

The Great Brain Robbery

How you could possibly be an unwitting accessory to a “crime” costing you and your organisation a fortune - and how you can safeguard yourself against it.



Bay Jordan

**Author of “Lean Organisations Need FAT People”
and “The 7 Deadly Toxins of Employee Engagement”**

Bay Jordan
The People Accountant
Valuing the integrity of your people

Author of "Lean Organisations Need FAT People" and "The 7 Deadly Toxins of Employee Engagement."

© All rights reserved. This transcript is provided on the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, resold, hired out or otherwise circulated - in part or entirety - without acknowledgement of the author and his copyright and without a similar condition being imposed.

Pause for Thought

Think of your organisation for a moment. How much does it depend on people to fulfil its objectives?

Of course as a leader and senior figure in the organisation that means you also depend on people. After all, organisational success drives your own success, doesn't it? So for you to succeed more, you need your people to succeed more.

"So what," I hear you say, "There is nothing new in that!" It is certainly what I would be thinking if I were in your shoes. However, just think through the implications of this a little more. How much of your time do you spend trying to help your people succeed? Even more significantly, how much time should you spend on that?

Of course there is no right or wrong answer to that last question. But I am sure you are aware - even if you have not analysed it in any great detail - that you are spending more and more of your time on people related issues. You are possibly all too well aware of it. Like most of your peers you may think it is just one of those things. You might, in your more stressed moments, possibly even think it is a result of poorer calibre people or declining educational standards.

But that is where you would be wrong. It is simply the result of the changing work environment. You see the workplace has changed drastically over the last fifty years or so. The nature of work itself has changed; the methods, the demands placed on people, and what is expected of them. Yet management practices have not changed to accommodate this.

What changes there have been do not address the fundamental shifts that have taken place. You are still using the tools, techniques and practices that followed the Second World War. They are thus rooted in the mass production requirements of the Industrial Age. And the Information Age has changed all the basic principles that drove those. For that reason they are no longer appropriate.

Inevitably this has consequences. And these may be a lot more significant than you realise. They rob your organisation through their impact on its performance, its results and hence its bottom-line. This means that they also rob you by reducing your results, your rewards and your reputation. So read on to see how you can reverse all this and transform your life.

A Spotlight into Our Changing World

Have you ever seen the video of the basketball game where you are asked to count the number of passes that the white team makes? And been so engrossed that you never even saw the man in a gorilla suit? That happens because you are so immersed in a problem you miss the obvious. Well, change can often have the same effect. You get so caught up with its consequences you lose sight of other issues.

Well, the shift to the Information Age from the Industrial Age is one of those changes. It is old news and you are likely to know as much about it, if not more, than I do. And you almost certainly know more about its consequences, complications and implications. But you are so caught up with those that you are unaware of what you are missing. So I am going put a spotlight on one particular aspect that I think will reveal it. This will show you how you are - albeit unwittingly - an accessory to robbery.

Of course you know that information without interpretation is only data. That is why we no longer talk about the Information Age, but instead call it the Knowledge Age. It is not about the information but how you create, interpret and use it. And that, as you also know, is where the change occurs in the workplace.

You now need knowledge workers: people who are capable of creating, interpreting and acting upon information. This is the fundamental shift in workforce dynamics. Previously you hired people for their muscles - and called them hired hands. Now you employ them for their brains.

This has significant ramifications. Some of the more obvious ones that spring to mind immediately - in descending order of the time you are likely spend thinking about them - are:-

- They are more costly.
- They are not so easy to order around. That is why the old command and control management style is no longer appropriate.
- It is no longer practical to employ them on a time basis. Their work does not fit into convenient time chunks.
- The question of ownership.
- The determination of value.

But as you know only too well, we have not yet found satisfactory answers to any of them. That is because employment practices still revolve around the historical concepts that are no longer appropriate.

So, to solve them you have to think differently. And these points are as good a starting place as any. After all, they are all issues that affect you every day, whether you are conscious of it or not.

A Simple New Approach

The problem is that when you start to look at these your thoughts start to multiply. So then do your efforts. You lose focus and become the victim of the old "divide and rule" tactic. That is when the consequences of change cloud the ability to cope with change.

Indeed, that may well be why your efforts to master the change have thus far not been more successful. In fact it almost certainly is. Your need to deal with the "day-to-day" makes it extremely difficult for you to detach yourself sufficiently to consider these more basic concepts. At the same time these ongoing demands perpetuate your need to deal with things as they occur. It becomes a vicious cycle. And so you continue to conspire against yourself.

