

# How to Hire AI-Native RevOps Talent

How to define, interview for, and evaluate AI-fluent RevOps talent across the analyst-to-VP ladder, plus the role everyone keeps asking about: the GTM Engineer.

# The Three Tiers

We've organized AI fluency into three tiers, adapted from our original GTM AI Fluency Rubric for RevOps-specific behaviors:

## AI-CURIOUS

Has experimented with AI tools but uses them at a surface level. Might use ChatGPT to polish an email, but workflows haven't fundamentally changed. This isn't automatically disqualifying, especially at well-resourced companies where AI tooling is built into the stack.

## AI-ACTIVE

Has integrated AI into daily workflow in meaningful ways. Can walk through specific use cases, explain what changed in their process, and share before-and-after results. They're not just using AI. They're iterating on how they use it.

## AI-NATIVE

Has fundamentally redesigned how they work around AI capabilities. They build systems and workflows (not just prompts), they think about scale and production quality, and they can articulate the compounding impact of their approach.

# FOR REVOPS ANALYSTS AND ASSOCIATES

	AI-CURIOUS	AI-ACTIVE	AI-NATIVE
WORKING WITH DATA	Pulls and formats reports manually. Knows AI exists, hasn't built a workflow around it.	Uses AI to speed up existing tasks: drafting SQL, summarizing a dataset, cleaning a file. Faster at the same work.	Automates the gathering and reconciling so their time goes to interpretation. Builds repeatable workflows that pull, structure, and first-pass the analysis without them in the loop each time.
APPROACHING A PROBLEM	Surfaces the data and hands it up. Waits for a defined task.	Adds interpretation. "Here's what the data says." Will improve a process if asked.	Adds a point of view. "Here's what the data says, here's what I'd look at next, here's the question nobody's asked yet." Spots the manual work that shouldn't exist and removes it before anyone asks.
CURIOSITY AND SELF-DIRECTION	Uses what's provided at work, hasn't gone looking beyond it.	Experimenting at the margins. Tries things without being asked, keeps up with the major tools.	Building on their own time. Tinkering. Has side projects and automations they made because they wanted to, not because the job required it.

# Interview questions to ask RevOps Analyst/Associate candidates about their AI fluency:

1. Walk me through a recurring task you automated. What did you build, what did you use, and what would you do differently now?
2. Tell me about something you figured out on your own in the last six months. What pushed you to dig into it?
3. You've been given a dataset and 90 minutes. Walk me through how you'd approach it.
4. What's the last AI tool or technique you tried that didn't work the way you expected? What happened?
5. What are you building or experimenting with outside your current role?

## GREEN FLAGS

- Talks in workflows and outcomes, not tool names
- Can walk through a specific thing they automated and what it changed
- Came from an unexpected background and is stronger for it
- Asks sharp questions in the interview, not just answers
- Has a story of building something on their own time

## RED FLAGS

- "I use ChatGPT every day" with nothing behind it
- Experience described as a list of tasks owned, not problems solved
- Analysis stops at the output, never pushes toward "so what"
- No evidence of curiosity or building outside assigned work

# FOR REVOPS MANAGERS

	AI-CURIOUS	AI-ACTIVE	AI-NATIVE
GETTING TO A SOLUTION	Starts from the tools they know and fits the problem to them. Buys capability and bolts it on.	Considers building, but defaults to off-the-shelf for anything non-trivial. Can wire tools together when shown how.	Starts from the problem, designs the solution, and builds it. Thinks like a PM: who is the user, what is the job, what's the right thing to ship.
BUILDING IT	Can configure existing tools. Modifications are incremental.	Has built automations that work in the intended scope. Can explain the logic.	Has built things that required real design decisions. Can defend the tradeoffs. Knows when not to build.
EXPLAINING IT	Can name the tools in their stack. Thin on the why.	Can walk a stakeholder through the what and the how.	Can frame the business case and the technical tradeoff in the same conversation. Won't call a build a win without the outcome attached.

# Interview questions to ask RevOps Manager candidates about their AI fluency:

1. Walk me through a workflow you built recently. What was the problem, what did you build, and what did you choose not to build?
2. Tell me about something you built that looked great and didn't work. How did you know, and what did you do?
3. Tell me about a time you had to explain a technical decision to a sales or marketing stakeholder. How did you frame it?
4. You have unlimited AI budget and engineering support. What's the number one GTM pain you'd go solve, and how would you know if it worked?
5. Tell me about a build that required a real design decision. What were you choosing between?

