ELC089: Building The Skills-Based Organization: A Data-Driven Approach

A Conversation with Koreen Pagano

theelearningcoach.com/podcasts/89

Connie: Hello, Learning People, and welcome to episode 89 of The eLearning Coach Podcast. Did you know that the way most organizations think about skills is e-

This means many organizations may be using incomplete or inaccurate methods to make strategic people-related decisions. Too often, skills are treated as a fixed attribute rather than an evolving, expanding aggregate of capabilities. In this episode, I speak about this with Koreen Pagano, who wrote the book, *Building the Skills-Based Organization*.

Koreen is co-founder of Rising Tide Cooperative and a globally recognized leader in skills strategy, AI transformation, analytics, learning technology, and immersive experiences. She's held product leadership roles at Lynda.com, LinkedIn, D2L, Degreed, and Wiley, and she's also the author of *Immersive Learning*.

In our conversation, she explains why organizations struggle to define and measure skills, why valid people. Data matters more than ever, and how L&D teams can play a central role in a skills-based transformation. You can find the show notes and a transcript.

You can find the show notes and a transcript at theelearningcoach.com/podcasts/89. Here's our conversation.

Connie: Hi Koreen. Welcome to The eLearning Coach podcast. I'm super excited to be here. It’s great seeing your book, *Building the Skills-Based Organization*, and my first question is, what were the conditions that inspired you to write the book?

Koreen: I wrote a book in 2013, 2014, called *Immersive Learning*, and I said I would never write a book again after I wrote that one.

It was incredibly hard, and I love to write, but it was much harder to write a book than I anticipated. But over the last eight-ish years or so. I have been working with organizations around this topic of skills. So, it started out where I was working in a company that had both higher ed customers and employers as customers.

And I was asked to figure out why do employers and educators like not, how come they're not talking to each other? Like, what is the disconnect? And [00:03:00] I spent a whole year and had this small team, and we were investigating this question of like, what's the disconnect between education and employment? It really became obvious that education was focused on competencies and competency-based education, and employers were asking for skills.

And so that led me to the question, well what is a skill and why? Why is this what employers care about? And how is that different than how education has been focused on competencies? So really, for the last almost decade I've been trying to answer this question, and the reality is, skills were kind of this vague concept, and everyone had a slightly different interpretation, that as I worked in different companies and worked with different customer bases, I started to see the demand for skills and skill data in organizations was increasing.

But the actual data transformation needed to make organizations skills-based keeps getting stalled. Like there were some really consistent places where companies would get stuck or not be able to figure out how to move forward when they got to a certain point or the initiatives would start to die and stall out.

And so, what motivated me to write the book was to take all those lessons learned and everything over the last eight or nine years. And hopefully help organizations that are on this journey think through some of the questions and the places where they organizations get stuck in a proactive way to help move this process along a little more seamlessly.

Connie: Did you find it easier to write book number two than book number one?

Koreen: I did actually. So, a couple things were different. One, I knew all the stories. My first book was really focused on design principles and examples, and this book is really focused on process and transformation. Like how do you think about becoming more data-driven?

How do you think about becoming more data-driven around people's capabilities and what are all the places where that's tricky? And so, I kind of had all of that information collected. But what made this a little more difficult or harder was early on in the process, I decided that if I really wanted this book to be a resource for organizations that needed to be more than just my perspective.

Mm-hmm. And so, I invited a whole bunch of folks to contribute who are either experts in some part of this transformation process, or are practitioners in the weeds figuring this out in their organization and included their stories and their lessons learned in the book. So, I was not only writing the book, but I was wrangling all of these other authors.

And so doing that made it a little trickier, but honestly, I think made the book a lot better.

Connie: Yes, it can really add a lot of richness. So, while you're talking about everyone having a different definition of a skill, what is your definition of a skill?

Koreen: Yeah, so I like to keep it simple. Something that you can do that can be measured.

And I try to keep it simple because there are a lot of, there's a lot of nuance and how organizations have thought about skills. So, one example is. A lot of organizations talk about leadership as a skill, and so then my challenge would be, well, how do you measure leadership? And as soon as I ask that question, usually folks say, well, I would look at this, and I would look at this and I would…

And so that kind of exposes the fact that leadership is more of a category of skills and the skills are actually the specific things that you can measure that fall under that category. The other thing that I see often is folks talk about skills that I think are hard to measure. Like I worked with an organization that had curiosity as a skill, and so I was like, well, I think that is a great characteristic or a trait, but how would you measure curiosity?

