

EVENTS & TIMELINE

Triggers the facilitator throws into the meeting

AUTHORS

Gesellschaft für Informatik

deRSE

Julian Dehne  

Florian Goth

Jan Phillip Thiele

Jan Linxweiler

Anna-Lena Lamprecht

Maja Toebs

AFFILIATIONS

Gesellschaft für Informatik

deRSE

For the facilitator. These cards steer the dynamics of the role-play. You throw them in one after another during the running meeting – verbally, as a printed card handed to a role, or via chat/note. Each event deliberately stresses a different competency of lateral leadership. You don't have to play all events: E1–E4 are the core, E5–E7 are reserves for fast or large groups.

RECOMMENDED TIMELINE (30-MINUTE ROUND)

Give the groups enough time – negotiation needs room to breathe. The time markers below are meant for a 30-minute round and can easily be stretched; only throw in a new event once the previous one has been *worked on* (see pacing notes below).

- **Min 0–7 · Opening**
Robin (RSE) opens, presents the goal & framework, begins gathering requirements. *No event yet.*
- **Min 7 · Event E1 — Data protection**
First stress test as soon as the meeting is running.
- **Min 13 · Event E2 — Conference deadline**
Pressure from above while Robin is still sorting things out.
- **Min 18 · Event E3 — Doctorate emergency**
A competing priority from within the team.

● **Min 23 · Event E4 — Resource loss**

The plan has to be adjusted.

● **Min 27–30 · Landing**

Facilitator announces “3 minutes left” → the group secures its results. *Only sprinkle in E5–E7 if there is time/energy.*

THE EVENT CARDS

E1 · CORE ### Data protection sounds

the alarm The data protection officer gets in touch: the video recordings of minors are not stored in a legally compliant way as things stand. New consents and an anonymisation pipeline are needed before work on the video data may continue.

Who introduces it: facilitator (call) or role 5 (partner school).

Stresses: communication · conflict resolution · planning under constraints

Expected conflict: unplanned scope vs. “but that was already settled”.

E2 · CORE ### The conference deadline

Petra (PI) announces enthusiastically: the project should be presented at the specialist conference in 8 weeks. The abstract (4 pages) is due in 2 weeks – with *first results*. “I’m sure we can manage that – and tell me what you need for it!”

Who introduces it: role 2 (Petra / PI).

Stresses: leading upwards · the power of language (convincing, not pressuring) · self-leadership

Expected conflict: “first results” vs. “data model first”.

E3 · CORE ### Doctorate in trouble Mara

needs a special data export this week for a dissertation chapter – otherwise she misses a submission deadline of her own. “Just the table, quickly, it’s really no big deal.”

Who introduces it: role 3 (Mara / domain).

Stresses: mindful leading of others · prioritisation · expectation management

Expected conflict: urgent individual request vs. a sustainable platform.

E4 · CORE ### Resource loss Two pieces

of bad news: the requested student-assistant funding has been cut, and Tobi is largely unavailable for two weeks during the exam period. A planned task slips.

Who introduces it: facilitator + role 4 (Tobi / student assistant).

Stresses: structuring the work · expectation management · conflict resolution

Expected conflict: commitments from min 0–15 suddenly become unrealistic.

E5 · RESERVE ### The partner school

wavers Sabine makes it clear: without a simple dashboard that shows the school the learning progress of *its own* classes, the school management is considering pulling out of the study. Without this school, important data is missing.

Who introduces it: role 5 (Sabine / partner school).

Stresses: stakeholder communication · negotiating without power · scope

Expected conflict: external benefit vs. research roadmap.

E6 · RESERVE ### Buy instead of build? A

reviewer has noted that one should check whether a commercial tool might be cheaper than building it in-house. Petra would like a short market analysis by next week – curious, not pushy: “Maybe we don’t need to build all of this ourselves – what do you think, Robin?”

Who introduces it: role 2 (Petra / PI).

Stresses: the power of expert knowledge · arguing on the merits · self-efficacy

Expected conflict: the very justification for the whole undertaking is on the table.

E7 · RESERVE ### “Just find the

interesting patterns” Mara wishes: “The platform should automatically show us the interesting patterns in the learning trajectories.” When asked about criteria: “You just recognise them.”

Who introduces it: role 3 (Mara / domain).

Stresses: requirements gathering · the limits of what is technically feasible · questioning technique

Expected conflict: a vague expectation vs. a decidable specification.

PACING NOTES

- Don’t overload. Only throw in an event once the previous one has been *worked on* (not necessarily *solved*). The goal is friction, not overwhelm.
- Dock onto roles. An event works most strongly when the facilitator passes it *to the fitting role* and that role presents it out of its own interest.
- With strong groups combine E5–E7 (e.g. E6 right after a self-assured plan – this tests the RSE’s self-efficacy).

- With groups that have stalled, leave out an event and instead pose an *open question* to the RSE via a role (“What exactly do you expect from me, and by when?”).