Curriculum

Advanced Product Owner

2020.5-EN-20210422

Table of Contents

Introduction

General information

This curriculum describes what participants can expect in the Advanced Product Owner training and what is part of the Advanced Product Owner certification exam.

Trainers are free to add additional elements to their trainings.

A training course designated as Advanced Product Owner training must, however, cover at least all the topics described in this curriculum.

Goal of Advanced Product Owner Curriculum

The Advanced Product Owner curriculum provides an open-source, framework-neutral training scheme with a corresponding certification.

The main goal of the Advanced Product Owner curriculum is to convey the interrelationships and interactions between methods and tools of agile product management. Participants should be enabled to assess the suitability of these tools and methods for their respective context and to apply them successfully.

Structure of Learning Objectives

The Advanced Product Owner curriculum distinguishes between three levels of competence and three kinds of ability. All three levels of competence are tested in the examination, one third each.

The three competence levels are

Competence Level 1 focuses on specific tools or methods related to the learning objective. At competence level 1, neither combinations of tools and methods nor their relations to the working context are relevant.

Competence Level 2 focuses on the relationships between two tools or methods and the relationship of a single tool or method to the working context.

Competence Level 3 focuses on relationships between more than two tools or methods and on the relationship of combinations of tools and methods to the working context.

The three kinds of abilities are

Knowing something is about facts and figures about a tool or method. The knowledge that may be assessed is, for example, about the elements that make up a tool or the phases of a methods. Knowledge about the history of methods or sources is not part of the examination.

Being aware of something is about being able to anticipate how a tool or method might be used. Anticipation is also relevant when deciding not to use a tool or method. In addition, being aware addresses the consequences of using different versions or templates of tools or methods and of combinations of tools and methods.

Being able to do something is about deciding about or applying tools and methods according to the working context. This can mean both that product owners apply the tools or methods themselves and that they let their team apply the tools or methods.

Out of Scope

This non-exhaustive out-of-scope list includes some topics that are related, but not part of the curriculum.

- Frameworks like Scrum, LeSS, SAFe
- Business strategy and portfolio management
- Business analysis, requirements engineering and requirements management
- Usability engineering and user experience design
- Development and engineering practices
- Deep dives into single methodologies

Preconditions

There are no formal prerequisites that participants need to meet in order to attend an Advanced Product Owner training.

It is recommended to have at least some basic experience in one of the following areas:

- Product management
- Project management
- User experience and usability engineering
- Business analysis
- Requirements engineering and management
- Product development

Design, Duration, and Didactic Methods

The curriculum is designed for a three day on-site or a three day online training.

The curriculum structure follows the connections between the tools and methodologies shown in the Advanced Product Owner Value Chain.

It is not goal of the curriculum to enforce trainers using specific methods for teaching. The didactic methods

should focus on these connections. Therefore, the trainings usually consist of about 80% practical exercises and feedback on the results of these exercises.

1. Understanding Customers

1.1. Related Tools

- Customers

1.2. Outcome

- Persona
- Empathy Map

1.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants are able to distinguish between customers and users
- Participants are able to describe typical groups of customers and users as personas

Competence Level 2

- Participants are aware of which aspects from personas are helpful or necessary for the creation of empathy maps
- Participants are aware of which aspects of customers or users are relevant for the creation of empathy maps in their working context
- Participants are able to decide which persona template best fits their work context or create a specific template for their working context

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to decide whether personas or empathy maps are useful in their working context
- Participants are able to describe the trade-off of using or not using personas or empathy maps in their working context
- Participants are aware of the lack of information when personas or empathy maps are not used in their working context

2. Defining a Business Model

2.1. Related Tools

- Value Proposition
- Inception Deck
- Value Model
- Feedback Loops

2.2. Outcome

- Business Model

2.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know the 9 elements of the business model canvas.
- Participants know the 5 phases of the business model canvas.
- Participants know which tools and methods of the product owner value chain provide valuable feedback for the development of the business model.

Competence Level 2

- Participants are aware at which layer of the product management vacuum model the business model applies.

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to decide which tools and methods provide valuable feedback for the business model in their working context.

