ALAC Meeting – 27 March 2018 – Fellowship Questionnaire

Program Goals and Vision

1. What does your group believe should be the objective of the Fellowship Program? How would the success of this objective be measured?

> Integration of "graduates" into the various constituent parts of ICANN as active participants in ICANN activities

2. The Fellowship Program was established to provide access to ICANN meetings to individuals from underserved and underrepresented communities. In your group's opinion, how effective is the Fellowship Program at fulfilling its current goal?

> It is moderately effective in getting people to know about ICANN. Although there have been a number of notable successes, it is more effective at raising awareness than in generating workers.

3. In your group's opinion, is this goal still a priority for ICANN, given the new bylaws? If

not, what new goals would your group propose for the program?

> Yes, it must still be a goal but with a target of measurable success as measured by the AC/SOs.

Assessment of Program Impact on your SO/AC group

4. Have Fellows contributed to the work of your group? If so, where do you think they have added the most value? What might be changed about the Fellowship Program to enhance participation of Fellows in your group?

> At-Large has had a number of great successes with Fellowship alumni. The greatest value has come from the relatively few who have chosen to devote time and energy to ICANN post-Fellowship.

5. Does your group make efforts to involve, educate, and/or inform Fellows about your work? If so, please describe these efforts.

> Yes, but it is rather haphazard. We engage at ICANN meetings, but there is no concerted effort to draw people into our activities.

6. How willing would your group (SO/AC/SG/C) be to participate and take ownership for selecting and developing fellows, including giving them assignments, assigning mentors, etc?

> We are willing to participate. Mentors are possible, but that would presume filtering candidates who have a particular interest in our areas.

Selection Processes

7. Are you aware of the Fellowship selection process? What changes, if any, would you suggest for the selection process?

> Yes, we are willing. Returning Fellows should come with a specific AC/SO/Const in mind and these must be balanced over the organization. This shouldbe accompanied by the identification of coaches from the appropriate group.
>
> The effectiveness of fellows returning as mentors and coaches should be evaluated.
>
> Prospective fellows must be willing to take intro courses on ICANN Learn. If there are not suitable courses there that will provide the needed background, they should be created.
>
> It should be clear that this is not tourism, but a path towards active engagement.
>
> One of the problems may be the categories used in the selection process. At-Large fits best into "civil society" but we do not comfortably fit into the typical model of "civil society".
>
> And lastly, as long as we still have fellows at the public meeting asking questions why ICANN doing nothing to regulate dangerous content, we are clearly not getting the selection/preparation right.

8. An individual can be awarded a Fellowship up to three times. Do you suggest retaining or revising this number? Why?

> We would like to see a study of who (and with how many trips) actually becomes active in ICANN on an ongoing basis prior to addressing this.

9. For Policy Forum Meetings, currently only Fellowship Alums can apply. Do you support continuing with this approach? If not, what changes would you suggest?

> We support it IF there is data to demonstrate that these people participate in the policy activities and do so across the community.

Program Size

10. Considering your responses to previous questions, would you suggest making the program larger, smaller, or maintaining the current size?

> 30 was a very effective group and At-Large supported increasing it. It may be that 60 was overreaching and there are not sufficient available resources (throughout the community) to integrate them.

11. If the program were to be reduced in size, what would your group deem as the priorities for the program with a smaller cohort?

> Migration of Fellows to active participation. This is too expensive a program to use it as purely dissemination of information about ICANN.

Program Structure

12. When you interact with Fellows at an ICANN Meeting, do you find that they are sufficiently knowledgeable about ICANN? If not, what skills or areas of knowledge would you suggest increasing focus on for pre-Meeting preparation?

> It depends on whether they are new or have been to prior meetings.

13. Do you think that Fellows spend sufficient time in working sessions with your group during the course of an ICANN meeting? If not, what would changes would your group propose?

> No, but it would be good to have us submit a list of sessions that would prove useful to them.

14. Do you feel that you have enough time to engage with Fellows at an ICANN meeting?

> Sadly, no.

Information Available on Program

15. Is the information currently available clear and sufficient for your community members to understand the Fellowship Program? If not, which elements could be improved and how?

> A presentation either via teleconference or at an ICANN meeting would be a good start.

16. Are your community members aware of the differences between the Fellowship and NextGen@ICANN Programs? If not, please state what type of clarification would be useful.

> Yes, I believe so.

General Questions

17. The Fellowship Program seeks to engage participants who will go on to participate actively in the ICANN community. What skills, attributes and backgrounds have provided the most successful and active participation in your SO/AC/SG/C? What skillsets and backgrounds would your group see as desirable for candidates for the Fellowship Program?

>   At-Large focuses on issues that impact end-users. A passionate consideration for end-users, those without the knowledge of ICANN, is the key.

18. With which elements of the Fellowship Program is your group most satisfied? What changes or improvements would your group most want to see implemented to the program?

>   We are most satisfied with the relatively small number of people who have gone on to make At-Large their home and productively work with us. We would like to see more!

19. Do you have any other questions or comments about the Fellowship Program?