

Annual State of Learning and Development in Life Sciences

Landscape and Path Forward





Introduction

Learning and Development leaders within life sciences have led and managed change like never before. The global pandemic brought live customer engagements to a halt and an intense focus on using time for enhanced development. To deliver, Learning and Development (L&D) teams had to identify resources to meet the expectations of stakeholders while redesigning and virtually-delivering to learners. In most scenarios, L&D teams were learning at the same time as their audiences. According to 60% of L&D leaders surveyed in the life science industry, **the main driver of their future success is Stakeholder Alignment and Support**.

This study assesses the current landscape of L&D, where it needs to go next, and most importantly, how to get there. TGaS Advisors sent an electronic survey to L&D professionals within life science companies. Questions were designed to measure current-state in relation to best-practice capabilities of Learning and Development organizations.

L&D's key messages to stakeholders about meeting future business unit objectives center on:

- 1. More strategic collaboration and partnership among L&D and stakeholders
- 2. Clear, focused and decisive priorities from stakeholders
- 3. Resources to meet the needs of the business

Question topics included:

Department Management	. 2
Learning Enablement and Operations	. 4
Instructional Design	. 5
Measurement and Metrics	. 6
Learning Technology	. 7
Curriculum Phases	. 8
Customer Engagement Models	. 9





TGaS[®] Advisors

The challenge to L&D Leaders is to attract, develop and retain talent to meet the needs of the organization while also contributing to succession of the broader talent pipeline. Priorities must simultaneously balance requirements of learning audiences, stakeholders and business outcomes.

Though 86% provide Trainer Job **Descriptions/Role Clarity, only 32%** have Career Paths Developed. This can lead to staff burnout, turnover and poor quality. Leaders can begin to address this gap by first designing roles according to stability needed per function as shown in the example to the right.

Capabilities of High-Performing L&D Organizations

Strategic Leaders

Long-Term Stability Developmental

Designing certain roles as intentionally developmental/transitional with others advancing in scope and responsibility balances all priorities.

Capabilities

Designing Roles and Responsibilities





Learning Enablement and Operations

Learning Enablement and Operations functions are often overlooked or absent though they are the engines that keep the L&D Organization (and teams/individuals within) running. Data illustrates the current gaps and need for focused resources in these important areas:

Extent to which L&D Department components are formally developed/available.



The Learning Enablement and Operations function is becoming highly-specialized and requires skill sets not typically found within traditional feeder roles or departments.



TGaS provides clients with current Learning Enablement and Operations job descriptions to assist in recruiting this important role.



Instructional Design

Fortunately, the principles and best-practices of instructional design for professional learning and development are industry-agnostic and guided by neuroscience, though it too requires expertise not typically found within traditional feeder roles or departments. Many L&D teams within life sciences rely heavily on third-party vendors to design (and deliver) curriculum components, though the practice doesn't guarantee adherence to the science. There are several myths of learning theory that are perpetuated by well-intentioned training developers (external and internal).

Myths about Learning effectiveness that have been dispelled: Learning Styles, Learning Pyramids, Music Helps Memory, Need for High-Production Video

Industry benchmark data illustrates the lack of dedicated expertise in Performance Consulting and Instructional Design. This could be the cause of poorly-integrated or non-existent best-practice elements seen below:

Extent to which L&D Instructional Design components are formally developed/available.





Measurement and Metrics

Instructional Design is inextricably linked to the L&D Organization's Measurement and Metrics Strategy. Both begin with clear articulation, understanding and alignment to KPIs (Key Performance Indicators), OKRs (Objectives and Key Results) of the Business Units. Many L&D Leaders aspire to improve the strategies and tactics to capture data that demonstrates efficiency, effectiveness and impact though it remains Sisyphean, largely due to the transformational focus, resources required, and lack of understanding within L&D staff (and often stakeholders).

70% of L&D leaders attribute lack of Staff Capability as the reason for not measuring outcomes or results of L&D

The future calls for evolving Measurement and Metrics beyond surveys and content assessments.