To remove a weed you have to pull it out by the roots. The same applies here. When you recognise the root cause like this you can begin to break the cycle. You will realise that seeing these as a direct consequence of the evolutionary changes in the workplace gives you a great springboard for developing a solution. For you are unlikely to ever find an effective solution to these issues if you consider them individually or in isolation. It is always so much easier to fix one problem than it is to fix several; especially if you are trying to solve them all simultaneously.

Even now you may see the point but still not see how it will help. So let's look at it from the business point of view.

The crux of the matter is that if the nature of the work has changed, then, logically, the relationship between the organisation and the worker must change appropriately too. Right? Of course there is nothing new there. You have already recognised this, for you accept the widespread concept of your people as knowledge workers. That is why you have already been looking into things like knowledge management and means of safeguarding your intellectual property.

But that is already where you risk over-complicating matters. Let's go back for a moment to the earlier statement about hired hands versus brains. If you recruit people for what they know (or how they apply knowledge) then you won't have any problem taking it almost

literally. It means that you can accept that the aggregate brainpower of your people is the total brainpower of the organisation.

So you need to measure this contribution. If your employees collectively provide the total human intelligence at your disposal, it is essential for you to find an appropriate measure. That is where your efforts have to begin.

But it cannot be with your current measures. And not just because your current measures are rooted in the old paradigm. They also have a distorting effect that does you a massive disservice.

A Gross Distortion

Like most of your peers you probably use FTE (Full Time Equivalent) as the basis for measuring the human performance of your organisation. And no one can blame you if you do. After all it is the universal standard. However, that does not mean it is right, even though it is easy to understand and calculate. It is clearly inappropriate.

You see FTE immediately diminishes the human contribution. By taking the number of hours a person works and comparing that to a universal time standard, you are perpetuating that old model. You are effectively discounting the numbers. Clearly that is not good. But the worst of it is that you are creating a self-serving number that is actually totally meaningless.

Why? Because you do not factor in the additional time that people work over and above the standard. This may be in authorised, paid overtime or just voluntary excess. Either way, by not including it, you distort the number significantly.

This means that any measure of productivity based on FTE is a very poor reflection of the human contribution to your business. You have completely failed to recognise or measure the human input - intellectually or otherwise. So if you genuinely regard your people as knowledge workers then you are guilty of failing to appreciate their true value.

In any case, you cannot manage effectively if the basic measures you use are wrong.

An Accessory to a Crime?

Considering people as hired hands rather than for their full intellectual capacity could be described as robbery, for two reasons.

Firstly, it diminishes their contribution. People who invest a proportion of their lives by working for your organisation deserve to have you make the most of their capabilities. To coin a phrase it is "brain-robbery" to under-use people's full capabilities. You are aiding and abetting a waste of life.

Secondly, it hurts the organisation. If an employee is not using their full potential you may be using someone else to provide what they could be doing. Alternatively, if you don't need their abilities they may be better off somewhere else where they can use them, and you would do better to employ someone who doesn't have them. Both are costly, and inevitably mean the organisation is less efficient and, arguably, less effective.

In fact there is a link between the two reasons that can compound the damage. People who are under-employed are disengaged and so may become inclined to do even less than they are capable of. Of course it is not a one-sided issue, but it nevertheless has a compounding effect that further distorts performance. That is why employee engagement is currently such a hot management topic.

So are you a "great brain robber." Of course you will plead, "Not guilty!" But unfortunately ignorance is no excuse under the law. You may well be guilty whether you like it or not.

Fortunately, there is currently no law against "brain robbery" and so you are unlikely to find yourself in the dock. But even so, economic pressures are compelling you to find a solution to the problem. And now that you are aware of the situation, you will want to take action. It will pay you to find some way to avoid committing the offence, because you will reap the reward of superior performance, and thus the benefits that come with it.

But how do you do this?

Meeting the Challenge

Of course the differentiation between people as hired hands and brains is only a semantic distinction. It just happens to provide a convenient aphorism. The fact is, at the end of the day, you can no more differentiate the brain from the person than you can the hired hands. You are dealing with people and there is no getting away from it. That means that there is no dealing in parts - irrespective of the amount of time they spend working for you.

Thus to create an effective basis for measuring human contribution you need something that operates at an individual level. You have to have something that recognises every single person in the organisation. FTE, of course, does not do that, which is why it is such an inappropriate measure.