And one of the things that I've maybe just come to accept and that different organizations have different ways of, and different benchmarks for this is if an organization said, well, we have curiosity as a skill, and here's how we measure it, then I say, okay, like then curiosity can be a skill. But in general, I think Curiosity Boot would be very hard to measure.

And so, unless you have some specific mechanism of measuring that thing, it might be a behavior, a trait, or a mindset or a personality characteristic. That doesn't kind of answer the first part of the question of something you can do.

Connie: I just want to make sure that anyone who's listening knows that you said things that people can *do*, and you didn't say things that people know.

Koreen: Absolutely. Because often having a skill requires some knowledge, which is things that you know. So, it's not that knowledge isn't important, it's actually part of developing a skill. I mean, when I wrote immersive learning many moons ago, I didn't use the word skills in the book or in any of the ways I described it.

I talked about behavior change and performance improvement, and all of the things that 12 years ago were top of mind. But skills are an aggregate of knowledge, behaviors, mindset, right? Like it's all of those things together. So, can I do this thing? Yeah. And I often use the example of: I can read all about baking a cake, but until I actually bake a cake and do the thing, I don't know that that would be enough. I could read all about it. I could describe to you how I would bake a cake, but you really don't know until you can do the thing.

Connie: So how are you defining a skills-based organization as opposed to one that is not?

Koreen: Somebody asked me, it might have been you, Connie, that asked me what's the opposite of a skills-based organization? And that was a really good question.

Connie: it was a conversation on LinkedIn, and the answers were kind of interesting. But nothing really hits home.

Koreen: No, nothing hits home because in my kind of context, a skills-based organization is one that has enough data about the capabilities of their people, that they can make more informed decisions.

Kind of across all of the people functions and people decisions that a business makes. Mm-hmm. The reality is that businesses and organizations are already making those decisions without skill data. They're using other data points or intuition or their best guess to figure things out. And it's everything from what areas should we invest L&D initiatives, where do we need to build experiences around?

Like, what skills do we need in our organization and, and who do we need to hire? Who is ready for a promotion? How do we make decisions around redeploying folks? COVID was a really, [00:10:00] a really big catalyst for organizations to understand that they don't actually understand a lot about what the capabilities of the people are.

So, as they need to make changes, like, okay, well, who's close to being able to do this new thing? So, if we need to move them from this role to this other role, that we can make those adjustments. And those are all examples of types of decisions, there's a million of them, but those are types of decisions that people are making right now. With skills data, it adds an additional layer of detail to help have some of those conversations and to look, hopefully, at more quantitative type data in making some qualitative decisions. So, to go back to what's the opposite of a skills-based organization. I think it's just an organization that's making decisions without truly understanding the capabilities of their people.

But it's hard to put that in a quick tagline. It's a really hard transformation. I'm not, I don't want to sugarcoat it. Like it's not easy to become skills-based. It actually takes a lot of intention and there's a lot of change management and education that needs to happen along the way. And it's not a surprise to me that more organizations aren't skills-based.

It also, I think, AI being infused into a lot of organizations now. There's a lot of AI automation that depends on data to make good recommendations. And so, we're at this point where it's becoming a little bit more urgent for us to better understand our employees' capabilities. And so, there's some world market pressure, there's some transformation kind of urgency.

Connie: You're kind of implying what the benefits are of becoming a skills-based organization. But I'm wondering. If someone asked you, like me, to explicitly, you know, list a few benefits, what would you say?

Koreen: The biggest overarching benefit, which is kind of a general statement, is you can make more data-driven decisions, but what that means for any specific organization is can vary greatly.

So, we're seeing a lot of things in the news. About organizations laying off a lot of folks and saying, well, they couldn't be re-skilled to use AI, which I think is an

absolutely crazy statement, but there's like the underlying undercurrent is the folks that they have in their organization don't have certain skills that they think that their workforce needs.

Yeah. They're going a layoff route of probably laying off those people and then hiring new people that they hope will have those AI skills. There's another strategy, which is to say, we're going to build these skills, okay. Across our existing employees, which I am much greater fan of, because I really do think that everyone in the workforce today is going to have to figure out how to use AI.