+	Not Available				Partially Developed/Available			Fully Developed and Available			→
	1		2			3		4)	5	A
Surveying Tools/Platforms	5% <mark>5%</mark>	o 18	8%		27%			4	5%		(
Final Assessments	9%	9 %	14%	6	18%			50%	6		(
Measurement & Metrics Strategy	9%	18	8%	%		32%		23%		18%	(
Training for Staff	18	%	9 %		23%		32%			18%	(
Internal Measurement and Metrics Support/Expertise	9 %		23%		32%		14%			23%	(
Calibrated Scorecards (for Certifications, Skills Assessments)		27%		9 %		23%	14%		27%		(
Field Intelligence/VOC	18	%	14%	6		32%		18%		18%	(
Baseline Assessments	2	23%	23%		% 18%		5%	32%		6	(
Effectiveness Metrics: Engagement, Skill Improvement, Behavior Change		329	%		14%	9%	23%			23%	
Cumulative Assessments	2	23%	9	%		45%			9 %	14%	
Needs Assessments		27%		9%		32%			23%	9 %	(
Efficiency Metrics: Activities, Utilization, Scores, Timelines		27%		1	8%	23%	þ	149	%	18%	
Outcomes Metrics: Correlations to Sales, Access, Retention, FCR Ratings		329	32%		14%	4% 27%		27% 14		14%	(
Dashboards for Internal Training Staff Metrics		27%			32%	b	14%		14%	14%	(
Dashboards for External/Stakeholders Metrics			41%			27%		9 %	9 %	14%	(
External/Stakeholders Metrics			41%			27%		9%	9%	14%	

Extent to which Measurement and Metrics components are formally developed/available.



Learning Technology

Operating assumptions of leveraging technology to enhance learner experiences and outcomes include:

- 1. Technology in itself is not a strategy. "Meeting learners where they are through use of technology" is.
- 2. Adults learn more effectively when using active learning techniques.
- 3. Blended learning is more effective than either eLearning or ILT (instructor-led training) alone.
- 4. Digital is here to stay.
- 5. Learning Management Systems (LMS) ≠ Learning Experience Platforms (LXP)
- 6. Personalized learning refers to instruction in which the pace of learning and the instructional approach are optimized for the needs of each learner.
 - Activities are made available that are meaningful and relevant to learners, driven by their interests and often self-initiated
 - Individualized learning: the pace of learning is adjusted to meet the needs of individual students
 - Differentiated learning: the approach to learning is adjusted to meet the needs of individual students
- 7. Adaptive learning: technology used to assign human or digital resources to learners based on their unique needs, scalable, help ensure each employee has the knowledge they need to be effective.
- 8. Competence-based learning: learners advance through a learning pathway based on their ability to demonstrate competency, including the application and creation of knowledge along with skills and dispositions

Inarguably, the global pandemic has shifted expectations of learners, from the point-ofneed availability and access of resources to the experience itself. Current development and availability of Learning Technology seems to be correlated to the level of innovation/complexity of the technology itself. Extent to which Learning Technology components are formally developed/available.

č	+	Not Available	Fully Develo and Avai	able					
			4 5	Average Rating					
	Surveys	9% 32%	59%	4.5					
	Learning Management Systems	<mark>ໍ່ຄ</mark> 9% 23%	64%	4.5					
.1	Single Sign-On	23% <mark>9%</mark>	68%	(4.5)					
	Mobile Device Enablement/ Device Agnostics	<mark>នំ នំ</mark> 14% 18%	59%	4.2					
11	Virtual Training Platforms	<mark>9%</mark> 14% 27%	50%	4.1					
	Learning Experience Platforms	14% <mark>ស្ព</mark> ័ត្ត 32%	45%	3.9					
	Internal Learning Technology Support/Expertise	14% <mark>%</mark> 14% 32%	36%	3.7					
	Gamification	Gamification 14% <mark>14% %</mark> 32% 36%							
g	Centralized Learning Portal	ntralized Learning Portal 9%9% 32% 9% 41%							
	Microlearning	18% <mark>%</mark> 18% 27	% 32%	3.5					
	Curated Content	<mark>9%</mark> 41%	41% 9%	3.4					
	Video Creation	9% <mark>9%</mark> 41%	18% 23%	3.4					
า	Coaching Platform	27% <mark>9%</mark> 9% 2	27% 27%	3.2					
	Podcasts	32% 23%	27% 18%	3.0					
	Video Role-Play	27% 🕺 419	% 18% 9%	2.8					
	Content Authoring	23% 23% 2	27% 23% ິຄ	2.6					
/	Adaptive/Personalized Learning	32% 23%	23% 18% ິ່ງ	2.4					
	Social Learning Platforms/ Communities	27% 27%	32% <mark>9%</mark> %	2.4					
	Animation Creation	50%	18% 9% 23%	2.0					
	Augmented Reality	64%	<mark>ត្ត</mark> ំ14% <mark>14%</mark> ក្លំ	1.9					
	Machine Learning/ Artificial Intelligence	64%	<mark>18% 9%</mark> ຮູ້	1.7					
	Virtual Reality	68%	<mark>14%</mark> 9% <mark>ខ្ល</mark> ំន័	(1.6)					
£									



