

What a forest review changes

A forest review is gardening, and it makes exactly three kinds of change. Walking in knowing this keeps the session focused — two to three hours with the team and the lead, not an offsite.

Skills move between ranks. Expectations shift. The skill that marked a senior three years ago — containerised deployments, say — is now table stakes for mid. The review moves it down. Occasionally the traffic runs the other way: a skill turns out rarer and more valuable than assumed, and moves up. Either way, ranks stay honest descriptions of *current* expectations rather than a fossil record of old ones.

Outdated skills retire. The framework nobody uses anymore, the process the org abandoned — cut them. Retiring skills isn't erasing anyone's history; it's keeping the *forward-looking* map clean. A forest cluttered with dead skills makes every read (coverage, gaps, rank progress) a little more false.

Emerged skills join. New tools, new practices, new demands the team now genuinely faces. They enter the forest with prerequisites attached and a rank assignment, so they arrive as part of the map, not a loose sticky note on the side of it.

Two habits make reviews cheap. **Collect as you go** — the monthly check-ins surface most of what needs changing ("this feels outdated," "we keep needing X and it's not on the map"); the review confirms and applies rather than discovers. And **review with the team, not for them** — the people doing the work know first when reality moves, and a forest changed over their heads is a forest they stop trusting.



Revision #3

Created 2026-07-08 16:09:07 UTC by Admin

Updated 2026-07-08 16:38:22 UTC by Admin