Episode 4 – Occupational/Employee experience

Transcription

INTRO: Welcome to Trailblazing with Corbett Price, where we present new and fresh perspectives that challenge how you approach change to solve some of the biggest challenges faced by business and government leaders today. Here's our host, Andy Corbett to introduce the fourth episode in our series on organisational health.

ANDY CORBETT: Hello everyone and thank you for joining us for our podcast series on organisational health and the seven dimensions of wellness. My name is Andy Corbett, and I am the Managing Director of Corbett Price. So let's recap. What have we achieved so far in this series to date? Well, we've spoken to several trailblazers on various topics, one of which was the organisational operating environment. We also spoke about how to apply agile enterprise principles and help organisations become more resilient and nimble for the future. And finally, we also spoke about the financial and performance health of an organisation and how that can impact their ability to make informed decisions. So today we will be covering the fourth dimension of organisational health. That is the employee experience, engagement, performance and satisfaction. So, this is absolutely fundamental component of organisational health. I'm sure you'll all agree. And I think if you look to all the different dimensions that we have, this is probably the most critical one to get to get right and is one of the main challenges that organisations face today both far and wide across the globe.

I actually recently facilitated some roundtables at the Public Sector Network's HR Innovation Showcase on this very topic. We spoke with several public sector leaders from across three different jurisdictions to get their views on the great attrition and identify ways to look within to elevate their workforce and reduce those attrition rates. And the biggest takeaway that I had from those conversations was really the clear, strong correlation between employee experience and

attrition rates. And I guess it goes without saying really, the happier your employee is in their role and what they do on a day to day basis, the more likely they are to stay within the organisation. And if we go back to sort of the theory around employee experience and just sort of honing in quickly on the definition, the definition really is the journey an employee takes with your organisation. So that journey includes every interaction that happens along the employee lifecycle, plus the experiences that involve an employee's role, all workspace manager and wellbeing. These are all critical touch points that an employee has to really inform and form what exactly their experience will be. And over the past few years, we've experienced a great deal of uncertainty with, of course, the global pandemic. The pandemic itself has led to new ways of working, different ways of thinking and approaching what we do. And obviously, we've had hybrid and remote working arrangements. We've got increases in internal mobility to fill short and long term talent gaps. There are lots of things going on. There's lots of things that have happened over the years and I think really has led many people to question what does a good employee experience look like? And how do we create an engaged and resilient workforce?

Well, luckily, we have Rodger Watson joining us today to help navigate these questions and provide some fresh perspectives on what we can do to address the Employee Experience Challenge. Rodger is the founding course director of the Master of Creative Intelligence and Strategic Innovation at the University of Technology in Sydney. Rodger has an impressive academic and practice background in psychology and criminology, and his work on designing for the common good approach to multi-stakeholder collaboration received many industry awards, and that includes multiple Good Design Australia awards as well. And in recent years, Rodger has contributed to government strategy and policy on numerous topics. And his work at UTs has been underpinned by a methodology developed under industry conditions, community engagement, and academic rigor since 2010. So, Rodger, thank you very much for joining us on today's podcast.

RODGER WATSON: Thank you, Andy. It's a pleasure to be with you.

ANDY CORBETT: Good. All right, well, let's get straight into it then, Rodger, shall we? So you've done a lot of work in the design thinking space, and I guess that work in itself is really around addressing complex, dynamic, and network societal challenges. How do you define design thinking, and can you provide us with an example of how you've used this to address and solve a significant societal challenge?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, sure. The popular term design thinking dates back from about 2008 in a Harvard Business Review article by the IDEO CEO, Tim Brown. So in that paper, Tim outlined their approach, the IDEO approach, as one of taking a business problem, finding inspiration from the real world ideating, an intervention, and implementing. So that design thinking approach is one that many people are familiar with, and it really comes from a product design background. It's been really influential, and it's been particularly useful as a way of bringing together teams to look at issues they're facing in a collaborative and generative way.

At about the same time that this article was published, the New South Wales Department of Attorney General and Justice, where I was working at the time, put out a tender. They put out a tender to all of the universities in New South Wales to establish a designing out crime research

centre. And that tender was really about looking at the products, such as lighting and consumer products, through a lens of how to make those products less conducive to crime or how to make environments less conducive to crime.