Curriculum Phases

Just as the pandemic shifted L&D focus from live to virtual design and delivery, equal focus fell upon the new hire curriculum; specifically, mitigating potential risks to the organization of suboptimal Onboarding experiences. Both vacancies and unwanted turnover lower the ROI (return on investment) of recruiting, as well as shift burdens and negative impact to teams and customers. The call to action for L&D teams shifted to delivery of a world-class new hire experience virtually. A change that was executed.

Eighty-seven percent of industry L&D Organizations have fully-developed Curriculum Paths/Learning Journeys with Self-Study and Live/Virtual Instructor-Led components available to new hires. Most also have clear learning objectives, final verbal and behavioral Certifications.

+	Not Available	2	P Develo	artially ped/Availa	able	Fully Developed and Available	
	1	2		3	4	5	
Home Study/Self-Study	14% <mark>5%</mark>	b		8	2%		
Live/Instructor Led	14% 5%	b		8	2%		
Onboarding Curriculum Path/Jouney	<mark>5%</mark> 5% 9%			8	2%		
Learning Objectives: Knowledge, Skills, Behaviors	<mark>5%</mark> 9%	18%			68%		
Final Certifications (Verbal, Behavior, Demonstration)	<mark>5%</mark> 14%	18%			64%		
Orientation (HR/Hiring Manager)	<mark>9% 5%</mark> 9	% 18	3%		59%		
Annual Onboarding Calendar	18%	9 %	23%		5	60%	
Final Assessments	18%	9 %	% 23% 50%			60%	
Cumulative Certifications (Verbal, Behavior, Demonstration)	9% 9%	9 %	32%	b		41%	
Pre-Boarding Phase (Offer Acceptance to Orientation)	27%		23%	14%	6	36%	
Off-Cycle Training Exceptions Policy	14%	18%	23%	,	18%	27%	
Cumulative Assessments	18%	23%		23%	9%	27%	
Baseline Assessments (Knowledge and/or Skills)	27%		18%	14%	9%	32%	
						n=22	

Extent to which Onboarding/New Hire components are formally developed/available.

The future calls for the extending and scaling of investments and expertise in virtual design/ delivery and new hire experiences to Advanced and Continuous Learning. Only 23% of industry L&D organization have a formal advanced curriculum. Other than POAs or Fast-Start events, less than onethird have fully-developed formal Continuous/OnDemand components available to learning audiences.

The extent to which the components are included in your formal Continuous/OnDemand L&D Curriculum?

lly Developed and Available	Ful	Partially /eloped/Available	Dev	Not Available	+
5	4	3	2	1	
		73%		<mark>5%</mark> 9% 14%	Field-Based Meetings (POAs, FAST-Start, etc.)
%	41%	18%	18%	18% <mark>5%</mark>	Third-Party Sources (LinkedIn Learning, Coursera, etc.)
27%		27%	23%	14% 9%	Libraries/Catalogs of Available/Suggested Resources
18%	18%	32%	4%	18% 14	Pulsed Content/Series
14%	18%	36%	9%	23%	Matrix-Based Knowledge Sharing (Cross-team/Function)
18%	14%	27%	14%	27%	Immersive Clinical/KOL Experience
24%	23%	23%	14%	27%	Assigned/Personalized Learning
<mark>5%</mark> 14%	14%	27%		41%	Customized Academic Institution Programs
n=22					