Just like we all had to figure out how to use the [00:13:00] internet. And I'm old now, so when I first started, we had the interoffice mail letters with the manila envelope. We adjusted. We figured out how to use this new tag. And we're going to go through the same level of transformation. When anyone tells me that they've been told they need to become a skills-based organization, the first question I ask is, why?

Because if you don't have a compelling business reason for doing this, you shouldn't do it. It's too hard. But if they say, we don't know if we, if we have the skills that we need to accommodate AI transformation or. We're trying to better understand how to improve our sales process or improve our engineering function, or they have a specific area of their business.

One type of business that has definitely been a frontrunner in thinking about becoming skills-based are consulting organizations because understanding the skills and the capabilities of their consultants and mapping that to the projects and work that's coming in for their clients is actually a core part of their business.

They need to map the best people to the best projects. So, because that was their core business skills have always been, I think, at the forefront of their thinking in terms of how do we run our business, how do we map the best people to the best work? Now that's becoming more prevalent in other industries and other businesses to say, Hey, it actually makes sense to think about how do we map the right people to the work to be done.

I didn't super answer your question because it is hard to answer that in a blanket way.

Connie: Yeah. All we have to do is connect the dots and I think you did it pretty well. Okay. Imagine an organization going through this transformation. How would it help the L&D team or what would happen to the L&D team? How would they evolve?

Koreen: One thing that I think is really important for L&D folks to think about in if your organization is saying, we're going through this transformation to become more skills focused or skills-based, et cetera. The L&D team is kind of the front line for collecting data about people's skills that we historically have been the ones that are building programs and content and initiatives. Knowledge is one element of that, but also just to help people get better at something, learn how to do something. And so,

because of that, we are also kind of naturally the guardians of the data about how people are improving over time. So, for folks in L&D that haven't really seen themselves as the owners and curators and guardians of people data, I think that's a big transformation, right?

Some organizations, L&D is already kind of involved in that, but I think for folks who haven't been, or L&D teams who haven't seen themselves in that role, which is definitely a transition in a skills-based organization that L&D is going to be. Kind of intricately tied into the mechanisms for collecting more information.

Connie: It's such a big change from all the people who are getting into the field, and the only work they can find is, you know, taking PowerPoint and turn it into Storyline or something like that. In some of those jobs, there's not even an awareness of how to collect data. It almost seems like you need the skills or close to the skills of a psychometrician to be able to assess skills.

What do you think?

Koreen: I think having some awareness of those principles. So, a big portion of my book is actually about building trust and skill data. And I talked about three Vs. Of skill data to build trust. One is validity, one is volume, and one is variety. And I think [00:17:00] what led me to that conclusion was several years ago is I was working on infrastructure for skills data.

I was working really closely with psychometricians and data scientists. Who were asking me questions and challenging me and kind of forcing me to think through, well, how do you validate a skill? What is better data or less trustworthy data? How do you think about comparing someone who's self-reporting their skills versus a certification versus inferred data, which is a thing that's happening right now in the industry where large volumes of data about skills are being inferred.

Through AI engines. You can get a lot of volume with inferred data, but the validity is very, very low. There's those kind of elements of thinking through like a psychometrician. How do you know or how can you prove that someone has the capability… has a skill? Has a skill at a certain proficiency level, which is another whole layer of validating skills. So yes, I think data science psychometrician capabilities are a really good compliment for L&D folks to think about from a data perspective as we get into more and more skills-based skill development types of conversations.

Connie: So, if an organization comes to you and says, we want to start doing this, we know it's a long, difficult process. It’s probably hard to generalize, but what would be some of the first steps? Like would it be department by department? Would it be role by role?

Koreen: Every company kind of starts in a different place depending on what their biggest business challenge is or what the business issue is that they want to start solving.

I do always recommend that organizations start with a specific use case that they want to solve for, identify the metrics that they want to move, and it likely won't be skill or learning metrics. That will be business metrics that will be the primary driver. And then learning and skills data will kind of be correlated to business metrics.

So, you can start to see like, well, is improving these skills, improving those metrics? Which is a good ROI for L&D anyway. But now that we've got skills data in the mix, it adds another layer of detail. So, starting small use case, something that's measurable, preferably something that won't take a ton of time to implement.

