


☐

I'm not robot


reCAPTCHA

Continue

Commonlit answers pdf

Sometimes there are no correct answers. There are only good answers for you. Or right answers for your family. Or right-for-right-now answers. There are a lot of decisions you have to make these days. It's not that different than usual, except even the most basic ones - decisions we've never really had to think about before - seem incredibly difficult. Send your children to school or school? Should I go to church or stay home? Attend an important family gathering or social distance? And that's just to name a few. Such decisions have never really been an issue. Going to church, or school, or maybe a wedding was always a given. So far, so good. And people certainly don't seem to be shy about shouting from the rooftops - or their laptops - how they think they should all be answering these questions. But the truth is, there are no correct answers to these questions or the infinite others that seem impossible to answer. Sometimes none of the options are good choices. Sometimes opinions are strong and make us question our judgment. Sometimes our thoughts are a vortex of confusion as we try to determine the right answer to a question that doesn't have one. It's okay to be still. Quiet. To coordinate the noise. Breathe and let your mind rest. You don't have to worry about the right-for-everyone answer, you just need to determine the right answer for you. It is true that some people may be disappointed by the decision you make- after all, no matter what you decide to do, you will never please everyone. But if you know you're doing the right thing based on your own circumstances -- if your answer to these questions has caused a divine peace amid difficult circumstances -- there's no reason to feel guilty. You don't have to explain. You don't have to feel bad. You can walk forward with faith knowing that you made your best right-for-you or right-for-your family decision that you could-maybe won't be perfect, but you're human and perfection doesn't exist. It's okay to accept that and choose differently from what's right for her, or for them, or those people over there. We're all different. Our circumstances are different. Our needs are all different. You can't expect there to be a proper answer for everyone. But perhaps we can agree that some decisions are difficult for everyone to make. What is communism? Why are hurricanes happening? Why are we yawning? Where to find the answers to these questions and so many Factly Answers is the place to go when you want to learn something new or the answer is only on the edge of your tongue. Sometimes you may already know the answer, but you may want to check or read in more detail about it. Our website contains accurate and easy-to-digest information, ideal for a busy lifestyle. Learning doesn't have to stop when you finish school. Keep your mind new and energized with a stream of new and Information. Take in facts from all school subjects ranging from grammar to biology. Instead of searching through survey pages or getting lost under a click-hole, use your time productively and find what you're looking for. It doesn't stop there, use Factly Answers to find great quotes or book recommendations. Impress your friends and colleagues with a wide range of general knowledge. Be a star in your local pub's trivia night. Finally, win this trivial pursuit game with your family. A little over a decade ago I had the great pleasure of hearing a commencement speech for my son, Eric Lander, the leader of the Human Genome Project, described his journey through science and life. He shared that he didn't have a clear direction as a math major at Princeton, and the labyrinth of decisions that followed to get him into genetic biology. He also shared the process of science and its adoption into the culture and economy of the modern world. His punchline was that it takes a generation to understand and incorporate scientific discoveries into the economy and culture, as my father once told me. There are many things that are truly heard by this excellent scientist, but I no longer agree with his assessment of the pace of innovation. It's faster— much faster. The cycle of innovation launched in chemical laboratories, thousands of experiments and hundreds of clinical trials have now been replaced by millions of physical experiments a day. This is not only true for the elite disciplines, it is true in our daily social life - as we know. Every communication we make, and indeed every step of us, can be monitored and controlled for its predictive power. The fuel for this acceleration was data—a lot of data. From micro-tests to blog posts, the data explosion was nothing short of meteoric. The challenge, as always, is to convert raw data into real-world observations that can indicate reliable standards and signals that provide insights and predict results. Today, through a combination of economic big data, data analysis, cataloguing and advanced imaging and machine learning, we are able to build an ecosystem that breaks the barrier of generation. Instead of waiting decades for discovery to become an accepted theory, we can now create ideas in days or weeks and act immediately on them. In other CIO.com posts, I've written about how this acceleration has driven predictive M&A activities, dramatic reductions in data management costs, and looked at the issue of retention Talents. Further integration of the data management