

Michelle Ockers:

Welcome to what promises to be a really interesting conversation today on Learning Uncut. Before we start, I'd like to acknowledge traditional custodians of country throughout Australia, particularly in the beautiful area that I live in, which has been cared for for thousands of years by the Brinja Yuin people. And I respect and honour their connections to land, sea and community in the area I get the privilege to live and work in. So today our guest is from the U.S. Welcome Christine Gaynor-Patterson.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Thank you. Good to be here.

Michelle Ockers:

It's lovely to have you here. And Christine, I want to thank you, you know, you posted on LinkedIn about a body of work you've done with your team, which was partly supported by a resource that Learning Uncut shared, which was built off the back of previous podcast conversations around AI and insights on the teams in L&D who are getting traction with AI, the kind of things they were doing. I put together a playbook building on insights from past guests. So it's really nice to have this virtuous cycle where people are sharing and then other people are able to pick it up and build upon it. So that was really awesome to see. And thank you so much for sharing that you had used, you know, those insights from other people to see the work with your team.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yeah, you are most welcome.

Michelle Ockers:

So you have an interesting background, a mix of different disciplines and types of experience that you bring to your work, particularly around learning, design, leadership, change management. There might be some other some pieces thrown in there. And I think that's affected the way you've approached the work we're going to talk about today. Tell us a little bit about where this mix of backgrounds and disciplines and the kind of things you're interested in, the lenses you bring to your work comes from and how that influences your work.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yeah, great question. I have a bit of a unique perspective I believe. I started my career in special education, so working with students that have disabilities in a very tech-forward district. And so for me, technology itself was very purposeful. It was assistive, empowering, life-changing. It's a tool to remove barriers and give people access to learning and participation. So just that unique perspective of what technology is and what it can do lent itself throughout the rest of my career. As I transitioned through my career and had done, you know, LMS rollouts and

technology adoption, user enablement in various different settings, as I moved into the business sector, I kind of kept that same technology learning enablement harmony to make impact for people and the business. So when AI began emerging, I immediately saw opportunity. I wanted to see how it could help people, enable people and really create value. That's kind of where I was positioning AI and where I was and how I came to see your resource.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah. And I think you've got some change management background as well.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

I do. So, one of my master's degrees is in leadership and through that I learned about change management, so the organisational development, all of these great leadership frameworks and theories. And what I realised is the things that I had done prior in my career before I had gotten my master's degree had a name. It was change management, helping people through the awareness all the way through to that reinforcement. Once I had a name, I joined associations and really started to delve into it to where I got a certification. And it's really been one of the cornerstones of all of my work as I'm nestled under learning and development. Really, I'm a change agent and a change enabler.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah. And if learning and development isn't about change, then what is it about, really? At so many levels, you know, individual, team, organisational. I love that phrase you use, which it's something I've never heard anyone say before. You use the word harmony. You talked about tech and learning enablement, harmony. And you've talked there about kind of technology and humans and technology supporting and enabling humans. I love the way your thinking weaves those together and that's already obvious. So thanks for introducing us to a new idea, a new kind of way of looking at the role of tech in enabling people and the idea that we can work in harmony with tech to bring out more of the human, right?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Right, exactly, precisely.

Michelle Ockers:

So we are going to explore a body of work that you led in a particular organisational setting in the US looking at AI and AI enablement or AI supporting human enablement, if you like, or helping people. Helping people, let's keep the language plain, helping people. Can you give us a little bit of context, the kind of organisational setting that this body of work's been done in?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. My latest work was through learning and development and supporting an organisation of 10,000 professionals across multiple different services, service lines, mostly finance professionals, tax advisory, those kinds of business sections and sectors. And everything that we do to help people in this learning and development department is customised to those 10,000 professionals, what they need. Even at scale, every organisation is different. So this organisation has its unique needs and

