Learning Innovation

and the definition of INSANITY

Game On Learning
Dear friends and colleagues:

This was the easiest of our white papers to write, but perhaps will be the hardest to read. It is, after all, about something just about every learning and development professional knows we need to do more of. But most of us aren’t. At least not to a significant extent.

And that’s innovate. REALLY innovate. Innovation can add immense value to the way we develop the workforces we serve. The way we align our functions with the needs of the business, identify performance improvement opportunities, determine training strategies, develop and deploy truly impactful training, and measure its effectiveness.

There are, however, many issues preventing the innovation we need to apply to talent development. My perspective about these issues has changed dramatically over the last several months. Which, I’ll admit, has surprised me. This white paper will examine those issues and offer some ways to get our learning innovation “game on”.

Best regards,

Bryan
Bryan L. Austin
Chief Game Changer
Game On Learning
bryan@gameonlearning.com
(888) 725-GAME
www.gameonlearning.com
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A Change in Thinking

The principle catalyst for our change in perspective on learning innovation, why it’s necessary, and why it is unfolding so slowly was the **Serious eLearning Manifesto** released on March 13, 2014 by Michael Allen, Julie Dirksen, Clark Quinn and Will Thalheimer.

Not familiar with the Manifesto? If not, you should review it at [elearningmanifesto.org](http://elearningmanifesto.org).

These 4 well-respected L&D luminaries have over a century of experience in developing online learning, and also consulting to organizations that do. With a dozen books, dozens of keynotes, and hundreds of clients between them, we listen to what they have to say.

And the Manifesto is a call to arms. The first statements of the Manifesto set the tone:

“**We believe that learning technology offers the possibility for creating uniquely valuable learning experiences.**

**We also believe, with a sense of sadness and profound frustration, that most elearning fails to live up to its promise.**

**We further believe that current trends evoke a future of only negligible improvement in elearning design—unless something radical is done to bend the curve.**”

The Manifesto goes on to call for adopting 8 values and characteristics of Serious eLearning, followed by 22 supporting principles. The values and characteristics are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>typical elearning</strong></th>
<th><strong>SERIOUS eLEARNING</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>content focused</td>
<td>Performance Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient for authors</td>
<td>Meaningful to Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance-driven</td>
<td>Engagement-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge delivery</td>
<td>Authentic Contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face testing</td>
<td>Realistic Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one size fits all</td>
<td>Individualized Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-time events</td>
<td>Spaced Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didactic feedback</td>
<td>Real-world Consequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. [www.elearningmanifesto.org](http://www.elearningmanifesto.org) by Michael Allen, Julie Dirksen, Clark Quinn and Will Thalheimer
We at Game On! Learning welcomed the *Serious eLearning Manifesto* enthusiastically, and have continued to promote awareness of it since its release. A few weeks after its release, we conducted one of our 1-Question surveys on the Manifesto\(^2\). We were very interested in what L&D professionals thought of it, and to what extent they would embrace and implement it.

We had almost double the number of responses to this survey of our other 1-Question surveys. What did responders think of the Manifesto? 98% agreed with it to varying extents. That was encouraging!

What surprised us (and shame on us, it probably shouldn’t have) was what the responders shared as their big issue. The **big issue** is not the lack of expertise to follow the Manifesto, or the respondents’ unwillingness to do so. It is the impossibility to do so given the business constraints, or the lack of authority (or autonomy) to follow the Manifesto. Here was one of dozens of respondent comments on this theme.

> "Why don't we? It's usually a complex set of variables like budget constraints, overworked, more comfortable with doing it the way we always have, resistance from trainers to ID ideas, ego, lack of management support, and the list could go on. It's not like we don't know what makes the best kind of learning, it's that my list of variables stands in the way."  

So the good news is: our representative segment of learning & development professionals **know how to** create elearning that is performance-focused, meaningful, engaging, authentic, realistic, and containing lots of challenging, real-world practice. And, just as importantly, that they **want to** create this type of elearning.