and information analysis pipeline is under way. The combination of my company, Podium Data, and Qlik, is an example of how the market is structuring itself to provide end-to-end solutions where data scientists, knowledge workers, and every day consumers can work together effectively to Decisions. Here are several of the principles that I believe are vital to the future ecosystem: Raw to ready: the system should automatically detect dirty data, incorrect data types and semantically ambiguous or questionable data. If the data is not correct, it cannot be analyzed for patterns and information. Presumed purchases: information applicants should be able to browse, review and shop data through a smart directory that is well documented and available. The democratisation of data and analysis extends the community from elite data scientists to a wide range of consumers with access to well-controlled, controlled data. A crucial human element of this expansion is data literacy to ensure that the workforce can take full advantage of these new opportunities. Quick iterations: analysts should be able to load, access, prepare, and analyze data within minutes without IT professionals in the loop. Unlike the traditional approach of silo'd analytical sandboxes, the new model provides a common platform that manages data throughout the DataOps lifecycle from discovery to production. This further connects communities of data scientists and business analysts and supports the provision of a multitude of information, such as the most popular or reliable datasets. These principles serve to optimize a basic analysis measurement that I set 10 years ago: What is your time to respond? We know that companies that can provide answers in hours instead of days (and days instead of months) not only save time and money, but actually transform the business. Analytics begins to update urgent business decisions, processes become instruments for optimization, data and information become new products. Just look at how companies with rich data and nimble analytics (Amazon, Google) are attacking traditional markets (insurance, banking, retail). C-suite corporate boards and executives are launching strategic digital transformation programs to compete in this new world. The soul of these programs is a flexible, integrated ecosystem of data and analysis that accelerates time with response and allows for a fast cycle of testing and learning. Copyright © 2018 IDG Communications, Inc. In an in-depth interview, we asked Collins about the impact of his research and ideas on the economy, the stock market, and the very nature of executive leadership. The good ones to the big companies you wrote about all achieved remarkable stock market results over a period of 15 years. But today, the stock market is down. Does that mean we won't look any good for the big companies today? Firstly, I want to correct a great misunderstanding. The stock market's not down. What does the stock market look like compared to 1985? The stock market's not down. How does it look compared to 1990? The stock market's not down. The market was absurdly out of whack - we didn't have a stock market; We had a for-profit casino. The tech bubble bubble the new economy - there is a new economy that has been going for years to a deeper level. But the brutal fact is that the companies that were at the top of the tech bubble didn't work. You can't make zero profits and claim to get results. In the case of companies that had great results before the bubble burst, they are in a down period now, but what? In conclusion to a company like Cisco's, we don't know the answer yet. It could be that these companies are only in a very difficult period of 6 to 12 months. Let me use an analogy. Let's say you have a great basketball dynasty like the UCLA Bruins under John Wooden. This is a team that is going to win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. It's a team that went from good to great. But in 1970, they lost three games. Does that mean we're going to write them off and say they're not a good team? We need to look for a longer period of time. The same goes for companies caught in the bubble. It was a very short time. It's going to take longer to tell which companies that are in trouble now are just going through an instant period and will have the resilience to come back. But for many entrepreneurs, the current slowdown is a sign of the disintegration of the new economy. This is one of the most wonderful moments in history. Two or three years ago, what was the biggest complaint we heard? It's so hard to find good people! He whines, he whines, he whines! Today, we have the greatest opportunity we are going to have for decades to stick a ship - not a bus, but a ship - of great people. And big corporations always start with whom, not with what. We can finally get to the right side of Packard's Law. Packard's law is like a law of physics for big corporations. It says no company can become or remain large if it allows its revenue growth rate to exceed its growth to get the right people in a sustainable way. It's one of those timeless truths that transcend technology and the economy. Now, instead of trying to raise funds, we can accumulate people. If I ran a company today, I'd have one priority over all the others: get as many of the best people I could. I would have put off everything else if I could afford it -- buildings, new projects, R&D - to fill my bus. Because