Now, interestingly, at about the same time, my now long-time collaborator, Professor Kees Dorst, had recently arrived in Australia, and he led the University of Technology Sydney, response to that tender, where he proposed taking an approach of exploring how design as a way of thinking could be used. So rather than looking at physical products and how they could be tweaked or used to reduce crime, he would put forward a proposal to let's look at design as a way of thinking and explore how that could be used in order take on complex societal issues. So his work really is underpinned by research into how top creatives take on problems. And he spent some time at IDEO. And so there's, I guess, a shared delta of knowledge there. But what case found? In his research is that how you frame the problem really determines how it can be approached.

So when I joined the Designing Out Crime Research Centre at the University of Technology, Sydney, as a Criminologist, as you mentioned before, I found a team of people with design architecture, history, computer science, and psychology backgrounds. And we in working with case, we worked together not just to simply apply a design thinking approach to crime issues, but to build on cases insights around framing. And we developed a custom made approach to taking on complex societal issues. So some of those the underpinning assumptions behind that work were that the issues that we face are becoming more open, so difficult to define or to land on a single frame that people can agree upon. These issues are becoming more complex, not just complicated, where you can break the issue down and understand the individual components of it, but complex in that there's multiple factors that are interrelated and can't really be pinned down through an analytical approach. These problems are also more networked. There's multiple problem holders or stakeholders who are interested in the area, and they're dynamic, so they're in a constant state of change.

I know this is a long definition of design thinking, but it's worth it for those who have done the [Stanford dSchool](#) course or the IDEO course; it's worth just me articulating how our approach is a little different to that. So we worked together on many projects with Police Justice In communities to develop and refine our approach to framing and reframing complex societal issues. And these projects would often show an alternative approach to the issue our partners were facing, so it presents an alternative way of them looking at things. Many of those projects led to products, services, strategies, policy, innovations, and. Although I've worked on a bunch of programs that I can't talk about, one that was done in an academic environment and is a really clear example of this notion of framing and reframing. And probably one of our biggest impact projects was some work we did with the New South Wales government and the City of Sydney. And that work was looking at Kings Cross and the crime that was happening in Kings Cross in 2008 through to 2013.

So back then Kings Cross was, if you look at the crime statistics, the biggest hotspot of assault, and I, having come from the Department of Justice, had been using criminology and working with other government stakeholders like Premier and Cabinet and police to really optimise how we could respond to it. So we're bringing in initiatives like no alcohol served in glass after twelve at night and things like that. Things that were really having no impact at all on the crime rate. At the same time

as that was happening, the designing out crime, people were getting out there into the community and getting an understanding of why people were going out into Kings Cross and what value they were looking to experience there. Through the process of frame creation, the problem of alcohol related violence in King's Cross was reframed to one of what if we treated Kings Cross as if it was a music festival and then brought in the principles of event organisation to take on that issue.

What resulted were some immediate things like crowd control. Portable urinals, manage taxi sands, "take care" space for people to go and chill out and get some water or arrange a ride home. So really practical things that were implemented, but that reframing. So reframing it from what if we look, instead of treating this as a crime problem, what if we treated it as a music festival, then opened up the context for City of Sydney to think more broadly? So they brought in business, they brought in community into the discussion. It empowered them to establish a night-time economy team, which then enabled them to create the Open Sydney strategy, which in turn then led to a global movement called Global Cities After Dark.

So in 40 odd cities around the world, we now have mayors of the night, all taking on this approach of looking at the night-time not as a crime problem, but as an economic development opportunity. So now, in New South Wales, we have a 24 hours economy strategy and the new state government commitment to reinvigorate live music and late night culture. So, yeah, hopefully that gives a bit of an idea of our take on design thinking and how we've applied it.

ANDY CORBETT: Yeah. Thanks, Rodger. So I've just got a few questions around that frame creation that you just mentioned there. So it sounds similar to sort of analogous thinking where you're sort of using analogies or something similar to sort of help people think outside of the existing problem, so then come up with more creative solutions to that problem. And is how did you how did you sort of arrive at the music festival as something as part of that reframing?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, great question. So it's not so yes, analogous or metaphorical thinking. Absolutely. But it's got to come from somewhere and it's got to come from a deep understanding of the situation and a genuine understanding of the situation. So, as I mentioned, the UTS designers went out and did ethnographic research in the field. We did a whole bunch of Stakeholder interviews; we did a whole bunch of user interviews. And then we brought that back into a place where we analysed that data and drew out a number of themes. So a few of the themes were identity forming and vibrancy. And so then if identity forming and vibrancy are shared values amongst the Stakeholder group, including the young people going out, we then ask a question around, well, where does identity forming and vibrancy occur? And that could be in the natural world or it could be in the business world. And one answer to that is music festivals. So people go to music festivals because of the vibrancy. They go there as an identity forming experience. It's part of growing up. It's a cultural experience. In this stage of framing, there's not one particular right answer. You could play around with those values and come up with different answers to that. But what we put forward is that a frame becomes fruitful if it then gives you a whole bunch of ideas that start to make sense when you overlay it on the original problem context.