challenges, obstacles, and everything that we build, including the AI framework, learning framework, is tailored to those 10,000 professionals. So when the AI team, which was under an IT department, came and said, we really need to start teaching people how to use AI. We've got it. We were trying to get adoption up. Luckily, we were engaged early in the enterprise AI roadmap that was created. And literacy really jumped out from that roadmap and the strategic plan. Thinking about AI as how do we help people? How do we make sure that it is aligned with the culture and the operations that are part of the business? In this particular company, and I'm very proud to say that this is, going back to helping people, it's a people-centred approach to AI enablement and adoption. So that's kind of where my group came in is the ask was, how do we align this adoption and have folks embrace this technology in a way that creates advantage and also in a responsible, ethical manner that aligns with the culture of the company?

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah. So you used the phrase people-centred approach to AI adoption. What does a people-centred approach to AI adoption look like? Maybe give us one or two examples to bring that to life.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure, absolutely. One of the cornerstones of people-centred approach to AI adoption is accessibility, so thinking through the accessibility of the actual software itself. Human-centered design, an element of co-creation, feedback. So it isn't tech experts that are off in a corner creating things. There's this co-creation between the user who is going to adopt that technology and using their need, their voice, their contributions, their ideas, alongside the technical know-how to create something that serves humans for humans and puts humans first. That's really what this people-centred approach is about.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, thank you. That helps bring it to life. And I expect that we'll see some examples of some of those things in action as we talk through the approach. So from a business perspective, were there kind of specific tools, and I don't need you to name the tools necessarily, but in terms of AI introduction, Were there specific tools that were being introduced? Was it being built into some of the business systems you were already using by the software vendors? Or was it more a case of, hey, we know there's AI tools out there. There's these large language models you can use. We want to free up people to go and start experimenting, exploring. What was the kind of business approach to AI adoption to round out the context for us?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. There was heavy investment in internal building of AI tools. So although existing GPTs were used as a foundation, they drove what was created inside the business itself. So with that comes a massive amount of opportunity and a wonderful governance system that protects the user. So the one aspect of this approach of having things built in-house is that the safeguards are intact. Professionals can use tools safely, responsibly, knowing that the access is being overviewed and overseen by the technical experts that are building these tools.

Michelle Ockers:

It sounds like that gives the user a level of confidence and comfort to use the tools, because often there's this, particularly in financial services, the people I work with and talk to in financial services have this sense of, I want to use these tools. I know they could make my work better and make me more productive, but I'm really nervous about doing the wrong thing with them in terms of security, data, privacy, and so on.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Risk mitigation is a huge factor in the financial sector. So absolutely, Michelle, that was one of the benefits and why we didn't see as much resistance and maybe even fear was reduced because there was such a good governance framework and safeguards that were built into the actual tool itself.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, absolutely. So you mentioned before that one of the early goals was around AI literacy. So what were the main goals or outcomes you were aiming for with this early initiative?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. The first goal was to find out where people were around their thoughts around AI, their fears around AI, if they had them, to really do a good assessment and talk to people across business lines to find out where they are and what they needed. literacy is the foundational concept. There wasn't really a definition, even going through and looking to see what is AI literacy. It depends who you talk to how it's actually defined. So to operationalise it, we turned it into a competency framework that answered the questions of What do we want our workforce to understand? What do we want them to be able to do? And who do we want them to become in this new world with AI? So those questions really led to creating this framework to drive all upskilling, reskilling of how we look at AI and how we can embed it into our workflows.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah. And how did you go about doing this analysis work, creating the framework, understanding where people were at? What did that look like?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. A lot of it is research informed. I personally have a fond appreciation of those researchers that have been in computer science for decades and really understanding and working with technical experts of what AI, what drives it, what do people need to know, what are the foundational understandings that the workforce needs. And so there's research out there that actually informs those questions, the answers to those questions. The other aspect of it with ten thousand people, it's difficult to just send out a survey right a readiness assessment survey as wonderful as that would be if that would work. What we did, this is where change management comes in, you do a little bit of stakeholder mapping and identify who are those that are adopting AI, interested in adopting an AI, who are not interested in adopting AI, who's already using the tool that we have, and let's talk to them and get their insight and start to actually have that conversation similar to an interview or a focus group