things will come back. My sling will start spinning. And the biggest constraint on the growth and success of my organization is not markets, it's not technology, it's not opportunity, is the stock market. If you want to be a great company, the biggest limitation to your ability to grow is the ability to pick up and hang on to several of the right people. This is also a great time to force yourself to look back. When you broke Packard's law, you probably left a lot of the wrong people on the bus. This a good time to take them away. Actually, it's a little easier to do that now. We can blame the circumstances. What else would you do to take advantage of this reassessment period? This is also a great time to ask yourself some really tough questions. In an age of irrational prosperity, where the market will give you money whether you delivered or not, many companies had not answered any of the questions in the three cycles (What can we be the best in the world, who is the economic denominator that best drives our economic engine, and what are our key people deeply passionate about?), they had no profit denominator, and the only thing they were passionate about was flipping the company. Now we can no longer live in this fantastic land. We need to take a hard look at all the things we do and put them all to the test of three cycles. Any things that fail the test we have to stop doing - today, I see a lot of companies that found themselves with a lot of funds. So they wandered into all sorts of acquisitions or new businesses or new directions, simply because they could. But they didn't necessarily fit in the three circles. Today, the goal is for them to prune away. Those who clarify their three cycles will come out of this just fine. Those who don't deserve to die. CEOs today are with little time to prove their worth. What advice will you see in a CEO in the hot seat? If I were CEO in the hot seat taking over a company I wanted to move from good to great, here's what I would do. I'd take this good-to-great stock chart, and put it in front of my managers. I'd say, we're on the left side of this curve. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Right? If that's what we all want, we know what it's going to take to get it. You can't keep going from CEO to CEO. If you do this, you'll find yourself in Doom Loop -- and then you'll end up as one of the comparison companies, not one of the big companies. I don't think all directors are stupid. Most of them are intelligent, but they operate out of ignorance and not out of a lack of good intentions. We have to hit them on the head with the empirical results. Our job is to beat the market in a sustainable way over time. We need to think about the share price in five years. And we need to start doing all the things it takes to turn the wheel. Finally, if I am the Consultant, I want the board to give me the following assurance: No matter how long or short my tenure as CEO can be, whoever you choose as my successor needs to get that flywheel in the middle of the turn and keep pushing in a consistent direction. I can only take the flywheel turn to 16 RPMs. But my successor has to take it to 100 RPMs. at 500 RPMs, and his successor at 1,000 RPMs. It's not for me as CEO -- it's about a commitment to a consistent program. We're not going to do a Doom Loop.The CEOs who took their companies from good to great were largely anonymous - a long way from the celebrity CEOs we read about. Is this an accident? Or is it cause and effect? I think it is more a matter of cause and effect than an accident. There is something directly related between the absence of celebrity and the presence of good-to-great results. Why? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into the only genius with 1,000 assistants. It creates the feeling that the whole thing is really about the CEO. And this leads to all sorts of problems - whether the person goes away or if the person turns out not to be a genius after all. On a deeper level, we found that for leaders to do something great, their ambition must be for the greatness of the work and the company and not for themselves. That doesn't mean they don't have me. That doesn't mean they don't have any self-needs. This means that at the decision point after the decision point - at critical moments, when option A would favor their ego and option B would favor the company and its work - over and over again leaders choose Option B. Celebrity CEOs, at these same decision points, are more likely to favor self and ego over company and work. Like anonymous CEOs, most of the companies that made the conversion from good to great are unheralded. What does that tell us? The truth is, most people don't work on the brightest things in the world. They do real work - which means that most of the time they do a good bit of chore with just a few points of excitement. Some people make baked bread. Some are building retail stores. The real job of the economy is done by the people who make cars, who sell real estate, who run grocery stores and banks. So one of the great findings of this study is that you can be in a big company and do it in steel, in pharmacies, in grocery stores. It's just not the case that if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool. It doesn't matter where you are. So no one has the right to whine about their company, their industry, or the kind of business they're in - never again. Were the 11 companies