**The bad news:** they feel their professional environment prevents them from doing so. The obstacles, in addition to those noted above, were most commonly in the following areas:

1. **Upstream managers that are more interested in** (read: **measured by**) **getting training delivered on time and on budget than by the quality of the learning** (and yes, we do realize it is harder to measure quality than project due dates and budget conformance).

\(^2\) You can review the results of our survey at [http://www.gameonlearning.com/blog/the-serious-elearning-manifesto-game-on-learning-survey.cfm](http://www.gameonlearning.com/blog/the-serious-elearning-manifesto-game-on-learning-survey.cfm)
2. *Internal clients that don’t understand the performance difference really effective elearning can make, but just need the training fast.*

3. *Internal clients that say “I’ve got $5,000, do the best you can, but don’t internally charge me more than that.”*

4. *Lack of sufficient access to SMEs that could help designers flesh out more robust case studies and practice scenarios.*

5. *Too few learning content developers (or L&D staff spread too thin) resulting in compromised learning quality.*

You may be able to identify with some/all of these, or perhaps none of them. But the passion, frustration, and emotion behind the hundreds of comments we received on this survey almost made us weep. Most L&D professionals know how to do it right, they want to do it right, but they often find it impossible to be able to do it right. But that said, we understand today’s “lean” business realities, timeframes and budgets.

We’ve been railing on the increasing pushback by many workforces to traditional elearning since founding Game On! Learning. We still hear it. Every day. But the root causes for the preponderance of lackluster elearning out there were something we were out of alignment with to some extent. And we’re owning up to it now.

Let’s examine this current conundrum and how to address it. There are literally billions of dollars of improved workforce performance to gain if organizations can fix this!
Issues Impeding Learning Innovation

Our Game On! Learning team speaks with hundreds of organizations each month. We don’t claim to have our finger on the pulse of every learning organization out there, but we continually compare notes and discuss what we’re hearing from countless phone conversations, webinars, conferences, and face-to-face meetings.

Here are some of the common themes. You may not feel these issues relate to your organization, but we might have spoken with others in your organization that do!

1. “Based on the negative feedback from our workforce, we really need to move faster with learning innovation, but things move very slowly here. It’ll take years.”
2. “I love some of the things I read about other organizations, and what they are doing to make learning more engaging and effective. I don’t see us really changing much.”
3. “Our leaders are pretty risk averse.”
4. “We’d love to pilot or implement some of the emerging learning strategies and technologies, but it would require resources we just can’t spare.”
5. “We’ve got too many things on our plate, and we just don’t have the time to try anything new.”
6. “Our executives talk about how innovative we are, but it’s mostly lip service. With a few minor tweaks, we’re still doing what we did years ago.”
7. “If we try something new and it doesn’t work, we won’t get another chance. So month after month goes by and we don’t do anything.”

These are the most prevalent concerns. Throughout the corporate L&D industry, we frequently provide less-than-optimal learning solutions (often due to environmental obstacles quite difficult to overcome) in the form of learning that is not very engaging or effective. But clearly too few organizations are trying to innovate their way into a better position.

Leading us to consider the famous quote most often attributed to Albert Einstein:

“Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.”
Rebalancing the L&D Equation

If doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results is the *hamster wheel* our learning & development organizations are running on, how do we change that?

What if we *really* are too busy to innovate?

What if we *really* do barely have the resources we need to get the best training we can out the door to the workforces we serve? Even if that workforce doesn’t feel it’s very effective training?

Clearly we have to approach the problem from a different direction. **Albert Einstein says so!** And not only with his “definition of insanity” quote, but with another pithy one, shown here.

**How do we tackle this challenge?**

According to our previously-discussed survey on the *Serious eLearning Manifesto* – and the opinions and frustrations shared with us on why organizations aren’t innovating aggressively – the 3 near-universal challenges from both include:

- **Too few resources.**
- **Too little time.**
- **Too little budget to solve the larger organizational obstacles.**
Our thinking in this section of the white paper will likely surprise no one. It is based on supply and demand – we know. But sometimes we get so focused on the day-to-day challenges we are facing, we don’t step back and think enough about the big picture, and how to repaint it.