and create a readiness assessment from that. Certain themes came out. It's not an exact science, but certain themes came out that created what I'll call learner personas. And although these are not to be static learner personas, where everybody falls into this category, it kind of gave us a continuum to look at. This is the breadth of where our workforce is. And so we're going to have to have multiple different pathways of learning. There is not just one size fits all approach, especially with AI. So we started to use that readiness assessment, those learner personas to inform learning pathways. Again, all aligned to that competency, AI literacy competency framework.

Michelle Ockers:

I have so many questions. This is such interesting work. Let me go back for one moment. You said you did research and there are sources out there. If people are listening to this episode right now, are there any particular sources you would recommend if they're thinking, I'd like to access some of that research? How might they go about doing that? Where do they go for that?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. I shared a number of, it's updating every day. In the States, if you go to Google Scholar, I'm sure it's similar to anywhere else that has access to Google Scholar. Look in there and see what the latest research is showing you. Put in the search bar terms around AI user enablement, AI literacy. There are so many wonderful researchers, but there's not one in particular that I could point to.

Michelle Ockers:

I think that's a great tip.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yeah, it's evolving. What we did last year and what it says now, the research is ongoing. So I would use that as a tip to keep looking at what that latest research says.

Michelle Ockers:

Excellent. Thank you. The learner personas, you know, many listeners will be used to working with learner personas and they're often structured around roles or seniority levels or something like that. What was the construct that fell out for your learner personas for this particular purpose? Like what was different across the personas? How did you name the personas?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. There were three distinct, really four, but because of AI literacy itself, we struck in our infancy. Now we're moving on to AI fluency. But when we started with the literacy framework and just meeting people where they are, that was kind of our mantra. We noticed three distinct personas and perspectives that came out of talking with people. The first we'll call a worker, so just general term, it's someone in the non-distinct field that hears about AI, maybe is curious about it probably a little bit hesitant if you look at an adoption framework those are those latent adopters that are waiting for everybody else to do a little bit more, hesitant waiting for everyone else to pick it up and see what happens, not necessarily fearful but could be. There's just no

sense of real urgency to pick up the AI tool. Where I'm at is perfectly fine, I hear about AI, I'll wait until it actually impacts me to pick it up. The second group is like an AI professional. They're not a technical expert. They could be interested in the technical side of things. However, they are interested, they're picking up the tool they're not really sure where to or how to use it, where to go to get more information, they potentially could be going off and trying to research for themselves to find out more about AI but the desire is there and they are adopting, they might just need guardrails, maybe some empowerment and influence in how they do that for their support. And then the third is, really those that look at, those are the innovators and they look at AI much like I'm sure they do with other things as the strategic advantage. They are the ones that are trying to really operationalise, innovate, make it work for the business, which is fantastic. And we want people to do that. We actually had a little bit of a different approach for each of those three personas. They weren't necessarily role-based. However, as you move more into that strategic realm, there is some seniority that comes because the experience comes with how do I be more strategic with this tool. So there tended to be more seniority in that bucket, in that persona. However, it wasn't a necessity. It wasn't like we said, these are, we're doing this by role and by level. We took the roles and levels out of it and really looked at where somebody is on their journey in the continuum.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, that makes sense. So before we dig into what did the pathways and solutions look like, you said one other thing, you say such interesting things. Your phrasing is really interesting, Christine. You talked a little earlier about seeking to understand, or one of the things you needed to find out of the needs analysis was what do people need to know about AI? What do they need to do with AI? And who do we want them to become? Such an interesting idea, such an interesting phrase. Tell me a little bit more about your thinking around who do we want them to become and how you kind of responded to that question. What does that look like? What does that mean?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. One of the things that came out of that area was the necessity of being a collaborator. So culture itself is very important with AI adoption, how different countries adopt in their cultural norms, and all of that is definitely involved in AI adoption. But just looking at each company, an organisation is a living thing, it has its own culture. So when looking at that culture, Are we more competitive versus are we more collaborative? What is it going to necessitate to make people the kind of adopters we want them to be? And does that mean that the culture is going to have to shift? So if we want people to be exchanging ideas and to doing experiments with each other and having this element of co-creation, well, that means it's going to take cross functionality to make that happen. So we have to be mindful of the cultural shift that we're asking folks to do when they adopt AI. So that's all about culture, that last question.