Yet to find a way to accommodate every individual is something that is much easier said than done. The problem with people is that they are all different. While you can group them into convenient categories they are never homogenous. And, because they are intelligent and can react to the way in which you label them, they make it even more difficult.

But in an environment where they can make such a difference to your organisation, it is imperative that you do so. And, as you might have gathered, to find a logical starting point you have to go back to where we began - the changing nature of the workplace.

For me the starting point has to be in the statement by Charles Handy that "*The wealth of organisations will be vested in individuals and what they carry in their heads.*" (The Elephant and the Flea; ©2001 Random House: Page 12.) If you are talking about the value of the organisation being made up of the knowledge of the individuals, then it seems pretty obvious, that you need to find a way to attribute value to the individual. If, as I said earlier "The aggregate brainpower of your people is the total brainpower of the organisation", then you simply have to find a way of valuing your people.

The Case for Valuing People

Valuing people is always likely to be controversial. On one hand theologians and humanists alike will say that it is impossible to put a value on any human being, and that any attempt to do so would be demeaning and degrading. On the other hand empiricists will say it is a practical impossibility.

Both arguments can be easily rebutted. The truth is that we implicitly attribute a value to people on an almost daily basis. Again we need look no further than Charles Handy who states "*A salary is supposed to be a reflection of your worth as measured by the market for your type of skills and talents.*" (The Elephant and the Flea: Page 21) By definition this is a limited view of a person looked at from a very narrow perspective, but it is not far removed from the context we are looking at here and thus gives us a practical place to start.

Of course value is subjective. It can depend on any number of environmental and other factors. But if you define these clearly and the rules for applying them, and then adhere to those rules, there is no reason why you should not be able to consistently, reliably and

equitably value people. No two businesses are identical, but you can determine their value at any time by following one or two accepted valuation formulae. It need not be any different with people.

It is outside the scope of this paper to go into any details of how you would value people. Or to explain the rules that might be applied. Just accept, for now, that you can do it.

The Value/Ownership Solution

The Zealise Value/Ownership solution enables you to value your people. It gives you the most powerful, pervasive and persuasive answer to all the issues raised by the changes in the work place. It offers you a financially viable, consistent and objective way of valuing the people in your organisation and thus assigning, measuring and monitoring the human value of your organisation.

And that is not all. It also enables you to introduce a new ownership model that transcends all the problems of traditional equity based ownership. Furthermore there is no direct cost to either the employer organisation or the employee. It thus prevents "brain robbery" and provides the platform to totally reform and revitalise your employees and their contribution to the organisation and to reward them accordingly.

Brilliantly simple in its conception, this solution is no more complex to implement and administer than any of your existing people management systems. It thus offers you "a consummation, devoutly to be wished" and an opportunity that you cannot afford to miss.

Of course you need more than just my word to convince you. So let's return to the ramifications of the changing workplace that we looked at earlier to see how well it addresses those. After all, if there are things that your current method of measurement overlooks, you need to be sure that you address them with any solution you propose.

Let's look at them in the order they were originally listed.

Cost

Knowledge workers are unquestionably more costly than historical workers. In both the Agricultural Age and the Industrial Age people were more like resources. They were relatively inter-changeable and you could easily find a replacement for someone who moved on.

In the Knowledge Age this is no longer true. That is why you read about the impending "War for Talent" and people with the skills you are looking for get harder and harder to find and more difficult to replace when you need to.

However, if you examine your thinking closely, you will most likely find that the perception of people as costs is ingrained. Whether you have consciously been aware of it or not, it will certainly have shaped your behaviour. If you doubt it, just think of the three most common strategies of recent decades and the likelihood is that you will have been involved in at least one, if not more.

Those strategies are:

- Introducing new technology;
- Outsourcing;
- Mergers and acquisitions.

And in each case your primary justification for it is likely to have been reduced headcount. Put that another way and it means you have been looking to reduce the people costs.

In fact it is one of the great paradoxes of the age. Technology has fuelled the need for knowledge workers, while it has simultaneously been the cause for putting so many out of

work. You can hardly be criticised for that. It is arguably quite natural because technological progress inevitably creates a skills lag. It always takes time for existing skills to catch up with necessary skills. And it is only right and proper that you should put technological advances to practical use.

But the consequences have actually been far more wide-reaching and profound than that. As you might expect they have been social, political, industrial and economic. But, to the extent that you can separate them, we are focussing here predominantly on their industrial effects.