3. Satisfying Customer Needs

3.1. Related Tools

- Empathy Map
- Business Model
- Inception Deck

3.2. Outcome

- Value Proposition

3.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know about the 2 perspectives of the value proposition canvas
- Participants know the 3 aspects of a value proposition
- Participants know the 3 aspects of a customer segment
- Participants are aware of the ideal path to complete a value proposition canvas
- Participants are aware of that potential gains for a customer segment are not consciously perceived by the customers

Competence Level 2

- Participants know about the relation between the areas "customer jobs" and "products & services" in the value proposition canvas to the areas "value proposition" and "customer segments" of the business model canvas
- Participants are aware of the consequences whether or not to create different value proposition canvases for different customer segments
- Participants are able to decide for which customer segments a value proposition canvas should be created in their working context

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to identify products and services for the value proposition that are related to the business model in their working context
- Participants are able to distinguish the pain relievers from the gain creators in their working context
- Participants are able to create value propositions for different customer segments based on empathy maps and business models in their working context

4. Measuring Value Creation

4.1. Related Tools

- Value Proposition
- Delivery Kanban
- Feedback Loops

4.2. Outcome

- Value Model

4.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know the differences between leading and lagging indicators
- Participants know the difference between the zone of results, the zone of action, and the zone of impact

Competence Level 2

- Participants are aware of the gain or lack of information that depends on the decision whether or not to use a value model in their working context
- Participants are aware of the leading and lagging indicators in their working context
- Participants are able to derive leading indicators from the value proposition and lagging indicators from the customer segment of the value proposition canvas

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to identify the non-obvious leading and lagging indicators that cannot be derived from the value proposition canvas in their working context
- Participants are able to create a value model for their working context
- Participants are able to use the value model as a tool in feedback loops

5. Understanding the Environment

5.1. Related Tools

- Persona

5.2. Outcome

- Stakeholder Map

5.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know about the four circles of the stakeholder onion model
- Participants know about the two dimensions of the power interest grid
- Participants know about the four quadrants of the power interest grid

Competence Level 2

- Participants are able to create and develop a stakeholder map for their working context

Competence Level 3

- Participants are aware of the political dimensions of stakeholder mapping in their working context

6. Influencing the Environment

6.1. Related Tools

- Stakeholder Map
- Value Proposition
- Roadmap
- Impact Map

6.2. Outcome

- Inception Deck

6.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know about the 10 views of the inception deck
- Participants are able to decide wether to use an elevator pitch or a product box as part of the Inception Deck

Competence Level 2

- Participants are able to select the relevant stakeholders for the Inception Deck from the Stakeholder Map
- Participants are able to decide which Value Proposition they want to use for the Inception Deck or how they want to combine different Value Propositions
- Participants are aware of the relationship and the importance of the target audience in their working context
- Participants are aware of the political side-effects of the Inception Deck in their working context

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to identify and manage the Feedback Loops from the Inception Deck pitches to the Value Proposition and the Business Model in their working context

7. Draft a Plan

7.1. Related Tools

- Inception Deck
- Value Model

7.2. Outcome

- Roadmap

7.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know about the concept of a Goal Oriented Roadmap
- Participants are able to describe goals for the Goal Oriented Roadmap
- Participants are aware of the relationships and dependencies of goals

Competence Level 2

- Participants are able of derive the goals from the Inception Deck
- Participants are able of derive the goals and the corresponding metrics from the Value Model
- Participants are aware of the difference and the relationship between deliverables and goals

Competence Level 3

- Participants are aware of the Goal Oriented Roadmap as a tool for drafting a plan not for measuring success
- Participants are aware of the Goal Oriented Roadmap as an intermediate tool for communication with stakeholders

8. Break Down the Results

8.1. Related Tools

- Roadmap
- Stakeholder Map
- Story Map

8.2. Outcome

- Impact Map

8.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants …

Competence Level 2

- Participants …

Competence Level 3

- Participants …

9. Describe the Solution

9.1. Related Tools

- Impact Map
- Persona
- Delivery Kanban
- Product Backlog

9.2. Outcome

- Story Map

9.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know about the concepts of Story Maps, Backbone, and Walking Skeleton
- Participants are able to use a Story Map for Release Planning

Competence Level 2

- Participants are know how to work with different users in a Story Map
- Participants are aware of the difference between the Walking Skeleton and a Minimum Viable product
- Participants are able to create Story Maps for their working context

Competence Level 3

- Participants are aware of the different ways to use the swimlanes of Story Maps and the effects in their working context
- Participants are able to use Story Maps for near and far future planning

