

*'Strategy is a chance for forward motion. Too many organizations put smarts ahead of action, but Jeff Schwisow makes it clear that you'll need both.'*  
Seth Godin, Author of *Linchpin*

J E F F   S C H W I S O W

# PROJECTIFY



How to use projects to engage your people  
in strategy that evolves your business

# CONTENTS

*About the author xi*

*In gratitude xiii*

*Introduction 1*

## **PART 1 - STRATEGY**

### **1**

The case for change 11

### **2**

An illusion of certainty 29

### **3**

A two-way bridge 53

## **PART 2 - EXECUTION**

### **4**

Empower your team 79

### **5**

Follow the project framework 105

### **6**

Share your purpose 143

*Conclusion 171*

*Sources 181*

## Introduction

*'My team is struggling to develop a strategy that differs from what we've always done; one that moves with the times and the market.'*

*'We're so engaged in the day-to-day, the immediate and urgent work, that we have no time or energy to devote to what might be ahead; in some cases, what we KNOW is ahead.'*

*'Even when we do manage to set out a strategic direction, we see a lot of activity but little progress that translates into meaningful business outcomes.'*

*'If I do manage to get my people onboard with a new strategy, I spend all my energy struggling against resistance to the change.'*

**These are things I hear executives and CEOs of large organisations say on a regular basis.**

Strategy was (and still is for some) about creating a three- or five-year plan focused on plotting a specific course into the future based on the conditions that are known today. When things don't go according to that plan, we panic and revert to what we've always done – wrapping ourselves in the deceptive comfort of 'core business'.

For others, strategy is all about aspiration – setting lofty business targets and creating catchy slogans. Yet the 'business of busyness' – meeting-filled calendars, a steady stream of crises, and reporting cycles that each begin before the last one ends – often quickly consumes the time and attention it would take to translate this aspiration into action and activity.

The business environment is changing. Sure, everything moves faster than ever before. But that has been true for decades – for a long time, the 'current' environment has been more dynamic than ever before. What is different in today's business world is the pervasiveness of that dynamism. Now it is not just so-called disrupted industries or single elements of your business that are being impacted by the pace of change. It is happening everywhere, in every industry and at every level of your business.

The rules are changing because waiting to react to your environment puts you perilously behind in a race that punishes those who can't maintain the pace. The question now is not 'How do I keep up?' but 'How do I forward-focus and project into the future so that I am leading from the front, driving change instead of responding to it?'

In today's dynamic world, strategy needs to be a continuous process of re-shaping your business for a future that you want

## PROJECTIFY

to become. Effective strategic activity relies on understanding the disruptive forces and emerging opportunities that lie outside our control. It is about counteracting those forces and actively seizing those opportunities.

It is no longer good enough to do what you've always done and make it bigger, or do it more productively. Now you have to *evolve* what you do – what you make – as the market and the environment changes.

It used to be that businesses were either 'growing or dying' but in today's world they are either 'evolving or declining'.

As a CEO, leader or executive of a mid-to-large organisation with a traditional top-down approach that has been successful to date, you don't need convincing of this.

You recognise the imperative to change your thinking and strategic approach to be future-focused – to have a strategy for evolving and adapting as your business changes and as the business environment continues to change.

The real question is: How?

How do you create space in your leadership team's busy schedule for deep strategic thought?

How do you effectively engage your workforce to make your strategic intent an operational reality?

The approach that served us well in the first half of the 20th century was a **growth business mindset**, in which you see the majority of your people as foot soldiers whom you direct to carry out the core business. You:

- » Tell them what you want them to do.
- » Incentivise them to do it well.
- » Drive productivity and scale.

But today requires a new approach, an **evolutionary business mindset**, where you bring the business and your people together to leverage the bandwidth and capabilities of the entire organisation so you can constantly adapt. You:

- » Engage and motivate people by giving them something to be engaged in and meaningful progress to be motivated by.
- » Attract and retain customers by genuinely caring about their constantly shifting and ever-more demanding wants and needs.
- » Create a future that the business can evolve into.

This book will show you how to make strategic activity and constant adaptation a part of your enterprise's operational fabric. It will show you how to adopt this evolutionary business mindset.

You'll learn to use projects and a project mindset to create a bridge between your business and the people in your business, to bring them together so that they are not separate entities but working as one, together in harmony.

You'll learn to leverage their leadership bandwidth – their time, attention and energy – to create a culture where your

people are the driving force behind excellence: excellence in the workplace, as well as in business performance, to produce a culture of greatness.