Michelle Ockers:

Right. And in your case, was it a matter of fitting your approach to the existing culture or were there some elements of culture that you needed to tackle shifting along with, you know, providing individual learn like pathways for that individuals could embrace? How did you tackle that kind of cultural piece on the initiative?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

The initial initiative, when we just wanted people to embrace AI and adopt it and understand the safeguards, one of the cultural pieces that came out was those that wanted to just go. I want to run full steam ahead. And the way that we approached that is to include those people into our strategic plan, make a plan for how we're going to engage them so that we're not telling them, no, we're not cutting off access. We're saying run along with us, don't run ahead of us. We love the enthusiasm. So making a place for those people and being really deliberate around empowering them with knowledge and having them work alongside of us is part of that framework. Their user enablement groups, change champions, like all of those things started to evolve. And that is part of learning. So, that social learning aspect, having those people lead sessions with their team, but giving them the resources in order to do it, that still is a part of that AI literacy. And then moving, they're the ones that are actually going to help us get everybody to be absolutely fluent and be the innovators that we want them to be.

Michelle Ockers:

Great. So, were they drawn from people who sort of fitted into that innovator persona?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Correct.

Michelle Ockers:

Excellent. That's a really good example of the value of the personas, right, and how they generated some thinking about how do we engage and involve the different groups. So, let's move on to the learning solutions you developed. What did the learner experience look like?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

So going back to the question that you asked, it is really important to support people, meet people where they are and what are they used to. So for those that are used to having modules, having courses, those were created. The courses are, there's not many of them, but it covered all of the competencies that were in the curriculum that we have built and it answered all of the questions of what do we want people to understand? What do we want them to do? Who do we want them to be? At a very foundational level. They were designed as low barrier and high flexibility, really resources for the more hesitant learners or somebody who didn't have a lot of time so they could be accessed continually and referenced whenever they need to with a lot of resources embedded. That was one of one of the curriculum outputs. For more curious advanced users, we developed intensives, so cohort-based experiences, social learning, live workshops. We leaned into that peer influence, those who are already experimenting, making them, like I said, a part of that enablement network gave them a shared language and really started to get use cases and let them start to experiment and move from there using, again, all of the things that we want them to understand, do, and who we want them to be. We also experimented with non-traditional formats. So one of the things that came out, which I thought was really interesting, was an AI escape room. So putting a little gamification in some of the

options. So you have your traditional pathway, you have one that's more social and experimental, and then you have really something more gamification and fun. So we're trying to have multiple modes of engagement and flexibility for those pathways.

Michelle Ockers:

And how did people respond to the different pathways? You know, maybe just talk us through, for those in kind of the work persona, what was the uptake like on the resources and modules? And did you find people moving once they kind of done the initial more traditional pathway? Were people moving into one or other of the other pathways?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

People's preference drove and is still driving the path on which they're taking. We're noticing that they aren't stepping out into other areas that they're not necessarily used to. Social learning is a great opportunity, though, to actually start to shift and get people to do different things. So, for example, when we had a workshop, a use case workshop, and people were joining, some participated, but they could only participate so much because they were a bit overwhelmed. They would rather, they're comforted by having all of the information in front of them that they can review and the modules were safer for them and that's okay because that's how they needed to be supported. As they got the support they needed, they were much more apt to try something else. So, preference always led and then curiosity, I think, got the best of folks and wanted to kind of switch pathways. And the pathways are there could just really have multiple modes of engagement. And it's flexible, as I said. So it isn't like you're on one path, and that's the path you stay on. It's really just making sure we're hitting the continuum of what people need.