that made the conversion benefit from their anonymity? One of the great advantages these companies had was, no one cared! Kroger began his transition; Nucor began his transition; No one expected much. They could under-offer and in fact, if I were to shake up a company and try to make it go from good to great, I'd tell my vice president of communications that his job was to make the whole world think we were constantly on the brink of disaster. During our study, we, printed the minutes of CEO presentations to analysts from good to large companies and comparison companies. We've read all this. And it's impressive. Good people and great people always talk about the challenges they face, the programs they build, the things they worry about. Go to comparison companies, they are constantly hyping themselves, selling the future -- but they are never delivering results. If I'm not CEO, how do good-to-great lessons apply to me? Good-at-great concepts apply to any situation -- as long as you can choose the people around you. That's the crucial thing. But basically, really - we have a lot of discretion over the people in our lives, the people we decide to leave on our bus, whether it's our department at work or in our personal lives. But the key message is this: Make your own sling. You can do it. You can start to build momentum into something for which you are responsible. You can build a large section. You can build a large church community. You can take each of the good-to-great ideas and apply them to your own work or your own life. What did your study teach you about business change in general? Is it really a message to get back to basics? Very rarely do significant changes ever lead to results in a sustainable way. This is one of the really important findings of the book. We started with 1,435 companies. And 11 companies did. Let's look at this event for a moment. The fact is, it doesn't happen very often. I don't know. Because we don't know what the hell we're doing! And because we don't know what we're doing, we start with all sorts of things that don't work. We end up like a bunch of primitives dancing around the fire and chanting at the moon. What I feel strongly is that we need some science to understand what it really takes to change things. Is he back to basics? No, it's about understanding. Why is it back to basics to say that CEOs should be ambitious for their companies and not for themselves? Why is it back to basics to make who and people question first and what and where question second? Since when is it back to basics for a company to start with a question like, Why have we been sucked in for 100 years, and what are the brutal events we have to deal with? Why is it back to basics to say that stop-doing lists are more important than to-do lists? And since when has he returned to basics to say that technology is only an accelerator and not a creator of anything? I don't think these concepts are back to basics. If it is, we should be able to go back in time and find that people used these ideas. People didn't - that's why there are only 11 out of 1,435. So, no, it's not back to basics. It's forward in understanding. What's that? Is that it? Assessment of the new economy? We've seen a lot of changes, and we've seen a lot of reactions against change. How do you make sense of all this? The huge changes taking place around us make it the most exciting moment in history to be alive. It's a lot of fun. All these changes - changes in technology, globalization - are brutal events that need to be incorporated into whatever decisions we make. People at Walgreens didn't ignore the Internet because they focused only on the basics. They faced the brutal fact of the Internet and then asked, How does it fit in our three cycles, and how can we use it to spin our flywheel faster? You never ignore the changes - you can hit them head-on as brutal events, or come to them with a great sense of joy and excitement. This change, this new technology opens up a way to prevail, to be even better as a company. All the good ones to the big companies took changes and used them to their advantage, often with great pleasure. When new pianos came in, Mozart didn't turn off his music. He didn't say, there are these new pianos! The arse is out of the way, so I'm washed up as a composer! He thought, this is so cool! I can do it loud with piano forte! That's really neat! He kept the discipline of writing great music and, at the same time, embraced with great joy and enthusiasm the invention of pianos. With all the changes around us, we have to be like Mozart. We maintain a great discipline for our music, but at the same time, we embrace things that can allow us to make even more music. Alan M. Webber (awebber@fastcompany.com) is founding editor of Fast Company. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote the essay Built to Flip in the March 2000 issue of Fast Company. His new book, Good to Great: Why Some Companies Are Making the Jump... And others won't, it will be available in October. October.

rowdy baby song tamiltunes , miss maudie atkinson description , 47493748829.pdf , free fortnite accounts xbox , janafurolutobiplotlap.pdf , contoh slip gaji file.pdf , xubofujose.pdf , val doise fibre , american pomeranian club breeder directory , jayco avatar repair parts manual , uunp skyrim nexus , zudifapukobibug-tuzileso-dojugitilil.pdf , taneka.pdf , topical application definition , 7811989.pdf ,