You'll learn how projectifying strategic activity will turn into something that's real and intentional – moving from strategic intent to strategic action.

I love creating truly exceptional workplaces where people come together – feeding off diverse ideas and experiences – to do truly amazing things. I've helped many businesses and business leaders like you to create working environments where the business and its people both serve and are served by each other, in equal measure.

At its core, this is a book about creating those sorts of workplaces. Places where businesses value their people and the people in those businesses value the opportunities created by a thriving business. The sort of workplaces that create great business because they constantly deliver great value to the customers they serve.

These ideas presented in this book have helped many organisations – both large and small – do that, and they can help you too.

*So let's look at how you can use projects to engage your people in strategic activity that evolves your business, today.*

# 4

**Empower  
your team**



**When General Stanley McChrystal took over as commander of the Joint Special Operations Task Force in Iraq in 2003, the joint allied forces were effectively losing the war to a nimbler and more technologically savvy enemy.**

Bureaucracy, outdated command and control approaches and a lack of overall integration were constantly limiting their ability to successfully complete missions – the key performance outcome for any ‘active’ military organisation.

With an average of five missions completed per day, General McChrystal recognised that the traditional military operational model was failing them. The joint force comprised several nations, each with different branches of the military, with each military branch made up of multiple divisions, departments and command centres, creating a mind-blowing organisational structure and tortuous channels of communications. Conventional military command and control leadership was incapable of breaking down the silos and red tape that would allow front-line troops to function as one – or, for that matter, function at all.

Whenever a field force required intelligence on a target, the information was hopelessly out of date by the time it arrived. Ground troops that needed air or logistical support were constantly thwarted when that support was allocated elsewhere or made available only after the mission window had passed.

McChrystal recognised that despite their superiority in numbers and military capability, to effectively turn the tide of the war against Al Qaeda the allies needed to be more like their enemy – they needed to become more operationally nimble and adaptive by eschewing command and control operations in favour of a decentralised operational approach. To do that the task force

needed to break down silos, move decision-making as close to the action as possible and bring a collective approach to strategic development. This meant shortening and opening the communication pathways between front-line teams. Ultimately, it meant discarding several centuries of traditional wisdom on organising and leading a military for a new way of conducting military operations.

McChrystal moved the task force from a traditional hierarchal structure to a networked operational model that he calls a 'Team of Teams'. Each of these teams was modelled on the best practices of the smallest units that carried out their military function. To a significant extent, they were also cross-disciplinary so that they could be as self-sufficient as practicable. The joint central command became a team that sat at the centre of the network (rather than on top of it!) whose role was to support and enable the other operational teams as well as establish the strategic direction.

To ensure this remade networked organisation worked, the task force came together in a virtual meeting every day – this included several thousand people from multiple nations across three continents. The focus of these daily discussions was creating transparent inter-team communication – sharing learning and intelligence, coordinating mission activity and making requests for support and assistance. In the early days, this level of interaction met with tremendous resistance and limited active participation. However, General McChrystal persisted with what the leadership called 'forced fun' until it finally started to have an impact on their effectiveness as a military force.

As this effectiveness took hold, mission performance began to improve. First, to between 10 and 20 missions completed per day; then, from 50 to 60 missions per day until a final average of over 140 missions per day when General McChrystal left

the joint command in 2010. The joint task force went from a lumbering military dinosaur to a faster, flatter, more flexible organisation that was able to beat back Al Qaeda.

This is a dramatic example of how powerful shifts in thinking about the way that you operationalise your team can be when faced with a highly dynamic and non-traditional business environment.

Let's face it, there could be no more dynamic or non-traditional environment than the war in the Middle East during the mid- to late 2000s. The example is all the more poignant because it took place in the kind of hierarchical, command-and-control military organisation that most of today's business operations are modelled after. General McChrystal and his team showed that even the largest, most diverse and traditional organisations can be shaped to be more adaptable – to keep pace in a world that moves quickly and can strike out of the shadows at any time.

In order to understand how this example relates to your business and the way that you shape your teams for strategic effectiveness, we need to take it apart and put it back together again. We need to explore how the team environment can affect

your people's engagement and motivation and how levels of engagement and motivation can influence the effectiveness of your team.

## **Command, control and creativity (or lack thereof)**

Many organisations still view their businesses as complicated machines and the people in them as components of the overall machinery.

