013 benchmark reported year-over-year revenue growth of less than 5%. 14.4% (33 firms) reported negative growth. These metrics compare unfavorably to 2011 in which only 13.3% (28 firms) reported negative growth. In 2013 only 30.9% (71 firms) reported year over year revenue growth in excess of 15% compared to 45.2% (75 firms) in 2011.

**Table 1: Five Year PS Key Performance Metrics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicator (KPI)</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual PS revenue growth</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual PS headcount growth</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of billable personnel</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Attrition</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual revenue per consultant (k)</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual revenue per employee (k)</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$168</td>
<td>$155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit (EBITDA %)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In PS the link between growth and profitability is undeniable as this people-based business always operates at its best when it is running at full capacity. Having more work is always preferable to not having enough work because PSOs are adept at rising to the challenge of too much work whereas they become complacent and disenfranchised when not enough work is available.

Slowing growth manifested in excess capacity, lower utilization, lower revenue per person and higher levels of attrition. *Slowing PS industry growth hit the bottom-line hard as we saw net profit decline precipitously from 16.8% last year to 11.4% this year.*
These negative trends are disturbing and may indicate the technology PS market has become over-saturated with too many firms chasing too little business. This slow-down also reflects the general malaise in enterprise software and hardware as technology growth has shifted to consumers with smart phones, tablets, social media and the cloud; away from large-scale enterprise IT.

SPI Research recommends caution in 2014 for traditional enterprise PS suppliers. Now is the time to revisit strategies and make adjustments to ensure your organization is in-front of shifting business trends.

**SLOWING GROWTH – WATCH OUT!**

The professional services market is accustomed to high levels of growth. Back in the early 2000’s annual revenue growth rates of 15% to 20% were the norm. As the global economy dipped into a protracted recession the professional services market also retrenched but never to the point of flat or negative growth.

In SPI Research's seven years of benchmarking the average annual growth rate has never been negative (Figure 1). 2009 represented the low point of year over year revenue growth at 3.6% while 2007 growth of 17.2% was the most recent high point.

The 2013 survey showed an average growth rate of 10%, which was 13% lower (on a relative basis) than 2012 growth of 11.5%. This sharp decline from 2011/2 affected all geographies and all PS sub-segments except Marketing and Communications and SaaS.

**Figure 1: Year-over-year Change in PS Revenue**
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Source: Service Performance Insight, 2014

**LOOKING AHEAD**

The high levels of growth and profit the professional services market experienced in 2011 and 2012 deteriorated in 2013 manifesting in lower per person revenue yields and sharply lower net profit. PSOs appear to
have taken their eyes off the ball, resulting in weakening productivity and excessive overhead. The primary question going forward is will growth in the PS market continue to deteriorate leading to overcapacity and intensified competition or was 2013 an aberration? Certainly the global economy is improving daily which portends a robust PS market, but increasing commoditization in hardware and enterprise software will have a negative impact on PS providers in those sectors. The hot growth areas of SMAC – Social, Mobile, Analytics and the Cloud mean well-run service providers in those sectors will grow and thrive. While enterprise software and hardware suppliers will be faced with increased competition and rate erosion. Caution is advised to ensure PSOs do not increase overhead and hiring in anticipation of growth which may not happen.

The focus on greater efficiency and productivity were major reasons for success in 2013. 2014 will require greater creativity, as increased burdens, such as healthcare costs and taxes, could not only limit profitability for PSOs, but could also inhibit growth as PS clients face similar challenges.

The professional services marketplace has grown and succeeded because a majority of the organizations offer innovative services to help clients manage change and improve performance. As market dynamics change, leading PSOs have been able to adapt to take advantage of new technologies and knowledge to create leading edge solutions. 2014 will be no different in terms of the need for continuous improvement. But, the headwinds are much stronger and the need for repeatable service offers and organizational efficiency and effectiveness will become increasingly critical to remain competitive and profitable.

**A CATALYST FOR TRANSFORMATION**

Until now, little if any research examined professional service strategies and benchmarks within the context of a rapidly maturing technology environment. The original concept behind SPI Research’s PS Maturity Model™ was to investigate whether increasing levels of standardization in operating processes and management controls improve financial performance. The Maturity Model™ benchmark seeks to answer these questions:

- **What are the most important focus areas for professional service organizations (PSOs) as their businesses mature?**
- **What is the optimum level of maturity or control at each phase of an organization’s lifecycle?**
- **Can diagnostic tools be built for assessing and determining the health of key business processes?**
- **Are there key business characteristics and behaviors that spell the difference between success and failure?**
SPI Research’s 2014 PS Maturity™ Benchmark demonstrates that increasing levels of business process maturity do indeed result in significant performance improvements.