Let's consider some of them.

Customer Service

Outsourcing has not been the success predicted. In many instances it is being reversed and operations brought back in house. Why? Because, although technology has brought down the costs, it has not improved customer service. It has done the exact opposite. People buy from people. So they expect to deal with someone who is in the same time-zone, speaks in the same accent and shares the same culture. Thus, existing relationships were broken and now need to be rebuilt and strengthened. You can only do that with people.

Broken Trust

Regardless of how you have handled the process of shedding people, you have sent out the implicit message that people are not really important and do not really matter to you. So you have also destroyed any trust or sense of obligation your employees might have had with you and/or your organisation. This makes both retaining your people and gaining their commitment more difficult. It is no wonder that employee engagement is a significant problem.

Sense of Own Worth

Knowledge workers merit the description because they know more and are capable of more. It also means that they need less instruction and supervision. Consequently they do not respond well to the old command and control structure that you are so comfortable with and have historically always relied upon. And that is compounded by the fact that they earn more and so have a greater sense of their own worth. Also, in a market where there is a ready demand for their services, they will not stay if their working conditions are not totally satisfactory.

Increasing Independence

None of the above factors exists in isolation. They are all connected. And, that inter-connection means that they all reinforce one another. This creates a compounding effect that makes managing your people increasingly more difficult.

One of the clearest manifestations of this is the ever-increasing number of people who have "gone independent." These are the "fleas" that Handy describes; people who work for themselves and hire themselves out to organisations that need their skills. They are effectively mercenaries who owe no loyalty to the organisation but will work according to a contract and at the end of the contract will look for a new one, offering their services to the highest bidder. It could just be that is your greatest competitor.

On the one hand you might think this is an ideal solution. You have somebody to provide the skills you need as and when you want them, but without the burden that goes with employment: no perquisites, no pension, and no permanence. Just somebody you can dispense with by invoking the get out clause in the contract. However, is it the panacea you think?

Even if you are not paying all those hidden employment costs directly, they are still costs that the individual has to meet. So they are effectively built into their price structure, along with a contingency element to cover the time they spend between assignments and their marketing costs. So it is false economy. On top of that your business depends on your brand and the quality of the service you provide. How can you build, maintain and better that if the people working for you do not have any loyalty to that brand themselves?

At some stage the pendulum has to swing back the other way. Your business survival depends on your brand and you cannot build that without loyal employees. Apart from anything else your customers do not wish to deal with different people the whole time. They also build relationships with the people in your organisation and not just the organisation. Consequently mutual dependence will compel both parties to look for a new form of employment contract.

Costs of Churn

Losing a good person creates significant direct and indirect costs to the business. Your consequences for losing somebody are likely to be:-

- Increased consequential losses caused by their departure and the time elapsed before their replacement can perform at an equivalent level.
- Recruitment costs to find a suitable replacement.
- Possibly, increased salary and benefits costs or increased contract fees.
- Increased training costs.
- Knowledge of your business that not only walks out of the door, but that may well end up with a competitor.

And, you can suffer these regardless of whether the person is an employee or contractor. In an increasingly competitive world you surely need to do everything in your power to minimise these costs.

No sense of value

The trouble with thinking of your people as costs is that you lose your sense of their value. It goes without saying that every person in your organisation contributes more value than they cost. If they didn't you wouldn't employ them. Yet, by thinking of them solely as a cost you lose sight of that. Let me explain what I mean by giving you an example.

In 1991 I was working as the Financial Controller for the retail division of a major financial services company. One day my manager came to me and instructed me to work out what it would cost us to close down our Private Banking Division, which after a multi-million dollar investment over several years was on the verge of breaking even. When I protested he told me to just get on with it as the Board had already made the decision. Shortly afterwards the division was closed and the entire staff was made redundant. The problem with that was the company had promoted their top 10% of performers into that division and spent a fortune training them to give an even better service. How insane is that!

Perhaps that is an extreme example. But somehow I don't think so. Any organisation that resorts to laying off people is looking at the costs and so completely failing to take any account of the value of those people and the amount that they have invested in them during their employment.

That is not to say that you should never make people redundant. But you should at least be aware of the value you are discarding. If your people and their knowledge comprise the bulk of the value of your organisation you owe it to the organisation.