ANDY CORBETT: Yeah, excellent. Thanks, Rodger. And I guess another question that springs to mind there is in a world where everybody wants everything done immediately and within a matter

of days, or they just want solutions to a problem straight away, design thinking in itself is something that requires patience. It requires a lot of thought to really sort of understand the problem in detail. How do you sort of manage any kind of pushback you might have from the people that you engage with who may not necessarily have the patience for a design thinking approach?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, I guess a lack of patience leads to a lack of impact. I've been in plenty of situations where immediate results are needed. Now, it might be that in an initial workshop with some staff and maybe some stakeholders as well, it may be that within a couple of hours there is full frame and some ideas that can be implemented more or less straight away, which is great. But if you're wanting to really shift a big problem, then you're going to need a bit more than that. And I like to think of portfolios and drawing from the business world, drawing from innovation literature, building portfolios of innovation. And a good portfolio might exist where 70% of your work of your innovation effort is aimed at just shifting what you're already doing. So that's where getting a couple of people in with frontline experience and policy experience and really thinking about it and identifying some quick wins, that can be useful.

But then if you're thinking about adjacent innovation, where you might be wanting to borrow from how someone else is doing, taking on an issue or more towards the radical end of the spectrum, where you're rethinking the value that you're wanting to achieve. You're rethinking how you're going to achieve that and rethinking what those actions are going to be, then that takes a bit more time and it really de-risks the Folio to take that time. Jumping into radical action without the thought behind it is incredibly risky.

ANDY CORBETT: Yeah, absolutely. I'm completely on board with you there. And in some cases, you'll always have a situation where people, regardless, will want to solve things quickly and not give it the time that it deserves. But the majority, ideally you want that time and headspace to think things through and to actually really address those risks and realise the full potential of the solutions that you put in place. And you mentioned shift in terms of addressing major problem, I guess bringing it back to one of the key areas and subject matters of this particular podcast in terms of employee attrition, that's certainly a big problem that's keeping executives up at night, not just in Australia, but on a global basis. In fact, the Australian Public Service Consensus recently found that a third of APS employees were unhappy with their working conditions and 70% wanted to leave within the next two years. It sounds like the approach that you take to design thinking is one which could really help address this challenge and help to improve the employee experience. Could you just provide some further detail on how the design thinking approach could help solve this big problem?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, sure. I'm just recently back from a conference in Budapest, the International Research Society of Public Sector Management, and this was a real topic of conversation, not just in the sessions, but around the coffee table. So it's a huge issue, and not just in Australia, and it really needs a reframe.

Having been a public servant myself and having worked with the APS and other governments in Australia, and internationally, there's a couple of issues that come to mind. So if you're in the APS,

for example, or any public service really, then you've probably got a reasonably good education. You've also made a decision to dedicate your career to the public good as a citizen of the world. You're probably aware of the many crises that we're facing as a global community, whether there the existential crises of climate change or societal transitions like the aging population, maybe local transitions, like a region moving from being a community where coal has been a big part of the economy. And now as a region, maybe you're looking to transition into renewable energy or exporting green powered advanced manufacturing.

If you're a public servant who's aware of all this, you can probably see the many links between these issues. So when you show up to work in your team, which exists within an organisation unit, within an agency or department and in a specific jurisdiction, and you're compelled to think and act just within your specific portfolio, just within the mandate of your team. And perhaps you're actively discouraged from even thinking outside of that, then there's no surprise that you might feel a bit unhappy.

So, taking a bit of a historical lens to how we organize our public services, we've basically borrowed hierarchy from the military. So a lot of public service organisations have a command and control culture and a hierarchy that perpetuates that. And command and control is fine if your mission is clear and if you've got the resources needed to accomplish the mission. The thing is command and control isn't up to scratch in a complex situation. So one might even come to the conclusion that business as usual is actually killing us if we look at the climate crisis.