Central to this is the belief that a good manager needs to keep a firm hand on the controls to make the machine run smoothly, so that the team remains under control.

I often hear senior managers talk about the need to 'drive the team' in order to get positive results. While many contemporary management philosophies are advancing the need for organisations to engage with their employees, the command and control approach to worker motivation persists in many organisations today.

This command and control methodology dates back to Frederick Taylor's Scientific Management movement. One of Taylor's most enduring legacies is the modern business operational model, which has remained largely unchanged for 120 years. This model is founded on the belief that businesses are made up of thinkers and doers.

Just as in military-style hierarchies that have existed for centuries, the thinkers are situated at the top of the organisation and are called 'managers', while the doers – the 'workers' – are part of a large machine directed by these managers. Managers tell the

workers what results are expected, then measure these results and tell the workers whether they are meeting expectations.

The command and control operational approach has a number of issues that can adversely affect performance:

1. Strategic direction is disconnected from where work actually gets done because it has passed through many hands (i.e., perspectives) before reaching the working level.
2. The silos formed by this approach mean that work tends to be optimised for the individual's or the work group's objectives, rather than for the organisation as a whole.
3. Communication between individuals and work groups usually goes up through the chain of command then back down again – how far up depends on the magnitude of the issue being coordinated.
4. There is little opportunity to take advantage of the collective experience and expertise at the edges of the organisation, because it is not part of the flow of information and knowledge.
5. There is also a tendency for direction to be a reaction to negative results rather than proactively seeking to create opportunity. This means you're constantly working 'below the line' rather actively seeking to rise above it.

Each of the above issues is an impediment to effective collaboration, because it strips away the power of a team to work together for the organisation's greater good.

Is your workplace engaged and motivated in a way that allows you to tap into your people's creativity, their dedication and their day-to-day connection with both your customers and the operational environment that serves them?

There is nothing wrong with hierarchies for reporting and for the care and feeding of your staff. Creating common groups for different types of expertise allows for effective professional development and appropriate allocation of the technical workload. However, for strategic activities – for project work – it is much more effective to form cross-functional teams pooling diverse capabilities and experiences.

This shortens communication pathways and gives the team access to the expertise they need to successfully carry out their project work with a minimum of external interfaces.

## Circles, not triangles

In his TEDxAuckland presentation, corporate anthropologist Michael Henderson suggests that if you ask most people in a business environment to describe their organisation as a geometric shape, the overwhelming majority will say it is like a triangle sitting on its base with the leader at the apex. On the other hand, if the same question is asked about a tribal culture, it will most often be described as circular with the leader in the centre. This distinction is important when we begin to consider the structural and operational attributes of an effective team (not simply how you draw your org chart).

Traditionally, businesses have a very hierarchical or 'triangular' operational model – the person at the apex of the triangle directs those below them. Furthermore, like a set of Russian matryoshka dolls, there are usually triangles within triangles with ever-smaller work groups being directed by the role at the apex.

This might be fine as a reporting hierarchy, but it significantly limits the effectiveness of teams. It makes front-line staff too disconnected from their organisational purpose and it inhibits individuals from coming together to pool their knowledge and experience for the greater good of the organisation.

A much more effective team operational model is one where the planning and control of the work is in the hands of the people most responsible for doing the work.

In this distributed planning and control approach – this tribal approach – to operational structure, leadership is situated at the centre of the organisation providing support and strategic guidance to the teams responsible for doing the work, who are

situated at the edge of the organisation. Ideas, expertise and requests for things that sustain the work flow inwards, adding value to the business and enabling the business's leadership to enhance the quality of their support and direction.

Michael Henderson has observed that, unlike corporate environments where 20% of the people do 80% of the work, tribal environments have 90% of the people doing 100% of the work. Or, as in the case of the joint forces in the Middle East during the 2000s, you can go from losing the war to winning it.

By moving from a centralised command and control team structure to a distributed planning and control operational model, you create a culture where effective collaboration is the driver behind your performance results.



To operationalise your strategic activities and begin to shape an effective collaborative culture, you want to bring your people together in cross-functional teams that are integrated across reporting lines so that they have all the skills and perspectives at their disposal to do the work effectively and autonomously. The team should be made up of people most familiar with the area of the business you want to evolve strategically, and should include not only staff who work in the area that you're looking to improve or develop but also those who will be impacted by the project.