In fact, SPI Research found that high levels of performance have far more to do with leadership focus, organizational alignment, effective business processes and disciplined execution than "time in grade."

Relatively young and fast-growing organizations can and do demonstrate surprisingly high levels of maturity and performance excellence if their charters are clear. Further improvements accrue when their goals and measurements are aligned with their mission, and they make the investments they need in talent and systems to provide visibility and appropriate levels of business control. Of course, it certainly helps if they are well positioned within a fast-growing market.

As Table 2 shows, the payoff from investing in a program to assess current maturity and prioritize maturity improvements can be substantial. Based on the 2013 benchmark of 238 service organizations, 55% performed at maturity levels 1 and 2, 25% at level 3 and 20% performed at maturity levels 4 and 5. The 48 level 4 and 5 organizations significantly outperformed their peers by generating significantly higher revenue per billable consultant combined with higher project and operating margins.

**Table 2: Maturity Matters!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Measurement</th>
<th>Maturity Level 1-2</th>
<th>Maturity Level 3</th>
<th>Maturity Level 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS EBITDA</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Clients</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billable utilization (2,000 hours)</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project gross margin</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per billable consultant (k)</td>
<td>$158</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>$245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Service Performance Insight, 2014

SPI Research summarizes individual PSO performance in a spider chart (Figure 5). The maturity scorecard provides a measurement for each organization in comparison to the benchmark maturity definitions. It provides an invaluable tool to analyze current performance and prioritize future improvement priorities.

This graphical depiction of the Service Performance Pillars by maturity level enables PS executives to quickly scorecard their organization’s performance, and diagnose areas of relative strength and weakness.
SPI Research developed a model that segments and analyzes a PSO into five distinct areas of performance that are both logical and functional. We call the five underpinning elements Service Performance Pillars™ because they form the foundation for all professional services organizations (Figure 3):

1. **Leadership - Vision, Strategy and Culture**: (CEO) a unique view of the future and the role the service organization will play in shaping it. A clear and compelling strategy provides a focus for the organization and galvanizes action. Effective strategies bring together target customers, their business problems, and how a solution solves those problems differently, uniquely, or better than its competitors. For a service strategy to be effective, the role and charter of the service organization must be defined, embraced, communicated and supported throughout the company. Depending on whether the service strategy is to primarily support the sale of products, or to drive service revenue and profit, service organization goals and measurements will vary. Leadership skills and competencies must mature as the organization matures. Culture is the unwritten customs, behaviors and beliefs that determine the “rules of the game” for decision-making, structure and power.

2. **Client Relationships**: (Marketing and Sales) the ability to communicate effectively with employees, partners and customers to generate and close business and win deals. Successful client management involves developing effective marketing and sales programs to better understand client needs, while ensuring clients will continue to buy and provide references and testimonials.
3. **Human Capital Alignment**: *(Human Resources)* the ability to attract, hire, retain and motivate a high quality consulting staff. With changing workforce demographics, talent management has increased in importance. Human capital represents the essence, brand and reputation of the firm. PSOs are starting to adopt hybrid on and off-site staffing models which put increased pressure on customer-facing staff to develop client relationships and more carefully define client requirements. Demands for career planning, skill development and flexible work options have intensified.

4. **Service Execution**: *(Engagement/Delivery)* the methodologies, processes and tools to effectively schedule, deploy and measure the quality of the service delivery process. Service execution involves a number of factors: from resource management, to delivering projects in a predictable and acceptable time frame, to reducing cost while improving project quality and harvesting knowledge. Processes include resource management, project planning and quality control, knowledge management and methodology and tool development.

5. **Finance and Operations**: *(CFO)* the ability to manage services profit and loss — to generate revenue and profit while developing repeatable operating processes. The finance and operations pillar focuses on revenue, margin and cost and the financial, contractual and IT operating processes and controls required to run a profitable and predictable business.
**Maturity Levels Provide Insight for Improvement**

Within each of the Service Performance Pillars™, SPI Research developed guidelines for process maturity. These guidelines cut across the five service dimensions to illustrate examples of business process maturity. This study has been developed to measure the correlation between process maturity and service performance excellence.