Michelle Ockers:

I like the individual choice to meet people where they're at, to motivate them and arouse curiosity and give them somewhere else to go. It's a really nice feature of the way that you've approached this. So talk to us a little bit more about kind of in that social or experimental approach, how you encouraged and supported experimentation? What was the scaffolding around there? What was needed? Or was it a matter of people got to a certain point and then they were kind of almost semi-independently experimenting, developing use cases? What was the level of support and scaffolding around that?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. I have to commend the AI team, so our technical experts, that really, this is where it goes beyond learning, but also embedded into learning, that technical side of AI really walked alongside the learning side as we're trying to get people to adopt. So they put in a lot of work identifying how they could walk alongside and work with people that were interested in experimentation. So no one had to experiment alone. So if they wanted to go to a workshop and having a use case led by their leader, meaning the leader of their business and their department that is a non-technical expert and creating use cases there is where they're comfortable, then there's something for them. If they wanted to do something a little bit more innovative and they had an idea, there's a pathway to submit ideas and work with technical experts to the idea, see if it has merit, how could it be created, should it be created, and be a

little bit more iterative, experimentative, along with a technical expert. So there is a pathway of those that are really, really innovative to not have to do that experimentation alone.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, great. So you're creating kind of an environment for people to apply in, to build their skills, into practice things, to see where it goes, but with support available for them, which I love. Did you need to do anything special or particular? to engage people leaders? You've got people going through these different pathways. Was there any particular approach taken to people leader engagement?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. The literacy framework and where it started was meeting people where they are, giving them the support they need to have adoption. From there, we want to move people to fluency, where it's embedded in their workflows. So that's about where we are now. And with that, the feedback that comes from moving people from literacy to fluency in their adoption reveals what people need. However, outside of that, there's a different conversation that happens with leadership. That is a more strategic conversation and sort of a different pathway that's carved out outside of the overall workforce adoption. It's been a challenge. And luckily, there's people who are really leaders and trailblazers in getting AI adopted. However, that is not something, in my opinion, and from my experience, that can be perfectly encapsulated and put into this AI literacy fluency box. I think that's a different beast that needs to be addressed in a strategic plan, a higher level of who are we as a company when it comes to AI versus who do we want to be as a workforce when it comes to AI.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, I understand. So it feels like the fluency stage is all about taking this literacy and moving people from kind of experimenting and exploring to actually starting to embed it in their work. Is that kind of the goal of the fluency stage?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yes. So the goal of the fluency stage is my work looks different than it did before because of AI. There's fundamental differences, although the tasks are the same, but how I get my work done. And then it frees me up as a worker and a professional to think more strategically or be more innovative and be more creative because the automations and some of the things that I'm looking at my workflows and embedding AI into it, the nature of my work changes because I'm using AI to help me find those strategic areas.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah. And I imagine as with AI literacy, that there's already kind of a mixed, like a range of levels of fluency, that there are probably some people in your organisation who are already very fluent, already using AI as a part of their daily workflow. Whereas, you know, others are having to build that literacy before they become fluent. So you're really trying to support and enable people at all different stages across literacy and fluency, Christine.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yeah, that's correct. Really rewarding work. It takes a lot of feedback to ongoing assessment to ensure that we're supporting people where they are and what they need.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah. Let's go back to the gamification piece, the AI escape room. I hear very mixed reports from people in organisations, L&D professionals using gamification and does it work, doesn't it work? What was the experience like and what was the uptake like around that and how did it add value on top of the traditional and social and experiential approaches?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

I am more of a, this is where a bias as an L&D professional can enter into where you go with building a curriculum. Gamification, I've seen it work in the past. I was hesitant. However, if I am to support my clients who are internal, and I'm going to support my team, so the L&D professionals that are designing and creating, and they have made a case to say that they think that this has value and it adds to the collection of wonderful learning experiences that we have created, I gave full support. And however, in my mind, I was thinking, I don't know what value this is going to add, but I'm going to trust my team.