Let’s consider the 3 variables that most impact learning quality and effectiveness: the **volume of training requests**, the **capacity of available L&D resources**, and the **available time to deploy** the finished learning solution.

Anyone that knows our *Chief Game Changer*, Bryan Austin, knows he likes to boil things down to simple constructs. This is beneficial to you reading this white paper – it’s not 50 pages long!

Presuming competent, knowledgeable learning development resources, the adjustment of the 3 variables above, either individually or in concert with each other, will either increase or decrease the quality of the resulting learning programs.

Bryan thinks in terms of a scale with slider buttons on it for each of the 3 variables, based on inspiration from Ross Smith at Microsoft.³

Raise or lower training request volume, and the resulting impact on learning quality and effectiveness will quickly become evident.

If the volume of learning project requests go up with no change in resources or the average turnaround time (due dates), quality will go down.

If requests go down, quality goes up, the other 2 variables being equal.

³ Ross Smith, Director of Test at Microsoft, and Bryan are both frequent speakers on gamification, and members of each other’s support group. ☺
A similar predictable correlation exists for the number of your learning development resources available to accommodate those requests for training. Slide the dial up if you are fortunate enough to add resources – and quality goes up. You have more resources to apply to the same number of projects. Slide it down (headcount reduction), and quality goes down, assuming training demand and the average project turnaround time stay constant.

Able to negotiate longer lead times with internal clients requesting training program support? Awesome! Or convince your internal clients to submit requests more than their habitual 4 weeks before they need the training? Great job! More time to get the job done will translate to higher quality on those projects, and more effective learning.

Pretty fundamental, right? Easy to understand, but quite difficult to actually pull off, as we all know. In reality, the entire learning content development/deployment process is a complex balancing act, structured to provide the best training possible to internal clients – when they need it – with the resources your organization can bring to bear.
This supply/demand equation is really a **capacity problem**. And as Dr. Einstein so eloquently said, we can’t solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.

There are 3 options to address the problem.

1. **Maintain status quo**, which isn’t really an option, because it doesn’t solve the problem. It simply sustains the L&D staff’s frustration, learners’ dissatisfaction, and produces little measurable performance impact.

2. **Significantly increase your learning content development staff**, which we would love to see for the health of L&D. But which most learning leaders tell us is not very likely given today’s lean budgets.

3. **Significantly reduce the amount of time required to process, develop and deploy learning solutions to incoming training requests**. But if we pick this option, learning quality and effectiveness absolutely cannot suffer any deterioration.

OK, we’ll pick Door number 3. But how?

First, let’s look at research on the following page for some baseline metrics.
Insanity?

Over the last few months, Game On! Learning has asked several organizations (via phone calls, at conference sessions, during business meetings) this question:

“How long does it take your organization to develop and deploy a 30-60 minute elearning course?”

Answers almost always range from 1 month to 3 months. For data more thoroughly validated, the Chapman Alliance researched 249 organizations to assimilate the terrific information in the chart below. All numbers are expressed as ratios (i.e. Low End, Level 1 is 49 hours of development time to create 1 hour of elearning, hence 49:1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eLearning Level of Sophistication</th>
<th>Low End</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>High End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 eLearning (Basic):</td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>79:1</td>
<td>125:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 eLearning (Interactive):</td>
<td>127:1</td>
<td>184:1</td>
<td>267:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 eLearning (Advanced):</td>
<td>217:1</td>
<td>490:1</td>
<td>716:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers above are key to the quandary we have described thus far. Many L&D professionals know how to develop the level of elearning defined by the Serious eLearning Manifesto. But what often gets developed/deployed is eLearning that the Manifesto Instigators (as they refer to themselves) feel “fails to live up to its promise”.

The all-too-common dilemma: the desired learning outcomes of an initiative, for example, require high-end Level 2 eLearning, but lack of time, people or budget relegate the final solution to midpoint Level 1 eLearning. Whether it is lack of expertise or environmental constraints (or both!), employee performance is not optimized, and learners feel the training has little value.

---

4 See the data at [http://www.chapmanalliance.com/howlong/](http://www.chapmanalliance.com/howlong/)
Thinking Differently to Solve the Problem

Thank you, Dr. Einstein, we'll try some different thinking!