Our business as usual across the last 150 years has got us to where we are now. So we really need to rethink how we organize ourselves. In fact, that the military have again way ahead of us on this. They've moved away from command and control in certain circumstances. There's a great book called Team of Teams by General Stanley McChrystal and we use that a lot on our Master's program here at UTS. So it's called Team of Teams. And it's the notion that if you establish multifunctional teams so with different expertise from different areas of the organisation and empower them with decision making in order to achieve their mission, then you're going to get much more adaptive. Outcomes or much more adaptive ways of working and you'll get to the outcome in a more predictable or less predictable way. But more predictably, you will achieve the outcome. Whereas a command control approach really assumes that you can understand the problem and then organize your resources around that sort of a waterfall or prints approach, whereas Team of Teams is a much more designerly approach.

Drawing on that kind of vibe, we do need top down as well as bottom up innovation. We need to allow and encourage people to think broadly and of course, sure, act locally within your portfolio, but to think broadly in day to day. Also, establishing a culture of collaboration. So putting in place structures that encourage and facilitate thinking across business units and across departments across your jurisdictions. This is stuff that we would do at designing our crime all the time. We'd have convening power where we could bring together community, non-government, private sector government agencies and really spend time getting to understand an issue.

And at the end of the day or the end of the process, all of those people going back to their organisations with a bit of a clearer understanding of what they could do. So note there the nuance

around the difference between command and control. If you were going to put together a policy to mandate private sector, non- government community to do something, you've got a really fat chance of that working. Whereas if you can convene people around an issue, and them come up with the ideas that they could do within their sphere of influence, then you're really headed towards collective impact where you haven't even had to really pick up the policy pen. Or if you are picking up the policy pen, it's based on the insights that you gain from that process.

So I think as well that probably requires a capability, like a different capability to what the public service necessarily has. And we've seen over the last decade or more in-housing of designerly capabilities, whether it's co-design or service design or human-centered design, but I think there's something to be said for that multi-stakeholder convening and facilitation as well. Ultimately, I think when you're talking about capability; a two day workshop on design thinking gives you little more than awareness. Designers study for four years before they're a designer. So we need to be a bit realistic about that as well. It's something to be built over time, but ultimately, it's about if we can, um, help people to bring their whole self into their work, and if we can help our public servants to see their fingerprints on initiatives, then they're going to feel more motivated, they're going to feel more valued, and they're going to be less likely to want to leave their organisation.

ANDY CORBETT: Absolutely. Just going back to your point there about the Team of Teams. There's a few examples of in APS. I think there's more that could be done there, but I guess one of the more recent examples is how team of teams have been applied in a time of crisis. And I think COVID kind of showed how we can apply the sort of government type perspective to deliver on a mission and apply that team of teams approach. So, yeah, it shows it can be done. Have you seen any particularly good examples of it being applied in public sector across other jurisdictions or from your experience?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, look, I'll pick you up on the first comment. First. Absolutely, yeah. The multidisciplinary teams that pulled together around COVID are an excellent example of that way of working. And COVID was a very fast moving, very abrupt crisis. What we also need to do is be able to acknowledge the slow moving crises that we're facing. We've got a great opportunity coming up with The Voice and Linda Burney, the Minister for Indigenous Australians, was talking the other day, talking about how all of these initiatives that have been put into place over the years that have been really positive for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. Great, but the issue is still getting worse. Things aren't getting better, things are getting worse. So we need to take that crisis mentality into issues like closing the gap, like our response to climate change.

COVID was a great example of something with really tight feedback loops, where every day we could see the figures on infections, the figures on hospitalisations, the figures on death. We need to have that urgency and we need to build those feedback loops around these other issues in a way that creates, I guess, the urgency that these issues such as the gap and such as climate change deserve.

If I think back to my own work and where I've seen this happen, that kind of collaboration was the sole mandate of the Designing our Crime Research Centre. We were mandated to build a new way of taking on complex societal issues. And from the design sphere, we drew on things like Co design

to bring people together around an issue. In my own practice as a consultant. There's stuff I've done in Canberra and stuff I've done in New South Wales that I can't talk to, but in the academic sense, that's the other thing about the conference I went to in Budapest International Research Society of Public Sector Management. There was a design stream there where we've got this whole new generation of designers who are building careers, working in and with public services, and they just weren't there ten years ago.

There was, I guess, an immaturity in the field of design in being able to work with public service, and also the public service didn't really know how to work with design. But I think over time, on both sides, public service and in design, we're building that deeper capability and deeper understanding across the context space of public service and the disciplinary of design. So I'm heartened by that.