I don't recommend that organizations start by choosing a technology or a platform. I think that slows down the whole process. I do think that technology is a great enabler. At the point that you figured out your strategy and what you want to do. But a lot of organizations have bought technology early and then their strategy gets dictated by what the technology can do.

I wish there was a product or a platform or a tech that I could say, [00:20:00] buy this and it'll solve all of your problems, and you can just use it. There isn't one. There isn't one. And that means that strategy actually becomes really important before you start investing. But on the counterpoint, so I said start small, measure time box, figure out pilots, do all the things to figure out your strategy.

The opposite side of this is that I've seen lots of organizations where like each department is figuring out their own piece, okay? And they're not talking to each other. So, I do recommend highly that if your organization wants to move in this direction, that you create a cross-functional. Skills team, your strategy team, your drivers, the folks that are part of that.

I would recommend having a data related person be part of that group. I would recommend line Manager be part of that group because they're going to have opinions about working with their employees and teams. I would recommend having some employees being part of that group [00:21:00] to share their perspective on the value of skilled data for employees and what's actually important for employees.

Because those are all potential places in a skills journey where organizations get stuck. Either managers are like, I don't understand why this is valuable. I don't want to do this. This isn't relevant. Employees are like, you're going to use this information against me. I don't know why I'm giving you all this information about my skills.

Like what are you doing with this? Those are all places where skills initiatives can stall out because they'll meet resistance.

Connie: It seems like one of the most difficult things is deciding on the sub-skills of a skill that maybe it would take the task analysis or lots of observation and audience analysis. How do you suggest people go about that?

Koreen: AI has helped us in this area. There definitely are some products and features and candidly, I even have a tool that I use to help organizations do task analysis. Those tools generally look at broad strokes, like what does the product manager do, or what does an instructional designer do, and give some recommendations around what tasks are relevant.

So, it helps. It's a good starting point. It might not be totally accurate to your specific organization, but I can kickstart some of those conversations. But the flip side of that is that it does force L&D and HR folks to get a lot closer to their business partners. I often think that we rely on subject matter experts or folks to come in and kind of be the experts in those areas.

So that we don't truly understand the work being done out in the world. This is really an opportunity to, to create partnerships with those managers who are closer to the work and the employees who are doing the work, and to get validation and have deeper conversations around the work to be done. So, it's forcing some conversations around how do [00:23:00] we all get closer to our audience?

Connie: Did you tell me that you knew of one organization that was truly skills-based? I mean, I know it's unusual to find one.

Koreen: Yeah. So, when I started writing the book, I thought, well, I have to find a company who's already doing this. And then I got really nervous that I wasn't going to find any. It's rare, like this is, this is new.

If organizations think that they're behind, they're not. Everybody's starting really. But there is one organization that I found, and Sandra Laughlin is a contributor to the book, but she works for EPAM. EPAM started out being skills-based. They are a consulting business, so when they started out, they started collecting data on all of their consultants in their pool.

And they created mechanisms for measuring skills as they were being developed over time and depending on what projects folks were working on. And so, they created kind of this ongoing mechanism. If you talk to Sandra, who is incredibly smart, and I highly recommend folks reach out to her or follow her on LinkedIn because she's always sharing information about what they're doing at EPAM couple notes.

One, they started from the ground up doing this. So, they never had to go through a transformation. They kind of organically developed this way. So, a lot of the transformation challenges that organizations face, they didn't necessarily face because they envisioned their company this way from the beginning.

The other thing that's unique about EPAM is that they built all their own technology systems to support their skills data. I don't think they are still using any outside vendors. I might be wrong as of this year, maybe they started working with someone, but they have all their own homegrown systems, which is probably not really feasible for most organizations to build all of this infrastructure to support their own skill data, but it, it's been interesting talking to Sandra to understand how they built those systems and then compare that to other technologies and things that are on the market.

Connie: That is amazing foresight that they've started that from the ground up.

Koreen: It's really interesting to just hear about what they've prioritized, how it's become ingrained in their culture, how they talk about skills, how they organize their work. And I have seen organizations even going through transformation have pockets of areas where they are skills-based. And I think that makes sense and kind of aligns with my recommendation is.

You don't have to boil the whole ocean to start. You can start with some specific use cases, and then as those are working, then you add on. But understanding for your organization what the end goal is and then figuring out how to work your way towards that goal will help you both short term wins, but also kind of working towards that longer term vision.