Benefits of valuing people

In the light of all this it would seem to be a no-brainer that you need to value your people. By doing so you will break free of the historical shackles that keep you thinking of them as costs. You will:-

- Have a clearer idea of their worth;
- Have a greater understanding of the constitution of your organisation's value;
- Have a better handle on how to derive more value from your business;
- Position yourself to manage your people more effectively;
- Create a platform for measuring the human contribution to your business;
- Be more accountable for the way you manage this key asset.

Command & Control

When you know something, you know it and don't need anyone to instruct you in how to apply your knowledge. You only have to think of children for a moment. The instant they get to grips with something the last thing they want is help. They simply want to be left alone to get on with it. They treasure their independence and resent what they see as interference. They will ask for help if they need it, and only then. Well, it is no different with adults.

So, if you are dealing with knowledge workers - as we agree you are - then, by definition, they know what they are doing. That means they don't need anyone to instruct them in what they are doing. Thus there is no place for the historic command and control management practices.

However, when you recognise that you are effectively acknowledging that the workplace needs to be more democratic. You might not like the term or its implications but, by definition, that is what it boils down to.

So stop now and ask yourself what is your honest reaction to that statement. I bet that, if you are totally honest, it makes you uncomfortable. Why do you think that is?

Maybe it is because command and control is still so ingrained into your thinking. Of course you know that command and control is unfashionable and has long been depicted as being inappropriate. But everything you do, despite your best efforts, is largely top-down. And that is an almost inevitable result of your position. You see your position gives you some status. It is your reward for years of hard work. It creates an expectation and a sense of power and tradition and entitlement that people should listen to you. It is almost a habit and you know how hard it is to break free of old habits. In the same way that someone (like me) who was educated in the old imperial measures has to convert metric back in order to benchmark against a familiar standard, you revert back as soon as you are under pressure.

And, as I pointed out earlier, your task isn't made any easier by the fact that the structures, systems and processes haven't changed either. Despite everything, we haven't identified an effective replacement for command and control.

Valuing your people may not be the total solution, but it certainly provides a powerful catalyst. By recognising the value of your people as a constituent component of the value of your business, you change the thinking. In the process you lay the foundation for a more democratic structure. If you don't yet see how it does this you will find out more shortly.

Time Basis

Here again you have a paradox between what technology has made possible and how we persist in adhering to old practices. Technology has made old business models redundant. This is self-evident in such people management initiatives as:-

- Telecommuting and working from home;
- Virtual teams;
- Video-conferencing;
- Hot-desking;
- Etc.

The list goes on.

Obviously all this means work and how we do it has changed. Yet, despite this, the concept of standard working hours still dominates employment practices (and employment law). We have already discussed one aspect of this when we looked at FTE as a universal standard for measuring people and their contribution to the organisation. However, practices like clocking in and flexi-time recording also show our obsession. We seem to be very slow in recognising that the historic link between time and value is no longer *always* practical or appropriate. (Of course there are times when it is.)

The likelihood is that you employ a knowledge worker to perform a specific 'job' for you. However, why prescribe a specific time when they have to do the work or how long it should take? The fact is that they have certain responsibilities to perform and as long as they meet the requirements for those responsibilities that is usually all you are really concerned about. So recognise that and value it - and them - accordingly.

Apart from anything else you will stop "robbing" the organisation of all the non-value added time, effort and money you spend administering things like punctuality, absenteeism etc. Also all the disciplinary costs associated with trying to enforce those issues. Clearly valuing your people will once again provide you with a solid foundation.

Ownership

Recent history has revealed the almost catastrophic consequences of running a business to "maximise shareholder value." As a result many commentators have called for a new management model. However, this call has not been widely followed through. Most of the changes made have been regulatory and then, arguably, they have been mainly cosmetic. There have been few, if any, practical suggestions for changing the basic model.

This may well be because the crisis was primarily seen as a banking crisis. No one appears to have recognised it as a "Crisis of Ownership." And that is what it was. You see the fundamental ownership model has been distorted. Let me explain how.

Historically ownership of a business resides with the shareholders. They provide the capital to start the business and then, as a reward for their risk, are entitled to its ongoing profits. They employ professionals to manage the business for them. These managers have a legal responsibility to run the business properly. That means they are responsible for acting in good faith to run the business as efficiently and effectively as possible and to avoid undue risk.

This model has been very successful and underpinned the economic development of the western world. In the last few decades, however, it became fashionable to think that the managers would run business more effectively "if they acted like shareholders." To encourage this they received shares and share options as part of their remuneration.