The model is built on the same foundation as the Capability Maturity Model (CMM), which has been adopted for software development; but is specifically targeted toward billable PSOs, that either exclusively sell and execute professional services or complement the sale of products with services. Figure 4 depicts the percentage of firms at each maturity level and outlines the primary characteristics for each level:

**Level 1 — Initiated “Heroic”: (approximately 30% of PSOs)** At maturity level 1, processes are ad hoc and fluid. The business environment is chaotic and opportunistic, and the focus for a PSO is primarily on new client acquisition and reference building. Often professional service employees at this level are chameleons — able to provide presales support one day and develop interfaces and product workarounds the next. Success depends on the competence and heroics of people in the organization, and not on the use of proven processes, methods or tools. Practices and procedures are informal and quality is based on individual experience and aptitude. **Level 1 organizations are often characterized as “informal” and “heroic”**.

**Figure 4: Professional Services Maturity™ Model Levels**

Source: Service Performance Insight

**Level 2 — Piloted “Functional Excellence”: (approximately 25% of PSOs)** At maturity level 2, processes have started to become repeatable. Best practices may be demonstrated in discrete functional areas or geographies but they are not yet documented and codified for the entire organization. Basic processes have been established for the five Professional Services Performance Pillars, but they are not yet
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universally embraced. Operational excellence and best practices may be discerned within functions but not across functions. **By level 2 individual Functional Excellence should have emerged in key areas.**

**Level 3 — Deployed “Project Excellence”: (approximately 25% of PSOs)** at maturity level 3, the PSO has created a set of standard processes and operating principles for all major Service Performance Pillars but renegades and “hold-outs” may still exist. Management has established and started to enforce financial and quality objectives on a global basis. Processes have been established to focus on effective execution and there is spotlight on alignment between and across functions. By level 3 project delivery methodologies and quality measurements are in place and enforced across the organization. **Level 3 organizations should exhibit “Project Excellence” with a consistent, repeatable project delivery methodology.**

**Level 4 — Institutionalized “Portfolio Excellence”: (approximately 15% of PSOs)** at maturity level 4, management uses precise measurements, metrics and controls, to effectively manage the PSO. Each Service Performance Pillar contains a detailed set of operating principles, tools and measurements. Organizations at this level set quantitative and qualitative goals for customer acquisition, retention and penetration, in addition to a complete set of financial and quality operating controls and measurements. Processes are aligned to achieve leverage. The portfolio is balanced with a focus on project selection and execution. **Level 4 organizations should exhibit “Portfolio Excellence”.**

**Level 5 — Optimized “Collaborative”: (approximately 5% of PSOs)** at maturity level 5 executives focus on continual improvement of all elements of the five Service Performance Pillars. A disciplined, controlled process is in place to measure and optimize performance through both incremental and innovative technological improvements. Quantitative process-improvement objectives for the organization are established. They are continually revised to reflect changing business objectives, and used as criteria in managing process improvement. Initiatives are in place to ensure quality, cost control and client acquisition. The rough edges between disciplines, functions, and specialties have been smoothed to ensure unique problems can be addressed quickly without excessive bureaucracy or functional silos. **Level 5 organizations are visionary and collaborative both internally and with clients and external business partners.**