One of the things many organizations have done over the last few years to gain efficiency is to leverage templates in developing their online learning, like separating the elearning course “player” from the content. Create the player once (or perhaps a few times via various iterations) and then ladle your course content in. The overall process becomes more efficient.

We love the idea of well-designed templates to provide some degree of uniformity to the learner experience. As long as every course doesn’t look like it’s been cranked out of the same sausage machine. Templates reduce the design possibilities in favor of efficiency. Can a template-leveraged approach produce the higher-end level 2 and level 3 elearning as defined on the previous page?

Yes, but let’s think differently about templates. Quite differently, in fact. Rather than templates for the elearning content player, let’s also move beyond the learning activity templates most organizations currently use.

What if the online learning “templates” were short, highly-interactive learning games? (And please, no Jeopardy or Tic-Tac-Toe!) What if the course templates also automatically created and included badges and leaderboards?

And while we’re at it, let’s think mobile learning. A learner experience automatically optimized for the small screens of smartphones, the larger screens of tablets, as well as the browsers on laptops and desktops. Oh, and we’d need everything tracked seamlessly across those options, right? So a salesperson could start a course on their laptop via Internet Explorer, Chrome or Firefox, continue it later via an app on their iPhone or Android smartphone, and finish it that evening on their iPad.

**OK, let’s stop for a minute.** We’re trying to think differently to fundamentally change the way we develop and deploy training. So before we go all “game” and “mobile” on you, we know you want to understand how this different thinking impacts the quality equation we’ve discussed thus far in this white paper.
Door number 3. Right?

- **Significantly reduce the amount of time required to process, develop and deploy solutions to incoming training requests. But if we pick this option, learning quality and effectiveness absolutely cannot suffer any deterioration.**

Let's refer back to the *Chapman Alliance* research on the average time 249 organizations require to create 1-hour of various levels of elearning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>eLearning Level of Sophistication</th>
<th>Low End</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>High End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1 eLearning (Basic):</strong> Including content pages, text, graphics, perhaps simple audio, perhaps simple video, test questions.</td>
<td>49:1</td>
<td>79:1</td>
<td>125:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2 eLearning (Interactive):</strong> Level 1 eLearning content + 25% (or more) interactive exercises, allowing learners to perform virtual &quot;try it&quot; exercises, liberal use of multimedia (audio, video, and animations).</td>
<td>127:1</td>
<td>184:1</td>
<td>267:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 3 eLearning (Advanced):</strong> Highly interactive, possibly simulation or serious game-based, use of avatars, custom interactions, award-winning caliber courseware.</td>
<td>217:1</td>
<td>490:1</td>
<td>716:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The different thinking Game On! Learning is currently doing with a more revolutionary use of learning activity templates will allow your organization to:

1. Create **High End Level 2 online & mobile learning.**
2. Use a **1-hour online experience for comparison to the Chapman numbers above.**
3. **Development time required:** between **10 and 20 hours.**

First let’s explore the implications, then the details.
Impact of this Strategy on Capacity & Quality

In order to quantify the impact, we’ll use a simple case study.

The mythical assumptions in our case study:

- 80% of the training requirements and volume are knowledge-based: new products, services, strategies, promotions, policies, regulatory requirements, etc.
- 20% of the training by volume is skill-based. Lower volume, but high strategic value.
- Our mythical L&D staff typically delivers about 16 new knowledge-intensive elearning courses per year, conveniently enough, 1-hour each.