Connie: Let's think about the data for a minute. What kind of information are you capturing in skills data, or do you recommend capturing such a good question.

Koreen: When I first started working on skills data initiatives, I tried to capture everything partially because we were just figuring out how to infer skills from different types of data.

Inference was very new back then. Now it's much more common. I think, for inference that's still relevant and the types of data that might be included is resume data, or even Microsoft is now scanning Slack channels and teams, chats and things to show indication that someone is talking about a topic or sharing information about a topic, and therefore probably has some capability in that skill.

It does feel a little big brotherish. I will admit thinking that the systems are constantly scanning what you're talking about to try to figure out what you know and what you can do, but those have long been thought about as like data points that could be aggregated to infer skills. As I've [00:27:00] gone along this journey, I definitely think higher validity data is more meaningful and easier to trust.

So having fewer data points, but higher validity, I think builds trust faster. But it's almost impossible to do that for every skill. So that really demands that organizations think about what are the most important skills that they really want to measure, and then what's the best way to measure those. So, it could be through simulation exercises.

I've seen that both for technical skills, but also for soft skills. If you create series of scenarios and you measure how people are responding, I have seen. Certifications being created or mechanisms for observation incorporated in. I love those because it's. Kind of capturing people on the job, doing the real things and collecting feedback on, and that performance or how well they did in the moment.

And then there's good old self ratings, manager ratings, peer ratings, kind of the, are we collecting and aggregating opinions around skill. Self-ratings are where a lot of organizations start is just to say like, Hey Connie, go in and rate. These skills for yourself. There's debate about how trustworthy that data is, and I will say it varies by gender.

It varies by geography, it varies by everything you can imagine, like even with rubrics and standards of like describing, there's lots of aspects that influence that. When I was at a company that was collecting a lot of this data, what we found was that employees would slightly underrate themselves from a skill perspective, and managers would slightly overrate someone's capabilities.

So again, the devil is in, do you have enough data points that you can compare and contrast, come to a consensus. Versus if you only have one piece of data, it's hard. Part of the reason [00:29:00] I wrote the book was just to write the chapters on data because I do think there's very few people in the world who have thought about this as much as I have, and so thinking about how you really influence an organization to make decisions based on data they trust and then collecting that data that they trust is really important as far as validity goes.

Connie: Let's take something simple like sales. If their sales continue to improve and everyone across the board is selling the same thing, and I guess you have to take into account how many years they've been at the company and how many clients they have. But once you even things out, would you call that high validity data?

Koreen: I definitely think that is high validity data. I will say, it would depend on how specific that data was. There are new technologies out that record sales calls, and if someone's in sales enablement, you probably have some system where your salespeople are recording their calls.

A lot of those systems do AI analysis now of things like communication or pauses and listening, and they can even sometimes evaluate the content to analyze how you talked about your product or did you ask for the close. All the things that you might care about from a sales perspective, those systems are actually really interesting to collect the nuance of how someone is performing in sales environment and then correlating that with the actual sales data to say, here's the skills that this person exhibited.

Their interactions and their close rate, or here's their revenue generated for the year, or whatever the things are. So, you can get into a deeper analysis of how skills relate to performance.

Connie: I love the idea of listening data. How much time did the person spend actually listen?

Koreen: You can get really specific data on the balance of conversations, and I think that that's informative.

Connie: I've done a lot of medical training and eLearning. And that was always, you know, a more difficult area to assess. I mean, sure. Knowledge, no problem. Even some simulations or scenarios. Okay. But really the human body is so complex.

Koreen: Yeah.

Connie: Very difficult to assess how someone has been doing in the field. These kinds of things are much more difficult than something as simple as sales and sales didn't sound simple.

Koreen: Well, I think there are more tools now that we have to evaluate sales calls, especially because a lot of our sales are virtual now, where if you're a salesperson who's going in person, there really is no way of knowing what a sales rep is doing once they enter a doctor's office or enter that hospital unless someone is observing them or walking alongside them.

Like there, there's not a lot of data collection opportunities to really evaluate that. Which is where simulations I think, have started to step in as can we actually collect some more realistic data about how they would handle a situation or handle more complex environments. But to your point, patient care well.

You know, the patients are complex cases. The family and environment are complex; the skillset is influencing it. There are all kinds of dynamics that are influencing those interactions. So, one of the things post book, I've been thinking a lot about. Skills are relevant to start to measure human capabilities, but we never really use a skill in isolation, or very rarely, like usually a skill is being applied with a whole bunch of other skills.