10. Prioritize Development Work

10.1. Related Tools

- Story Map
- Value Model
- Real Options

10.2. Outcome

- Product Backlog

10.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know the difference between a product backlog and a to-do list
- Participants know the concept of the product backlog of options
- Participants are aware of the consequences of having multiple backlogs for one product
- Participants know the concept of real options
- Participants know the 4 attributes of an option

Competence Level 2

- Participants know about the connection between a product backlog and a story map
- Participants are able to describe the different types of backlog items that occur in their working context
- Participants are able to identify the leading indicators that a particular backlog item affects
- Participants are aware of the difference between a prioritised, an ordered and an estimated product backlog and the impact of these different types of product backlos in their working context
- Participants are aware of the difference between tasks and options

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to decide whether or not they want to estimate the effort of backlog items in their working context
- Participants are able to decide whether or not to treat the product backlog as a backlog of options in their working context

11. Build and Deliver

11.1. Related Tools

- Product Backlog
- Delivery Kanban

11.2. Outcome

- Product Increment

11.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know how Kanban looks on processes
- Participants know about Proto Kanban
- Participants know the 7 cadences of Kanban
- Participants know the Lead Time Distribution chart
- Participants know the difference between a feedback-ready product increment and a delivery-ready product increment

Competence Level 2

- Participants are aware of the abstraction level of Kanban and how to embed agile frameworks into the Kanban flow
- Participants are able to define and develop the Kanban workflow for their working context
- Participants are able to define the criteria for a product increment in their working context

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to use the Lead Time Distribution chart for planning with the Story Map and the Product Backlog in their working context
- Participants are able to use the Lead Time Distribution chart for forecasting and defining Service Levels in their working context

12. Managing Feedback Loops

12.1. Related Tools

- Business Model
- Value Propostion
- Inception Deck
- Value Model
- Impact Map
- Story Map
- Product Increment

12.2. Outcome

- Feedback Loops
- Experiments and Tests

12.3. Learning Objectives

Competence Level 1

- Participants know how to describe experiments and tests
- Participants know the five core elements of feedback loops

Competence Level 2

- Participants know how to distinguish between experiments, tests, and feedback loops
- Participants know how to distinguish between latency and cadence in feedback loops
- Participants are able to define experiments and tests in their working context
- Participants are able do distinguish between noise and valuable feedback

Competence Level 3

- Participants are able to connect different tools to valuable feedback loops in their working context
- Participants are able to describe feedback loops in their working context
- Participants are able to apply feedback loops in their working context

List of Learning Objectives

- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 9 Elemente des Business Model Canvas.
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 5 Phasen des Business Model Canvas.
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, welche Werkzeuge und Methoden der Product Owner Wertschöpfungskette wertvolles Feedback für die Entwicklung des Geschäftsmodells liefern.
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, auf welcher Ebene des Produktmanagement-Vakuummodells das Geschäftsmodell ansetzt.
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, welche Werkzeuge und Methoden in ihrem Arbeitskontext wertvolles Feedback für das Geschäftsmodell liefern.
- Participants know the 9 elements of the business model canvas.
- Participants know the 5 phases of the business model canvas.
- Participants know which tools and methods of the product owner value chain provide valuable feedback for the development of the business model.
- Participants are aware at which layer of the product management vacuum model the business model applies.
- Participants are able to decide which tools and methods provide valuable feedback for the business model in their working context.
- Die Teilnehmer:innen wissen, was die Impact Map ist.
- Die Teilnehmer:innen kennen die Elemente einer Impact Map.
- Die Teilnehmer:innen sind in der Lage, eine Impact Map auf Basis eines in der zielorientierten Roadmap formulierten Ziels zu erstellen.
- Die Teilnehmer:innen sind in der Lage, aus einem Stakeholder Onion Diagram die relevanten Stakeholder als Akteure in einer Impact Map auszuwählen.
- Die Teilnehmer:innen sind in ihrem Arbeitskontext in der Lage zu entscheiden, bis zu welchem Detailgrad sie die Deliverables der Impact Map beschreiben.
- Participants …
- Participants …
- Participants …
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 2 Perspektiven der Value Proposition Canvas
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 3 Aspekte einer Value Proposition
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 3 Aspekte eines Kundensegments
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den idealen Weg zur Vervollständigung eines Value Proposition Canvas
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich im Klaren darüber, dass potenzielle Gewinne für ein Kundensegment von den Kunden nicht bewusst wahrgenommen werden
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Zusammenhang zwischen den Bereichen "Kundenaufgaben" und "Produkte