**THE PROFESSIONAL SERVICE EXCELLENCE ROADMAP**

If the Service Performance Pillars are mapped against process maturity a “Professional Service Excellence Roadmap” can be developed. Table 3 provides insight into where an organization fits within the PS maturity model as well as guidelines to move from one level of maturity to the next. It allows organizations to diagnose their performance strengths and develop plans to bring lagging areas into alignment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Level 1 Initiated</th>
<th>Level 2 Piloted</th>
<th>Level 3 Deployed</th>
<th>Level 4 Institutionalized</th>
<th>Level 5 Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial strategy is to support product sales and provide reference customers while providing workarounds to complete immature products. Leaders are “doers”.</td>
<td>PS has become a profit center but is subordinate to product sales. Strategy is to drive customer adoption and references profitably. Leaders focus on P&amp;L and client relationships.</td>
<td>PS is an important revenue and margin source but channel conflict still exists. Services differentiate products. Leadership development plans are in place. Leaders have strong background &amp; skills in all pillars.</td>
<td>Service leads products. PS is a vital part of the company. Solution selling is a way of life. PS is included in all strategy decisions. Succession plans are in place for critical leadership roles.</td>
<td>PS is critical to the company. Service strategy is clear. Complimentary goals and measurements are in place for all functions. Leaders have global vision and continually focus on renewal &amp; expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Relationships</th>
<th>Level 1 Initiated</th>
<th>Level 2 Piloted</th>
<th>Level 3 Deployed</th>
<th>Level 4 Institutionalized</th>
<th>Level 5 Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Capital Alignment</th>
<th>Level 1 Initiated</th>
<th>Level 2 Piloted</th>
<th>Level 3 Deployed</th>
<th>Level 4 Institutionalized</th>
<th>Level 5 Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Execution</th>
<th>Level 1 Initiated</th>
<th>Level 2 Piloted</th>
<th>Level 3 Deployed</th>
<th>Level 4 Institutionalized</th>
<th>Level 5 Optimized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Finance and Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiated</td>
<td>The PSO has been created but is not yet profitable. Rudimentary time &amp; expense capture. Limited financial visibility and control. Unpredictable financial performance. Rudimentary contract management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Piloted</td>
<td>5 to 20% margin. PS becoming a profit center but still immature finance and operating processes. Investment in ERP and PSA to provide financial visibility. May not have real-time visibility or BI. Standard Library of Contracts and Statements of Work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deployed</td>
<td>20 to 30% margin. PS operates as a tightly managed P&amp;L. Standard methods for resource mgmt., time &amp; expense mgmt., cost control &amp; billing. In depth knowledge of all costs at the employee, sub-contractor &amp; project level. Processes in place for contract management, legal and pricing decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>PS generates &gt; 20% of overall company revenue &amp; contributes &gt; 30% margin. Well-developed finance and operations processes and controls. Systems have been implemented for CRM, PSA, ERP and BI. IT integration and real-time visibility. Systems have been implemented for contract management, legal and pricing decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why Maturity Matters**

SPI Research believes wide support for the PS Maturity Model™ is due to its holistic approach to measuring performance. Maturity is determined through alignment and focus both within and across functions. For example, although financial measurements are of primary importance they are equally weighted and correlated with leadership and sales and quality measurements to ensure organizations improve across all dimensions, not just in terms of financial performance. However, if the organization is profit-motivated (which most are), increasing maturity levels do show up in significant bottom-line profit. Figure 5 highlights major key performance measurements by maturity level, and should alone be an important reason why PS executives should look deeper into using it to increase profits.

**Figure 5: Maturity Progression**

Source: Service Performance Insight, 2014
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With increased global competition for business and resources PSOs must continually improve. These improvements cut across every aspect of the organization, and all departments must work together to achieve service performance excellence. Executives need key performance measurements, integrated business applications and a plan for continual advancement.

The results and insights gained in the past seven years have confirmed SPI Research’s original hypothesis that service organizations must develop a balanced and holistic approach to improving all aspects of their business as they mature. SPI Research has discovered that the emphasis on individual service pillar performance shifts as organizations mature. Excellence in only one particular service performance pillar does not create overall organizational success – rather it is the appropriate balance and alignment within and across performance pillars, which ultimately leads to sustainable success.

This white paper provides a glimpse into areas where PSOs can improve by showing statistics for average performance reported by over 1,500 professional service organizations. The comprehensive 2014 PS Maturity™ Benchmark report describes how Service Performance Pillars can be optimized and provides prescriptive advice to help organizations enhance their business process maturity while improving bottom-line results.

As the technology professional service industry has matured, the stakes and the “ante” to play have been raised. Today’s PSO requires significant investment in tools, methods and business controls in all areas of Leadership, Client Relationships, Human Capital Alignment, Service Execution and Finance and Operations to prosper. High-performing organizations must optimize each Service Performance Pillar and take advantage of technology and process advancements to be competitive.

While much progress has been made in service revenue and margin achievement, significant gaps in strategy, service sales and pricing, project delivery methods, service quality and human capital alignment persist. Variable onshore and offshore workforce models have made a disciplined approach to managing all facets of the business more important than ever before. We believe this study and continued focus on the Professional Service Maturity Model™ provide a roadmap for achieving Professional Service Excellence.
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