Customer Engagement Models

TGaS[®] Advisors

While the pandemic forced L&D to change and pivot, it also caused radical changes to the company's customer engagement models. Specifically, how Brands interacted with customers and patients in a virtual/digital way. Omnichannel/digital is one of many evolving customer engagements models. Included are selling models, account management models, and coaching models to accelerate both the selling and account management models. Customer engagement model scorecards vary slightly by company size, with all being slightly-to-mostly effective. Impactful customer engagement models have cross-functional leadership, integration and pull-through in common.

Reforms that L&D would like to see in the upcoming year include:

- 1. Clearer vision and alignment to KPIs, Goals and Objectives
- 2. Leadership commitment to resources current and expanded scope: including internal and field-based L&D headcount, new Learning Models, and budgets
- 3. Process improvements and metrics
- 4. Autonomy and Flexibility to design ways of working



As the industry tackles the future of work, the question is not simply "Where should people work?" but more importantly, **"How should people work?"**

Decisions about ways of working can be based on data, specifically, the locations and channels that offer optimal outcomes, whether collaborations or independent activities and tasks. Future of work policies and models for L&D organizations can use data like the following: (n=540)

- » Achievement of Intended Outcomes for Collaborations and individual tasks are 16% higher for remote/ virtual channels than doing the same work from corporate offices.
- » Work-life balance impact ratings are 54% higher when working remotely/virtually vs. in-person/at corporate offices
- » Development impact ratings are 29% higher when working remotely/virtually vs. in-person/at corporate offices
- » Autonomy impact ratings are 38% higher when working remotely/virtually vs. in-person/at corporate offices
- » Connectedness impact ratings are 21% higher when working remotely/virtually vs. in-person/at corporate offices
- » Contribution impact ratings are 17% higher when working remotely/virtually vs. in-person/at corporate offices

How to Use This Landscape Report:

- 1. Recognize each possible response field as a best-practice element of that functional area
- 2. Use the Scorecard to determine your own organization's benchmark vs. these elements
- 3. Use the additional resources to build a business case to further develop your organization's Capabilities

Annual State of L&D in Life Sciences: Scorecard

Best-Practice Elements Developed	Industry	You
L&D Staff Job Descriptions/Role Clarity	86%	
Career Paths Developed for L&D Staff	32%	
Content-related operations are developed, for example – archiving/accessing, content management, templates/frameworks	60-77%	
Processes and workflows: SOPs, Project management, Automated reports/alerts	27-46%	
Knowledge checks/assessments, Rubrics for Behavioral Evaluations, and Learning Objectives are developed	77-91%	
Internal instructional design support/expertise available	37%	
Performance Consulting function or roles	23%	
Alignment to KPIs, G&Os of Stakeholders/Business	50%	
Measurement & Metrics best-practice elements: Strategy, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Outcomes	23-31%	
Virtual platforms, LMSs, Surveys, mobile-enablement, single-sign on, LXPs	77-86%	
Innovative Learning Technology	10-23%	
Advanced L&D Curriculum	23%	
Continuous L&D Curriculum elements (other than POAs)	19-59%	

As always, TGaS will continue to focus on the emerging trends in L&D. Please reach out to any member of the L&D team if you have questions or need additional information about any of the topics discussed in this landscape.



About TGaS Advisors

TGaS Advisors, a division of Trinity Life Sciences is the leading benchmarking and advisory services firm for commercial organizations in the life sciences industry. With a roster of large, emerging and precommercial life sciences companies, TGaS provides robust comparative intelligence and collaborative network membership services. The team includes more than 50 experienced professionals, most with senior-level experience in the life sciences and related industries.

For more information, please contact us at info@trinitylifesciences.com.

Copyright © 2022 Trinity. All rights reserved.