& Dienstleistungen" im Value Proposition Canvas zu den Bereichen "Wertversprechen" und "Kundensegmente" des Business Model Canvas

- Die Teilnehmer sind sich der Konsequenzen bewusst, ob für verschiedene Kundensegmente unterschiedliche Value Proposition Canvas erstellt werden sollen oder nicht
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, für welche Kundensegmente in ihrem Arbeitskontext ein Value Proposition Canvas erstellt werden sollte
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Produkte und Dienstleistungen für das Wertversprechen zu identifizieren, die im Zusammenhang mit dem Geschäftsmodell in ihrem Arbeitskontext stehen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, in ihrem Arbeitskontext die "pain relievers" von den "gain creators" zu unterscheiden
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Wertversprechen für verschiedene Kundensegmente auf Basis von Empathy Maps und Geschäftsmodellen in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu erstellen
- Participants know about the 2 perspectives of the value proposition canvas
- Participants know the 3 aspects of a value proposition
- Participants know the 3 aspects of a customer segment
- Participants are aware of the ideal path to complete a value proposition canvas
- Participants are aware of that potential gains for a customer segment are not consciously perceived by the customers
- Participants know about the relation between the areas "customer jobs" and "products & services" in the value proposition canvas to the areas "value proposition" and "customer segments" of the business model canvas
- Participants are aware of the consequences whether or not to create different value proposition canvases for different customer segments
- Participants are able to decide for which customer segments a value proposition canvas should be created in their working context
- Participants are able to identify products and services for the value proposition that are related to the business model in their working context
- Participants are able to distinguish the pain relievers from the gain creators in their working context
- Participants are able to create value propositions for different customer segments based on empathy maps and business models in their working context
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die Unterschiede zwischen vorlaufenden und nachlaufenden Indikatoren
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Unterschied zwischen der Ergebniszone, der Aktionszone und der Wirkungszone
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich des Informationsgewinns oder -mangels bewusst, der von der Entscheidung abhängt, ob ein Wertemodell in ihrem Arbeitskontext verwendet wird oder nicht
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich der führenden und nachlaufenden Indikatoren in ihrem Arbeitskontext bewusst
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, führende Indikatoren aus dem Wertversprechen und nachlaufende

Indikatoren aus dem Kundensegment des Value Proposition Canvas abzuleiten

- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die nicht offensichtlichen Früh- und Spätindikatoren zu identifizieren, die nicht aus dem Value Proposition Canvas in ihrem Arbeitskontext abgeleitet werden können
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, ein Wertmodell für ihren Arbeitskontext zu erstellen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, das Wertmodell als Werkzeug in Feedback-Schleifen zu verwenden
- Participants know the differences between leading and lagging indicators
- Participants know the difference between the zone of results, the zone of action, and the zone of impact
- Participants are aware of the gain or lack of information that depends on the decision whether or not to use a value model in their working context
- Participants are aware of the leading and lagging indicators in their working context
- Participants are able to derive leading indicators from the value proposition and lagging indicators from the customer segment of the value proposition canvas
- Participants are able to identify the non-obvious leading and lagging indicators that cannot be derived from the value proposition canvas in their working context
- Participants are able to create a value model for their working context
- Participants are able to use the value model as a tool in feedback loops
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die vier Kreise des Stakeholder-Zwiebelmodells
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die zwei Dimensionen der Power-Interest-Matrix
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die vier Quadranten der Power-Interest-Matrix
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, eine Stakeholder-Map für ihren Arbeitskontext zu erstellen und zu entwickeln
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die politischen Dimensionen des Stakeholder-Mappings in ihrem Arbeitskontext
- Participants know about the four circles of the stakeholder onion model
- Participants know about the two dimensions of the power interest grid
- Participants know about the four quadrants of the power interest grid
- Participants are able to create and develop a stakeholder map for their working context
- Participants are aware of the political dimensions of stakeholder mapping in their working context
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 10 Ansichten des Inception Decks
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, ob sie einen Elevator Pitch oder eine Produktbox als Teil des Inception Decks verwenden wollen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die relevanten Stakeholder für das Inception Deck aus der Stakeholder Map auszuwählen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, welches Value Proposition sie für das Inception Deck verwenden wollen oder wie sie verschiedene Value Propositions kombinieren wollen
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich der Beziehung und der Bedeutung der Zielgruppe in ihrem Arbeitskontext