Let’s take a look at a 3-step resource re-deployment and its impact on learning quality:

1. **If half of the eLearning were to be conventionally developed as Tier 1 and half as Tier 2 eLearning, it would require 2,104 hours of development using the Chapman numbers, as noted in the table below. That is our baseline capacity, and the level of quality our mythical L&D staff can produce given the requirement for 16 one-hour online learning programs.**

2. **What if our mythical L&D organization redirected half of those online learning requirements (4 Tier 2 courses and 4 Tier 1 courses) to the game-enabled template platform noted on page 10? The development time is reduced by 932 hours, from 2,104 down to 1,172.**
3. **So what to do with the freed-up capacity?** More eLearning at the same quality, or develop the 8 remaining eLearning programs to a higher level of quality, adding more authentic application-level practice? If we applied the resources to **quality** rather than quantity, here is what we could develop for our resource capacity of about 2,100 hours from number 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Re-Deployed Development Resources</th>
<th>Development Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 eLearning courses at High End Tier 2 (267:1)</td>
<td>1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 eLearning courses at Midpoint Tier 2 (184:1)</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Mobile Game courses at High End Tier 2 (15:1)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,090</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in quality is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Approach</th>
<th>Re-Deployed Development Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All online learning as eLearning</td>
<td>6 eLearning courses at High End Tier 2 (267:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 eLearning courses at Midpoint Tier 2 (184:1)</td>
<td>2 eLearning courses at Midpoint Tier 2 (184:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 eLearning courses at Midpoint Tier 1 (79:1)</td>
<td>8 Mobile Game courses at High End Tier 2 (15:1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We moved the quality bar from 8 hours of Midpoint Tier 1 eLearning and 8 hours of Tier 2 eLearning to 2 hours of Midpoint Tier 2 eLearning and 14 hours of High End Tier 2 eLearning and game-enabled mobile learning.

- Your workforce wins, as they receive higher quality, more effective, more engaging online training they feel is worth spending the time to put effort into.
- Your organization wins, because the training is much more likely to impact performance as well as business results.
- Your training development staff wins because they get to make a difference by developing high quality training, and leveraging their expertise to its fullest.
- Most importantly, **YOU** win because you are the catalyst making learning innovation work for your organization, and potentially result in measurable productivity gains that are worth millions (or perhaps billions) of dollars to your organization in the coming years.

**Congratulations, you innovator you!**
Jumping Off the Hamster Wheel

The math in the preceding section certainly works, but only if the game-enabled template platform introduced on page 10 actually has substance, and can produce High End Level 2 online learning within the development times claimed. We have not forgotten about Door number 3:

- **Significantly reduce the amount of time required to process, develop and deploy solutions to incoming training requests. But if we pick this option, learning quality and effectiveness absolutely cannot suffer any deterioration.**

So let’s get to the substance.

Several organizations, from Fortune 500 corporations to government agencies to mid-size businesses, are seeing one solution as remarkably effective in improving the retention of core learning programs, as well as other knowledge deemed “critical” by their leadership. It is called mLevel (for “mastery” level), offered by Game On! Learning.

Here are some comments from organizations who are leveraging this new learning approach.

```
I am pleasantly surprised to find a market standout that not only pulls together all the things that make learning effective, but does so in a way that's fun and engaging for the learner, rapid and insightful for the designer, and cost efficient for the business.

International Bank

The first gamification product that actually addresses learning.

Home Improvement Retail Chain

Best Mobile Learning solution we have ever implemented.

Telecommunications Company
```
Some readers will want lots of detail about this specific example of learning innovation. Others just want the concept. We will provide a brief overview of the concept in this section of the white paper, and include links to more specifics for those that are interested in them. All readers may be interested to know that this solution was just selected as Elearning! magazine’s Best of 2014.

mLevel is a game-enabled learning platform used to deliver critical knowledge more effectively to workforces, customers and retail channels. Let’s note what this platform does not require:

- New infrastructure, as it can leverage assets already in place: learner’s smartphones, tablet computers and laptops. The subsystems used to develop, deploy and measure the learning are in the Cloud. Each client organization has their own secure tenant.
- Developing and then supporting mobile apps, as mLevel supports all iOS, Android and Windows smartphones and tablets with native apps employees can obtain via their app store, or via corporate deployment from the client’s IT group.
- Authoring experience, as the content development capabilities are incorporated into the cloud-based part of the Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) system, and are highly automated. An organization can either be trained to develop the game-enabled learning content, or outsource the development to Game On! Learning. Our cost to develop missions for clients? Typically about $2,000.
- Design resources, as the 13 selectable learning activities (10 of which are mobile games) are already coded, tested, and designed as templates into which knowledge-based content is quickly and efficiently loaded.
- Development time. The time required to develop new learning activities is typically 10 to 20 hours for a 30-60 minute mobile learning sequence.
- Deployment time. Once the program is ready, it can be deployed to the relevant learner groups (business unit, functional, geographic or global) in less than 5 minutes.