Michelle Ockers:

I would have been right with you. That's so interesting, isn't it? That our own bias has come into it. And sometimes we have to kind of go with, let's see what happens. Let's get curious about this. So what did happen?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. Oddly enough, what came out of it was it piqued people's interest. So a lot of the curiosity was piqued. We have a developer on our team who is just fantastic. So, actually DevLearn, which is a conference that is being held in October. The escape room is going to be presented there. So, there's going to be the escape room. And the wonderful developer, James Brack, who developed this escape room, will be showing that work. So, in that regard, the outputs and the impact are the outreach and the interest that other industries and other people are going to see. It piqued the interest of the people inside the company of like, ok, this is low risk. This is just for fun. I'm just going to tool around in this escape room. Which gave them kind of dipping the toe into that adoption of, okay, this is not really for any purposeful reason, which again, which is why I was like, what purpose is this for? But that was the exact reason why it piqued people's curiosity and what made them feel safe, because it was for fun. So I think it was a great addition. So not only is it externally being recognised, but internally, it is that awareness piece, and that curiosity piece, and that low risk approach. If you don't get out of the escape room, nothing happens. It's okay. It really did add to the whole continuum of all the learning experiences we designed and developed.

Michelle Ockers:

I think it is an interesting approach. It is an interesting approach. I've done an episode before around gamification. I'll pop a link to that in the show notes around gamification and game mechanics for people who want to explore that. And I would encourage those who are going to DevLearn in the US in October to take a look at that. So what were some of the biggest challenges you encountered and maybe one or two challenges and how you address those with this initiative?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Sure. As I said, one of the challenges before I alluded to that leadership enablement is different. That's a different byline than L&D. So having a conversation within that stakeholder map with leaders. Sometimes it's best through a learning lens. And sometimes it's best through education. And sometimes it's best if strategic plans and those who are at those levels have a different kind of support, which is where the IT team and those that are on the governance committee and all of those, that's where those conversations are happening. So L&D doesn't necessarily have to tackle every conversation. However, those conversations need to happen in order to make training work, right? Because we need leadership buy-in, we need their voice, we need their support. So that was one of the challenges, and knowing that you can build the most wonderful curriculum and the best training, you need leader support to really get it adopted and moving. Aligning the existing curriculum, the framework, the competencies with the momentum that is going on. As I said, we didn't have, surprisingly, resistance was not one of the things that came out of our assessment. Really having a good governance framework and guardrails and avenues for access of those that are really wanting to accelerate their adopter, the early adopters, those that are wanting to charge ahead, those trailblazers. Preparing for them is another aspect of creating a curriculum around AI that I suggest they're going to definitely need different support and engagement. So that's something else I would contend with.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, thank you. And was there anything you had to adapt or change about the learning pathways and learning experiences as you started rolling out and seeing what was happening?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yes. All of the learning that we create, all the learning experiences, whether it be a module or an escape room or a workshop, there's feedback loops built in. So we're checking in with those participants to see, are they adopting? How are they doing? What did they get from the learning experience? Is there something else they needed? We had one example is when one of the use case workshops that was created, my team members joined that workshop to observe and see how it is going. So, all of our learning experiences that we're creating are iterative. We're having eyes on. We're getting the feedback. Because we know that people's needs are changing. AI is changing. So we have to really have those feedback loops built into those learning experiences so that we can keep assessing, keep monitoring and keep evolving.