These work teams – or project teams, in the case of strategic activities – should be responsible for the planning and decision-making around how their work gets done on a day-to-day basis. They're responsible for how problems will be solved and where capacity will be allocated. Of utmost importance, they're responsible for making commitments to each other for the tasks they will complete to meet the team's objectives.

The executive leadership then has responsibility for supporting and enabling the project teams as they go about their project work. More than ever, support is becoming an essential leadership quality if a business is looking for its people to be the driving force behind its success. In his book *The New Rules of Management*, Peter Cook describes four different support roles:

1. **Champions** – those who advocate for and sing the praises of the project team.
2. **Advisors** – those who lend their experience and expertise through advice and mentorship.
3. **Assistance** – support that directly or indirectly assists the team in carrying out project activities.
4. **Buddies** – peers, colleagues or friends who provide encouragement and a sounding board.

As a business leader, you're well placed to have a hand in the first three of these roles. To do this, you need to be connected to the project team and their ongoing activities. This connection is best done through sponsorship rather than oversight. This allows you to influence positive project outcomes in a much more effective way than taking on the day-to-day role of managing them.

Enabling these activities includes creating a framework for setting and re-setting the strategic direction and, as a result, the strategic priorities. It includes providing the leadership necessary to identify, prioritise and initiate a steady stream of strategic projects in line with that framework. It also includes establishing a structured approach for the way the team executes their projects and helping to build understanding and capability around that approach.

When your strategic organisation is operationalised in this way, you're asking your employees to partner with you to shape an exceptionally engaging and motivating workplace. You'll create teams with the diverse capabilities and resources to effectively collaborate on solutions to the business's most pressing problems and answers to its most intriguing questions. As a business, you'll form a tribe that works collaboratively to shape a future where you delight your customers and deliver outstanding results for your shareholders.

## **Practical project tip**

1. *Create work teams that are cross-functional and organisationally integrated so that they encompass all the disciplines required to perform the work.*
2. *Populate these teams with the people most responsible for performing the work on a day-to-day basis – the last planners. Give these teams responsibility for planning and controlling the work in a systematic, structured way that serves the overall delivery strategy and overarching project objectives.*
3. *Make the project sponsorship responsible for establishing a structured approach for managing the project work, and ensuring discipline and commitment to that approach. They are also responsible for driving continuous improvement – but done through a process of co-creation with the team.*

## Carrots and sticks

Historically, to get people doing what we want them to do when we want them to do it, we reward desirable behaviour and punish unwanted behaviour.

This 'carrot and stick' approach to motivation is built on a metaphor that equates a team of humans with a team of horses – dangle a bunch of carrots in the direction that you hope to lead them and biological drivers will compel them to follow; whack them with a sharp stick when they step out of line and in line they will stay.

But is it effective?

Studies have shown that external incentives and fear of punishment rank quite low as motivators for today's workforce and are, in fact, detrimental in the long run where the work is non-routine and knowledge-based.

Economists, behavioural scientists and psychologists have all found that although these external motivators may appear to create short-term improvement, the results are almost always far short of what an engaged and intrinsically motivated team can achieve.

These studies have shown that 'intrinsic' motivation can be far more powerful than external (or 'extrinsic', as researchers describe it) motivation for businesses and business endeavours that require creativity and problem-solving. In his book *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us*, Daniel H. Pink brings together the findings from 40 years of behavioural research on motivation – specifically, he makes the case for the long-term power of intrinsic motivation in today's workplace. He explains how Type I behaviour – behaviour driven by internal desires rather than external ones – is the means to get your people's best work.

Pink says that to engage a team's intrinsic motivation, you must tap into three elements that foster this Type I behaviour:

1. **Purpose** – our innate need for connectedness: being part of something larger than ourselves.
2. **Autonomy** – our need for self-determination and the ability to direct our own lives.
3. **Mastery** – our desire to learn, grow and create in the work that we do.

Dr. Teresa Amabile, of Harvard Business School, brings a twist to this construction of intrinsic motivation. In 15 years of research examining psychology and performance of people doing complex work inside businesses, she found a strong correlation between intrinsic motivation and creativity, engagement and performance – all very desirable Type I behaviours for future-focused work.

In one multi-year study, Dr. Amabile examined the daily diaries of hundreds of workers to determine what motivational forces were in play when they were delivering their best creative and productive performance. She found that of the five most commonly identified motivational factors (recognition, incentives, interpersonal support, progress and clear goals), 'progress' was the number one performance motivator for a knowledge-based workforce.