The mLevel platform does provide:

- Highly interactive and engaging learning.
- Attainment symbols (“badges”) and leaderboards that are built in and real-time. And yes, learners respond VERY positively to the concept of competing against their peers and colleagues! Don’t think they will in your organization? Let them try it.
- Tracking and analytics dashboards that provide real-time metrics on activity, engagement, performance increase, and potential skill gaps.
- No limit to the volume of missions and learning games as required by your organization.
- Unlimited ability for licensed users to play, score, learn and review all assigned missions and training.
Highly-Interactive, Engaging Learner Experience

mLevel sequences learning into discreet activities. These are grouped into a course-level experience called a “mission”. Missions can be accessed via smartphone, or tablets like iPads, or via laptop or desktop browsers.

For those that are interested in learning more about the innovations in the platform to create a more highly interactive, engaging learning experience through game-enabled learning, you can find them here: [http://ow.ly/AcmH7](http://ow.ly/AcmH7)

Learning Analytics

mLevel provides comprehensive real-time analytics on several key dimensions of learning, including:

♦ **Learner and Organizational Performance**
  - Mission & game statistics
  - Duration, game plays, game completions
  - Organizational and team scores
  - Leaderboard summaries

♦ **Content Analytics**
  - Item-based statistics
  - Attribute-based statistics
  - Knowledge gaps
The mLevel analytics data can be easily ported to your LMS or learning analytics system. For those interested in more detail, you can access more information here: [http://ow.ly/AcnFv](http://ow.ly/AcnFv)

**Redefining Learning Content Development**

*Thinking differently to increase the quality of learning, while reducing the time required to develop and deploy it.*

mLevel administrators and developers use **mLevel Studio** to create and deploy learning. Part of the leverage of mLevel Studio reducing training development time is the way it intelligently processes the content. Your designers/developers are trained to organize learning content in Excel spreadsheets which are then imported into mLevel as topics.

After the topics are imported, developers can make changes and add custom pictures or graphics to the various topic elements. When the content is delivered in the learning, mLevel exploits the **relationship** between content elements, like product knowledge for sales training, and the corresponding attributes of those products, like price, specs, and features.

To learn more about mLevel’s “different thinking” to revolutionize learning development, click here: [http://ow.ly/AcoBx](http://ow.ly/AcoBx)

**From the beginning of the process of developing the mission until its deployment: usually between 10 and 15 hours.**

We think Albert Einstein would be very proud.
Summary and Final Thoughts

To the extent that your organization finds it difficult to free up resources to consider learning innovation options, you are not alone. Most every L&D organization we speak with and work with use the adjective “lean” to describe their organization.

As the pace and complexity of business continues to accelerate, the volume of requirements for critical knowledge, skills and behaviors throughout your workforce will continue to grow. And your L&D organization will be asked to address those requirements, usually without a corresponding increase in staff.

Something’s got to give. The erosion of training quality that the creators of the Serious eLearning Manifesto see is real when viewed across the entire L&D industry. Collectively, we need to win back our workforces with quality training that is more effective at improving performance in a measurable way. And in many organizations, we must win back our learning developers as well.

Remember the 3rd paragraph of the Serious eLearning Manifesto:

“We further believe that current trends evoke a future of only negligible improvement in elearning design—unless something radical is done to bend the curve.”

Innovation is difficult for many people and businesses because, by definition, it requires change. We humans only embrace change when we’re fairly certain it will significantly improve our lives.

The innovative training development approach we have brought to your attention in this white paper is certainly not the only way to achieve learning innovation. But it’s a very compelling way to start. Contact us and we’ll give you a peek under the hood!

It’s time to find and implement ways to “bend the curve”.

Oh, by the way, do you know the definition of insanity?
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