## GREEN FLAGS

- Leads with the problem before the tool
- Can defend tool choices under follow-up ("why Clay and not n8n?")
- Talks about what an automation changed, in numbers
- Has a point of view on when to build versus buy versus configure
- Thinks in scalable systems, not one-off cleverness

## RED FLAGS

- Cool workflows with no outcome attached
- Every answer is about the tool, not the problem
- Can't say why they chose one tool over another
- Hypothetical fluency without real examples behind it
- Random acts of AI with nothing connecting them

# FOR REVOPS DIRECTORS

	AI-CURIOUS	AI-ACTIVE	AI-NATIVE
TECHNICAL DEPTH	Leads on process and people. Defers all technical judgment to the team.	Understands the builds well enough to follow them and ask reasonable questions.	Technical enough to set architecture direction and lead a building team credibly. Understands the build because the roadmap demands it.
OUTCOME TRANSLATION	Reports adoption and activity. Equates usage with progress.	Ties most initiatives to a result after the fact.	Hears "get adoption up," asks why, and comes back with the three places AI is going and the revenue they roll up to. Manages a vague mandate into outcomes.
CREDIBILITY AND CURRENCY	Known to the team, less so to sales. Keeps up with the market sporadically.	Trusted by sales, current on the major moves in the space.	Pulled in by GTM because the team delivers and matches their urgency. Current enough that a major launch in their domain is never news to them.

# Interview questions to ask RevOps Director candidates about their AI fluency:

1. The board says "get AI adoption up." Walk me through what you actually do next.
2. Tell me about a time you were asked to show AI adoption. How did you frame it, and what did you actually measure?
3. Walk me through a technical decision you made in the last year. What were the tradeoffs?
4. Tell me about an initiative you killed or paused because the foundation wasn't ready.
5. What changed in our space in the last month that you're paying attention to, and why?

## GREEN FLAGS

- Reframes an adoption ask into outcomes that roll up to revenue
- Technical enough to lead a build and defend the tradeoffs
- Visibly credible with sales leadership
- Caught up on the latest moves in their domain without prompting
- Talks about the boring infrastructure as readily as the cool workflows

## RED FLAGS

- Treats adoption as the goal, not the means
- Leans on "I'm business-minded" to dodge the technical bar
- No real credibility with the revenue team
- Surprised by a major development in their own area
- All vision, no foundation

# FOR VP OF REVOPS

	AI-CURIOUS	AI-ACTIVE	AI-NATIVE
ARCHITECTURAL VISION	Thinks in headcount and familiar org shapes. Adds managers to scale.	Sees where AI helps and restructures in places. Still defaults to familiar org design.	Designs for the compressed org: senior architects paired with builders, the middle layer justified only where it earns its place.
BUILD VS. BUY JUDGMENT	Buys to solve, builds rarely. Ships standard tooling.	Builds selectively, buys the rest, roughly right on which is which.	Treats build-vs-buy as strategy. Builds the intelligence that becomes a moat, buys the commodity, won't ship out-of-the-box AI that looks like everyone else's.
CAREER PATH AND TEAM	Promotes on tenure and scope.	Mixes capability and tenure in how they level people.	Runs a skills-based ladder: build first, then cross-functional understanding, then design thinking. Advances people on demonstrated capability.

# Interview questions to ask VP RevOps candidates about their AI fluency:

1. Tell me what you think RevOps looks like in three years. What roles exist that don't today? What roles go away?
2. Walk me through the hardest architectural decision you've made. What were you choosing between, and how did you decide?
3. Tell me about a bet you made that most people in your position weren't making yet. What did you see that others didn't?
4. How do you think about what to build versus what to buy? Give me a real example.
5. Tell me about a time the org design you had wasn't the right one. How did you know, and what did you do?

## GREEN FLAGS

- Has a thesis about what the org looks like in three years, grounded in something real
- Talks about what the team is building, not just what tools they're using
- Has made a bet something not everyone was doing yet, and can explain the reasoning
- Treats build-vs-buy as a strategic question, not a procurement one

## RED FLAGS

- Great AI adoption story with no revenue outcome attached
- Managing up to the trend without a thesis underneath
- Ten years in RevOps and the model looks exactly like RevOps ten years ago
- Has never made a build decision, only buy decisions

# What's next?

If you're ready to make the hire and want a thought partner, reach out. We love talking through this stuff.

And if you just want to keep learning, we've got more guides and resources waiting for you at [captivatetalent.com/resources](https://www.captivatetalent.com/resources).