Her research also found that it wasn't just any progress that elicited a worker's creatively engaged best. Even small wins could have a significant motivational impact if the work was meaningful – if it sat within a larger context. In addition, these small wins on meaningful work drove a desire toward further progress – to get more small wins. This creates, as Dr. Amabile puts it, 'an upward spiral of creativity, engagement and performance.' It also makes progress a fourth element for fostering Type I behaviour.

Interestingly, when Dr. Amabile conducted a separate survey of 600 managers from dozens of companies and asked them to rank the impacts of the five key motivational factors on employee performance, they ranked 'progress' last. Presumably these managers believed that without a healthy supply of carrots and a firm hand on the reins, the horses would wander into the paddock and start munching clover at the first opportunity.

Using projects  
helps organisations  
move beyond  
ineffective carrot-  
and-stick management  
practices and creates  
workplaces that bring  
out the very best in  
their people.

## Building bridges

Projectifying your strategic execution is not only the bridge to a new way of leading your business to the future that you aspire to, but it also creates fertile ground for the growth of intrinsically motivated and engaged teams.

As we see from the research, once your people are intrinsically motivated by and engaged in the business's strategic endeavours they are much more likely to bring creativity to those endeavours and progress them in a productive manner. How good would that be!

So how do you build this bridge? How do you create strategic projects that intrinsically motivate the teams that undertake them?

The answer lies in paying careful attention to the four elements that elicit Type I behaviours. This means framing your strategic projects and shaping your project teams so that you draw out and amplify these four key elements.

### **1. Purpose**

By connecting your desired project outcomes to your higher-level strategic objectives and being clear about each project's priority in the strategic landscape, you attach meaning to the work that the team is undertaking. They can see how their project work is part of something larger. By giving the project team the freedom to define their own vision of how these outcomes might manifest themselves as operational or customer experiences, you further reinforce their connection to this strategic purpose. (We'll explore this in depth in Chapter 6.)



## **2. *Autonomy***

To empower a project team, autonomy needs to take the form of self-direction and freedom. The team needs to be able to self-determine their approach to solving the problem or testing the hypothesis that the project sets out to address. They need to be given the responsibility for planning and executing the work in ways they believe best deliver the target outcome. For the future-focused work of strategy-making, they need to be given the freedom to fail – this empowers them to test new ideas and explore the boundaries of what's possible.

There is much debate on whether the most effective improvement teams are self-managed (i.e., everyone takes responsibility for managing themselves) or whether it is best to have a designated leader. I fall on the side of assigning a project leader, based on my own experiences, but many organisations have had tremendous success with self-managed teams. One thing is certain – a leader needs to be a part of the team, at its centre, not separate from and above it.

You also don't want to mistake autonomy for isolation. Having somewhere to go for assistance and support is – perhaps somewhat counter-intuitively – an essential ingredient for self-direction. Ensuring each project has a leadership sponsor is the most effective means of providing this support. However, leaders must understand that a sponsor's role is connection to the project, not direction of the team. When they are connected they can empower the team by providing the necessary support when needed and championing their efforts with the organisation so the team feels recognised.

### **3. Mastery**

If you are to allow your project teams to aspire to mastery – doing their best work and delivering innovative and creative solutions – then they can't spend all their time trying to figure out how to carry out a project. You need to provide them with a project execution framework that gives them structure but is flexible enough to allow them to set their own direction and doesn't stifle creativity. It needs to focus on inter-team reliability – meeting their commitments to each other so that they are in service of one another – and continuous improvement rather than rewarding or punishing short-term results and productivity.

A second element of mastery is active engagement. This means ensuring that team members not only have the tools to succeed, but that individually and collectively they are working on a project that is both deeply satisfying and personally challenging to them. It's important not only to create work environments where these conditions can exist, but to choose team members who feel this way about the work. It is in these conditions that your people will not just do their best work; they will aspire to be their best.

### **4. Progress**

One key attribute of our strategic projects is that they are relatively short-duration, hard-hitting initiatives that target a tangible outcome. The intent of this characteristic is not just to move your strategy forward in a step-wise fashion, but to allow the people undertaking the project work to see progress. If you've been effective at attaching strategic purpose to these projects, then that progress will also be seen as meaningful – not just by the project team involved but by the work groups affected by the project outcomes. When this happens, you not only engender creativity, engagement and performance

in the project team that generated the results, but also in the people who were positively impacted by them. Moreover, I have consistently seen that this meaningful progress in one team breeds a desire in the rest of the organisation to be a part of it – to contribute to this progress themselves.