Michelle Ockers:

Okay. How long has it been since you rolled out the initiative, since you started actually having the learning experiences available to people?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

We started rolling out December of 2024 and then slowly drip fed all the way through the past six months plus.

Michelle Ockers:

Right. So rollout started around nine months ago. In that time, what has shifted in the business that you think this program has influenced or had some impact on and how have you measured that? How do you know that these things have shifted?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Yeah, so that's a great question. We are still tracking typical AI adoption metrics, usage rate, time saved, course completions, requests for training. The other measurement that we are starting to look at is what's behind those numbers? How many new ideas? How many cross-functional projects? What's the language that's being used that didn't exist nine months ago? So through those touch points and in those learning experiences, through resources that are being used, conversations that are happening, spaces that are being created and utilized to be more innovative, experimental, cross-functional. We are looking at that as not necessarily a causation, but a correlation, the evolution and the support from the curriculum.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, and I think that idea of correlation or what is changing that we may be contributing to without having to prove causation opens us up to actually be more confident in having business-focused conversations around what's moving and how might we be contributing to that. So kudos for doing that. I like the idea of linking this to kind of innovation, what's changing in people's work, what's changing with cross-functional projects and so on. They're good indicators. So Christine, what advice would you give other L&D leaders and their teams who are seeking to build AI literacy in their enterprise?

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Map where you want to go. And even if you don't know exactly where it'll lead you, where do you want to be? And create that roadmap to success. And then meet people where they are. Really find out where people are, what their barriers are, perceived or otherwise, and start to remove those barriers to adoption to really get them to move across the continuum. Include them in the journey. embrace experimentation, capture the insights that aren't just strictly automations and ROI, but the innovation, the who do I want that person to be? Can we find a different way to measure that? Use that as a measure of success, and use any feedback that you gather to drive the evolution. Because what you dreamed of, or what you thought the end was, when you begin with the end in mind, and it might not be the end, you might go way past where you thought you wanted to go.

Michelle Ockers:

Yeah, fantastic. I'm really struck by a couple of things. One is the change management approach and the way that's influenced and shaped the approach, the way you've grounded this in people's reality and understood and connected to where people are at and worked across the organisation with other teams to provide people with different pathways and support to actually become more literate or if they are at kind of a more advanced stage to embrace and involve them in shaping things. And also the other idea that I'm really struck by or thing about your work that I'm really struck by is the continuous improvement approach and evolution. So, you know, maybe we'll talk in another 9 to 12 months, Christine, and see where you've taken this. It's an interesting body of work to be able to follow. So thank you so much for your generosity in sharing this so that others can think about their own endeavours with building AI literacy in their organisations. It's been an absolute pleasure.

Christine Gaynor-Patterson:

Thank you for the opportunity, Michelle. This has been wonderful.



Learning Uncut are learning and development consultants that help Learning and Development leaders and their teams become a strategic enabler so that their businesses can thrive. We work in evidence-informed ways to drive tangible outcomes and business impact and are strong believers in the power of collaboration and community. We specialise in helping to build or refresh organisational learning strategy, update their L&D Operating Model, enable skills development, and conduct learning evaluation. We also offer workshops to shift learning mindset and practices for both L&D teams and the broader workforce – as well as speaking at public and internal events.

Learn more about us [at our website](#).

About your host, Michelle Ockers



Michelle is the co-founder and Chief Learning Strategy at Learning Uncut. She is an experience, pragmatic organisational learning strategist, L&D capability builder and modern workplace learning practitioner. She also delivers keynotes, workshops and webinars for learning and broader professional or workforce groups at both public and in-house events.

Michelle received the following prestigious industry awards in 2019:

- Australian Institute of Training and Development Dr Alastair Rylatt Award for L&D *Professional of the Year – for outstanding contribution to the practice of learning and development*
- Internet Time Alliance Jay Cross Memorial Award – *for outstanding contribution to the field of informal learning*



Find Michelle on [LinkedIn](#)