So, you've got your human skills, and you've got technical skills, and you've got your job-related skills and knowledge of what, of what you're coming into the scenario with. And so, a way that I'm starting to think about [00:33:00] framing measurement is around goal achievement or hitting milestones, or are the aggregate of your skills helping you achieve the outcome that the organization is measuring?

And so, it becomes less about an individual skill measurement and more about the aggregate of the package that you bring. And I think for things that are complex like healthcare and. There's lots and lots of other environments as well, like thinking about is this person consistently achieving patient outcome, like whatever those

measurements are, and then being able to step back and maybe measure some of the skills in isolation to get an aggregate picture is a better way of doing it.

Connie: I love that idea because the aggregate allows people to compensate. You could be a great listener if you're, let's say a doctor. Maybe you don't know as much as a doctor who has many years more experience, but if you're really listening, you could conceivably do a better job at solving a problem. So, the aggregate of skills makes so much sense to me. I think you're going to have to write another book.

Koreen: There's another thing that I've been really grappling with, which is there is a tendency if you create a, this is what good looks like, these are the skills that you need. To then think everybody needs to have the same cookie cutter profile in terms of skillset.

And to your point, you could have three salespeople that are all very successful, and they may have very different strengths and weaknesses, but they've figured out how to compensate and work within the system to achieve the end goal. Yeah. So, if you only hire for one profile, does that actually take away from the more complex kind of environment that you're operating in, and is it actually better to look at the aggregate than it is to look at the individual pieces?

I do think that that's true of effective teams, that you want to actually look at the diversity, but I actually think it's true even in individual roles that you might have very wildly different strengths in terms of skillsets but still have successful folks in those roles with that variance.

So, I always caution against us thinking one size fits all. Our world is way too complex. To think that we're going to be able to break this down into a template that we're trying to model from, and if we did, what fun would that be? I love the variations.

Connie: To wrap things up, I'd love to ask, what are common mistakes you've seen or heard organizations making and that, that they can avoid when they're collecting skills, data, and even thinking about making the transformation?

Koreen: I've mentioned a couple, so I'm going to. To answer this question by maybe recalling, definitely don't try to start from the big picture. We're going to solve everything at once. That is a challenge that will inevitably lead to frustration. Um, not tying skills to business goals are another one. You really need to be able to articulate what the business problem is that you're trying to solve and the metrics that you're trying to influence.

Thinking about this as an L&D initiative or an HR initiative and not thinking of it as a whole, business transformation, I think is another problem. So really thinking about the change management component. Maybe one that I haven't mentioned yet, but it actually is really important is there is a huge education component to skills transformation, which is another role that L&D can play that different stakeholders in

the organization are going to react to and think about skills and what it means for them.

And so, they're going to have questions, and they'll have different questions. Employees will have different questions than managers will have different questions and executives. And so, one of the things that's really important is not only understanding, but you also have different audiences that you need to support.

What's the education around skills that we can provide and making sure that we're communicating, and then how do we communicate progress and wins along the way? So that's a little bit of marketing skills that are probably underestimated, but that transparency and communication is really important. And then I haven't used the G word yet, but governance from a data perspective actually can sink a skills initiative. The challenge is not to enter into this change and not think about how you build trust and how you build transparency around the data and what that looks like in an ongoing way. And I really do think that this is an opportunity for L&D to own and create standards and benchmarking and think about data quality and sources of data, and how we pull that all together to tell a story.

That governance element is really, really critical and often underestimated. [

Connie: That's a great summary, a really good recap. So, thank you so much for your time. It's been great.

Koreen: Thank you so much for having me, Connie. It is always a pleasure, and this was really fun.

Connie: It was.

Here are a few key takeaways from this conversation.

Skills represent what people can actually do and that changes over time. Moving toward a skills-based organization helps businesses and organizations make more informed strategic decisions. Moving toward a skills-based organization opens the door for learning and development to become true stewards of capability data, not just content creators.

And a little side note for people who were looking to upgrade their skills or find a new position. You may want to focus on data science. If that interests you, it sounds like a need that's only going to grow. You can find the show notes and a [00:39:00] transcript at theelearningcoach.com/podcasts/89.

Take care and talk to you next time.