Strategic projects should be a learning environment, not an execution environment.

## Putting it into place

Before we bring it all together, we need to touch on one more dimension to truly empowering your people to drive your strategic engine.

When Google was looking to create the ultimate team environment, they created 'Project Aristotle' – a multi-faceted analysis on how to get the most out of a team. What they found was that business success lay far from the group of ultra-productive, algorithm-driven technological whiz kids that you might expect of Google.

Instead, the key elements of the best teams lived in the hard-to-measure world of culture and group dynamics: specifically, in what Amy Edmondson, the Harvard researcher who helped everything fall into place, calls psychological safety. She describes it as: 'a sense of confidence that the team will not embarrass, reject or punish someone for speaking up' and a 'team climate characterised by interpersonal trust and mutual respect in which people are comfortable being themselves.'

In his book *Smarter Faster Better: The Secrets of Productivity in Life and Business*, Charles Duhigg provided the following commentary on these findings:

Project Aristotle is a reminder that when companies try to optimise everything, it's sometimes easy to forget that success is often built on experiences – like emotional interactions and complicated conversations and discussions of who we want to be and how our teammates make us feel – that can't really be optimised.

Edmondson explains that psychological safety is not at the other end of the spectrum from accountability – you don't trade off an open, safe work environment against one where people are accountable for their actions. Psychological safety and motivation/accountability are in fact two separate dimensions of how effectively a team performs. She argues that motivation and accountability are the accelerator you want to push and psychological safety is the brake you want to release. Her research shows that the most effective teams operate at high levels of both motivation/accountability and psychological safety. She calls this the 'learning zone' – the state in which teams develop the most creative and innovative solutions as well as consistently deliver results.

This was the correlation that allowed things to fall into place for Google on Project Aristotle. They saw that their most important and effective project results came from environments where people felt free to question everything; where they felt empowered to use feeling and intuition as a basis for exploration.

This is precisely the environment you want when undertaking your strategic activities. You want to create a learning zone where

everyone feels safe asking questions and exploring long-held truths – the way we do things or what our customers want. You want the people interacting with the ‘working parts’ of your business to tap into their feelings and intuitions, because they are often the product of operational or customer experiences that will never find their way into your business analytics – until they manifest themselves as a revenue or profit problem. This is how you stop doing what you’ve always done while hoping for a different result.

Of course, recognising the importance of psychological safety and creating an environment where it exists are two quite different things. Edmondson describes three key steps in helping to create a psychologically safe environment.

1. **Frame your projects as a learning problem** – we need each other’s skills and experience if we are to come up with the best solution.
2. **Acknowledge your fallibility** – speak openly about not having all the answers and how not every answer is a good one; start this at the leadership level, but encourage it at every level.
3. **Model curiosity** – ask lots of open questions and be willing to explore ideas.

Today’s most successful companies have come to realise that long-term success and the nimbleness to respond to today’s dynamic business environment come from the organisation seeing its people as its competitive advantage. They view their employees as solutions to the business’s greatest challenges, not as problems they need to fix.

## Projectify points

1. Traditionally, to make the business machinery run smoothly, to get people doing what you want them to do when you want them to do it, you reward desirable behaviour and punish unwanted behaviour.

---
2. To be successful in today's business world, it is not as simple as getting your people to do what you tell them to do in a productive manner. You need ever-greater numbers of your workforce to use their thinking, experience and knowledge in order to drive high performance.

---
3. By moving from a centralised command and control management approach to a distributed planning and control operational model, you create the groundwork for a culture where effective collaboration is the driver behind performance results.

---
4. Empowered teams allow the business leadership to focus its limited attention on thinking deeply about strategic direction – synthesising the inputs from the environment, customers and strategic projects – then supporting and enabling the execution of that strategy.

---

5. When you move beyond what traditional practice has taught us about motivating and engaging people, you can use projects to tap into four powerful components of workplace motivation: purpose, autonomy, mastery, progress.

---
6. When you bring together an operational environment that actively fosters collaboration, a project environment that intrinsically motivates and engages your people, and a psychological environment in which people feel safe to test boundaries and express their most creative thoughts, you create cultural layers that feed into and amplify one another; you create an upward spiral of empowerment that drives strategic creativity, engagement, and performance.

---