ANDY CORBETT: That's great. Thank you, Rodger. Yeah, that's good. So obviously it can be done. There's lots of good examples of it, and we can really sort of see the power of applying that team of teams approach in terms of the impact that it has, but especially on really improving the employee experience, thus having a positive impact on employee attrition as well.

And my next question is related to internal mobility. And LinkedIn's 2023 Workplace Learning Report states that creating an engaged and resilient workforce is shaped through career development and internal mobility. And reading the report, it also mentions that employees who have made an internal move at two year mark are 75% more likely to stay with their company than employees who haven't. So my question really is how can mobility be crafted into the employee experience and lifecycle successfully?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, I've probably got two answers to this. So firstly, mobility is an essential part of resilience. The experience you build from moving around and from getting those different experiences really adds to your own resilience as a practitioner, but also adds to the broader public service. But the downside of that is, if it happens too quickly, the experience you gain is just a little bit too superficial. It also can lead to a lack of continuity. As we've talked about, some of the things I work on take two, three, five years to achieve. So if I'm dealing with a churning team, then the impact and the insights then just not going to take hold. So that's the downside of it. But the upside is really big.

And I think if we can approach this strategically, then I think there's a lot to be gained. So I'll bring in a little academic model here, just to facilitate the conversation a bit. If we look at a public servant as an individual who is developing their practice, then this is a model that we've been developing called the practices model. So you can look at a practice as a bundle of actions. So things that a practitioner does or a thing that a public servant. Realizes in the lived world, we can then look at methods. So how do we go about developing that action? We can then look at principles. So what are the working principles that we use to develop those methods that lead to that action and values? And these values aren't, I guess, the things that you would in a mission statement. They're more the values that are experienced in the lived world. So a resident of a care home might experience care in many different ways. So values, principles, methods, actions, four quite different things.

And I think if we're looking at mobility, this is a place where the public service really has a strong opportunity. So internal mobility within and across public service agencies has been a thing. I benefited from it a lot when I was a public service servant, moving from frontline, working with victims of crime through to policy roles. And the thing in my experience was that it was all around the same topic area, it was all crime related. So what I experienced was I saw many different actions that our organisation was taking around crime. I saw many different methods and principles. In fact, saw many very different disciplines. So working with psychologists, working with social workers, working with law or legal practitioners and myself as a criminologist, each of us were working to shared values. But we had different principles, different ways of working and very different methods that led to very different actions. But collectively, as a public service, through that bundle of practice, we were contributing to a portfolio of interventions.

So I think the opportunity around mobility, if it's about rounding out individuals as public servants, if it's about exposing them to many different actions so what is the public service doing? Many different methods. How is the public service doing? It many different principles of working and ultimately probably just a few values that the public service is working to. Then you're really going to build out a workforce that is T shaped, I guess, broad experience and with some disciplinary expertise and I think also building a network of trusted colleagues through that journey and a career trajectory, I guess, that grows. Public servants with that broad bundle of practices who can not only think strategically but can draw on their experience across those many opportunities. Now that I guess, is my experience within one government agency, but I've seen that happen across agencies as well. And I think it leads to leaders who are then able to communicate in the different languages that departments have in order to be able to better negotiate or better collaborate towards a shared outcome.

ANDY CORBETT: And I guess it sort of leads to what you were talking about before with Team of Teams. I think if you're mobile across agencies and you're opening yourself up to different perspectives on things and experiences, do you think that's almost a catalyst in a way to really help promote that team of teams approach?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah, absolutely. I mean, team of teams requires that you have an understanding at least about what the other members of your team, what their expertise is. And so I mentioned right at the beginning of our talk that when I landed designing our crime, I landed there as a Criminologist. And I joined a team with product designers, architects, historian, computer scientist, um, and I had no idea what those disciplines were. So landing there in a leadership role, I could have micromanaged, I guess, but I didn't know how to micromanage those disciplines. So being open to these different discipline areas and being open to forming a shared way of working was how I got through that. And not only got through it, but as a team, we built a new way of working together. So I think having that openness and having that opportunity to experience the different discipline areas and I guess the humility to understand that even if you're coming into an agency as an economist or in my experience, as a Criminologist, the different disciplinary lenses all bring different value to a situation. And being able to create a situation where those different disciplines can work together means that you're going to have something that's stronger than the sum of the parts.

ANDY CORBETT: Excellent. Thanks, Rodger. And I guess for the listener as well, there's some excellent and very useful information here. Now there might be a person who's thinking, okay, well, this all sounds great, and how can I get started? I'm in my team, I'm in my agency. How can I actually apply some of these concepts to what I do in my role to really get to achieve some of the outcomes that you've mentioned here today? So, I guess, what would your what would your sort of key recommendations be for individuals or organisations when approaching a known problem with a different approach or trying to leverage design thinking in the roles that they perform today?

