Atlas III Design Action Steps

After our call yesterday, I thought it might be helpful to put something in writing that explains our way forward and decisions we need to make.

We know we want to create a robust learning experience that is interactive and highly relevant to the target audience. We know the schedule is fluid and will be so until September perhaps. Given what we know, we need to create a program that can adjust to schedule changes.

We need to decide what leadership skills will be most relevant to the target audience and prioritize them so if we need to drop something, we have already determined the level of importance. We also need to decide what approach we will take for the program. Below I will explore both of these decision points so we can make an informed decision.

Leadership Skills:

The questions that I sent out before the Kobe session turned up some interesting information that fit nicely into a four-block leadership model displayed below. Keep in mind there were a total of 12 responses to my questions. Based on the responses these were the patterns of needed skills that emerged.

Taking a more holistic view of the multiple roles played by ALAC leaders

Leader

Driving vision and motivation

- Leadership mindset
- Community-wide mindset
- Change leadership

Coach

Building team member knowledge and skills

- Onboarding and Talent development
- Coaching and feedback
- Leveraging strengths



Managing information and time to create measurable results

- Setting goals
- Delegation
- Knowledge management

Facilitator

Creating connections and building relationships

- Managing meetings
- Networking across community
- Policy development



We need to determine if this is the direction we want to go in and, if so, is this the model to use. Look closely and ask yourself:

Atlas III Design Action Steps

- Are the roles played by At Large Leaders aligned with these four quadrants? Are there other roles? Do we need to rename?
- Are the actions of those roles correct as charted? Do we need to add other actions? Do we need to reword?

These decisions will give us a skill set to work with and we can determine what can be derived from ICANN Learn resources and what to address face to face in November. We need to keep the model simple so it is memorable and easy to take in.

Methodology:

We talked about using a Case Study Approach or a Scenario Approach. I realized that I was using these terms in what might have been a confusing manner. So perhaps some explanation:

Case Study Approach: In this method we create an At Large Case Study that would be used as a basis for the program. We create a backstory; the when, where, who, and what of the situation. We make up characters that will be played by leaders and participants depending on the activity. We make up situations arising from the case information that present challenges to participants. In this approach, participants work in learning teams when doing case work. The case work aligns with the skills we are practicing. Participants receive pre reading before the November meeting so they are familiar with the case and our approach. During the program I deliver the skills, frameworks, or models that they will be practicing and when they go to practice in their teams they are using the case as the context for practice. The culmination is some sort of presentation of their recommendations on Day 3 to the case characters played by ALAC Leaders or others designated by them.

Scenario Approach: This is similar to a case study but not as in depth. A scenario approach is simply using customized scenarios for specific breakout and plenary activities. We use this approach in the Leadership Program since participants come from different SO/ACs. The scenarios we design are based on what activities I decide to use for skills practice. In this approach it is easier to mix up the groups for different activities since they are not working on solving a larger problem that is linked throughout the program. They are still practicing the skills and solving problems but the problems are distinct from previous problems with no prerequisite knowledge.

After our discussion and since we don't know the final schedule I lean toward the scenario approach. It would give us flexibility to drop activities without impacting a larger context like a case study. It would also allow us to move skills around in the agenda due to changing time constraints that may arise later as the agenda solidifies. Also, it is less work for the WG sub group. The sub group will need to help create the scenarios once we know how many we need and for what skills they will be used. The program will still be very interactive and fun it is simply a different way to approach the content.

If we agree; then the next steps are to decide on the leadership skills that we will address in the program. Let me know your thoughts on the skills and the approach.