Fundamentally the logic for that is sound and cannot be criticised. However, a problem arises in larger organisations that are listed on the stock exchange. This causes shares to become a market commodity rather than a commitment to the business. When this happens shareholders can make more money by trading shares and maximising the share price becomes a key issue. Then it is all too easy to forget the core business: why it exists in the first place and who else depends on it. Investment, not ownership, becomes the focus. And, because managers are now owners, they also get caught up in this maelstrom. Profits rather than value become paramount. And thus there is not the same long-term focus that you normally attribute to ownership.

That leaves only your employees to look out for the long-term interests of your business. So, that means you should be asking yourself whether there is a case for recognising this. I would argue that there is.

For starters they are more knowledgeable and therefore better equipped than ever before. And with the greatest proportion of business value residing in them they are certainly better placed. Also, because of their mutual dependency, you can argue that employees have more of a vested interest in the long-term than the shareholders (or the executives who are rewarded in shares.) Thus they are now more capable of playing the role of owner than the shareholders.

You would do well to recognise and address this. Furthermore the value/ownership model gives you the perfect mechanism to do so.

Valuing your people gives you a far more realistic picture of what the business is worth. It also provides a platform for employees to take better stock of themselves and what they contribute and what they are capable of contributing to the organisation.

More significantly though, by giving everyone who works for you an ownership stake you address many, perhaps even all, the issues we have discussed. For instance you will:-

- Give them the pride of ownership which will engage them more;
- Ensure better customer service;
- Build a platform for re-establishing and cementing trust;
- Tangibly demonstrate their value and enhance their sense of worth;
- Create greater alignment and counter the need to be independent;
- Reduce staff turnover and churn and all the associated costs;
- Build a strong framework of shared values;
- Ensure greater teamwork and organisational integrity;
- Cement a culture of continuous improvement.

I am sure you could think of many other benefits over and above all these. Suffice to say that you will not only be tangibly demonstrating that they are a valuable asset but create a sense of belonging that will massively enhance the organisation and ensure it will be more successful.

Now, instead of "robbing" them you help them have more fulfilled lives. Of course in doing so you will also stop "robbing" the organisation. You should thus see a massive transformation in the organisation's overall performance.

Value

I don't think there is much more I can say about value. It is clearly a theme that runs through everything I have already said and is integral to this entire paper.

The fact is no-one recognises or accounts for the value of their people. Thus their value is totally ignored and their fate is at the mercy of people who have none. This can lead to the unthinking destruction of value and leave the wider community to deal with the fallout. This cannot continue.

The ideas in this paper offer you the ideal solution. They give you the foundation and framework to move properly into the Knowledge Age and to introduce the tools to manage your people more effectively.

No Need to Fear the Gallows

So there you have it. Here is a solution that will transform all you do - your business, your performance and your quality of life.

You have seen that the idea of you being a "brain robber" is only partly facetious. There are ingrained aspects of current management that have their roots firmly in the past and are completely inappropriate. They rob your people, your organisation, and you yourself by

preventing you from fulfilling your respective potential. Of course there is a price for this, but there are no legal consequences. The closest you are likely to come to retribution - if you continue along the present path - is when the gap between the rich and the poor becomes so great that the people ultimately revolt. Although this is unlikely in the near future it is not inconceivable. However, hopefully you will recognise the potential of these ideas and adopt them, and so prevent any risk of that.

To Transform your Organisation

I would love the opportunity to share more with you, to find out more about your needs and explore how I can help you improve your effectiveness, transform your performance and boost your bottom-line returns. And make your life a whole lot easier. Find out more about these ideas and how they can help you in your organisation, contact me directly now.

CONTACT US

Telephone: +44 (0) 1254 727652

Email: info@zealise.com

Website: www.zealise.com



About the author

Bay Jordan is the People Account. The author of "*Lean Organisations Need FAT People*", "*A Feeling of Worth*," and "*The 7 Deadly Toxins of Employee engagement*" Bay is the founding director of Zealise, a company that helps organisations value their employees and embed employee engagement into their DNA, and creates a new employee ownership model.

As a lifelong, passionate subscriber to the principle that people are an organisation's primary asset, he attributes all his own career success as a Chartered Accountant in auditing, financial management and consulting to this philosophy. He avers that sustained success is impossible with disengaged people and is confident that his innovative model provides a solid foundation for greater organisational effectiveness, greater performance with significantly improved bottom-line results and greater organisational integrity. It thus provides the antidote to the toxins that undermine all conventional efforts to create engagement.