RODGER WATSON: Yeah. So, firstly, there's some pitfalls. Be very wary of off the shelf applications. We developed and experimented with our approach six years before we were confident enough to put our book Designing for the Common Good on the shelf, and then another two years to develop it into the Graduate Certificate of Public Sector Innovation, and then another three years to develop into the Master of Creative Intelligence and Strategic Innovation. So just be wary of taking things off the shelf, or if you do take it off the shelf, approach it with an open mind, I guess.

And I'll put a bit of a definition around open mind. So one of the theorists that has been influential to me but also to the field of design, is John Dewey. Any listeners who've worked in education will probably be familiar with John Dewey. He was very influential in education reform in the United States in the late 18 hundreds and early 19 hundreds. He was also part of the American Pragmatist movement with Charles Sanders Peirce. The logician and of William James, brother of Henry James. So. William James, father of modern psychology. Charles Sanders Peirce, logician. They each had their own disciplinary, but as a trio, they forged this notion of American pragmatism. So open mind. John Dewey wrote how we think and he has a few principles around guiding how we think. So if you're picking something up off the shelf around design thinking or designerly ways of doing things, there's just a few things to keep in mind that won't necessarily be written into it.

Firstly, make assumptions. Yes, make assumptions, but hold on to them, lightly them, and build a way of testing your assumptions. So if you've got a brief that you've been given at work to work on, you might take a bit of time to consider, well, what's the frame that this brief is coming from? How tightly held is that frame? Is it the right frame? And then you might think, well, what could we do? And come up with a few ideas and then find a way of testing those ideas quickly without too much expenditure, even just testing them. Hypothetically, building a prototype of the idea and see how it all worked.

The biggest fails that I've seen in public service is when a policy is rolled out based on a whole bunch of assumptions that have never been tested, and then things are implemented and we wonder why they didn't work. One of the best examples of how this didn't happen was in a legal or a law initiative in New South Wales. So a bunch of assumptions were made around this program dealing with potential offenders and those assumptions were then questioned every month in the rollout of the program. And those assumptions were then the program was then refined around those assumptions. And then over a couple of years, the program got to a point where it didn't need any more refining and so it got rolled out.

Now, that flies in the face of normal or normal practice as it was back then. Like normally, you would come up with your initiative, you would roll it out, you might have a control site, you

wouldn't touch your intervention because that would contaminate the data. And then after two years, you'd evaluate and find that it didn't work. Now, of course, it's not going to work. If you're just implementing something with no feedback loops, with no refining, you're destined to failure. So I guess that the principles of John Dewey. Hold on to your assumptions, lightly test your assumptions, change your initiative based on those new assumptions. And repeat. And repeat and repeat, I think. Um, that and the art of reframing were the biggest learnings for me back when I started in this work, and hopefully that's useful for your listeners.

ANDY CORBETT: That's great. Thanks so much, Rodger. I really appreciate what you've spoken about today. I've learned an awful lot from this conversation. So thank you very much for your perspectives on this dimension of organisational health, the occupational dimension all about the employee experience. So if you'd like to read more, and also the articles that Rodgers co -authored on Creative Intelligence and Designing for the Common Good, please visit our website. We've got Rodger's bio uploaded on there and there's lots of links and further information that you can access. Once again, thank you very much, Rodger, for today.

RODGER WATSON: Thanks very much, Andy. It's been an absolute pleasure. And for anyone interested, we do have a new book out called Creative Reboot Catalysing Creative Intelligence with my co-authors Barbara Doran and Diana Vo. Also has a bunch of case studies written by participants on our master's program of how they've picked up this way of working and applied it into their professional life. So thanks again, Andy. It's been a real pleasure.

ANDY CORBETT: Well, that was really good. I'm sure you'll all agree that was extremely insightful to really make sure you didn't miss anything, that the transcripts of today's episode is available to download from our website address being www.corbetteprice.com.au/podcast. That's www.corbettprice.com.a/podcast. We will also include any references to the materials mentioned today during the conversation, such as that book on team of teams, of course, and anything else which is relevant to give you as much information as possible.

Please tune in next week as we talk with Cherie Canning from Luminate leadership on our fifth dimension, which is the relational and workplace culture. Thank you for tuning in. Goodbye.