bewusst

- Die Teilnehmer sind sich der politischen Nebeneffekte des Inception Decks in ihrem Arbeitskontext bewusst
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, in ihrem Arbeitskontext die Feedback-Schleifen von den Inception Deck Pitches zur Value Proposition und zum Geschäftsmodell zu identifizieren und zu steuern
- Participants know about the 10 views of the inception deck
- Participants are able to decide wether to use an elevator pitch or a product box as part of the Inception Deck
- Participants are able to select the relevant stakeholders for the Inception Deck from the Stakeholder Map
- Participants are able to decide which Value Proposition they want to use for the Inception Deck or how they want to combine different Value Propositions
- Participants are aware of the relationship and the importance of the target audience in their working context
- Participants are aware of the political side-effects of the Inception Deck in their working context
- Participants are able to identify and manage the Feedback Loops from the Inception Deck pitches to the Value Proposition and the Business Model in their working context
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Unterschied zwischen einem Product Backlog und einer To-Do-Liste
- Die Teilnehmer kennen das Konzept des Product Backlogs von Optionen
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich der Konsequenzen bewusst, die sich ergeben, wenn man mehrere Backlogs für ein Produkt hat
- Die Teilnehmer kennen das Konzept der echten Optionen
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 4 Attribute einer Option
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Zusammenhang zwischen einem Product Backlog und einer Story Map
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die verschiedenen Arten von Backlog Items zu beschreiben, die in ihrem Arbeitskontext vorkommen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die Leading Indicators zu identifizieren, die ein bestimmtes Backlog Item beeinflussen
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Unterschied zwischen einem priorisierten, einem geordneten und einem geschätzten Produkt-Backlog und wissen, welche Auswirkungen diese verschiedenen Arten von Produkt-Backlogs in ihrem Arbeitskontext haben
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich des Unterschieds zwischen Aufgaben und Optionen bewusst
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, ob sie in ihrem Arbeitskontext den Aufwand von Backlog Items schätzen wollen oder nicht
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, ob sie in ihrem Arbeitskontext das Product Backlog als Backlog von Optionen behandeln wollen oder nicht
- Participants know the difference between a product backlog and a to-do list

- Participants know the concept of the product backlog of options
- Participants are aware of the consequences of having multiple backlogs for one product
- Participants know the concept of real options
- Participants know the 4 attributes of an option
- Participants know about the connection between a product backlog and a story map
- Participants are able to describe the different types of backlog items that occur in their working context
- Participants are able to identify the leading indicators that a particular backlog item affects
- Participants are aware of the difference between a prioritised, an ordered and an estimated product backlog and the impact of these different types of product backlos in their working context
- Participants are aware of the difference between tasks and options
- Participants are able to decide whether or not they want to estimate the effort of backlog items in their working context
- Participants are able to decide whether or not to treat the product backlog as a backlog of options in their working context
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, wie Kanban auf Prozesse wirkt
- Die Teilnehmer kennen Proto-Kanban
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die 7 Kadenzen von Kanban
- Teilnehmer kennen das Lead Time Distribution Diagramm
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Unterschied zwischen einem feedback-ready Produktinkrement und einem delivery-ready Produktinkrement
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die Abstraktionsebene von Kanban und wissen, wie man agile Frameworks in den Kanban-Ablauf einbettet
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, den Kanban-Workflow für ihren Arbeitskontext zu definieren und zu entwickeln
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die Kriterien für ein Produktinkrement in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu definieren
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, das Lead Time Distribution Diagramm für die Planung mit der Story Map und dem Product Backlog in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu nutzen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, das Lead Time Distribution Diagramm für die Prognose und Definition von Service Levels in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu nutzen
- Participants know how Kanban looks on processes
- Participants know about Proto Kanban
- Participants know the 7 cadences of Kanban
- Participants know the Lead Time Distribution chart
- Participants know the difference between a feedback-ready product increment and a delivery-ready product increment

- Participants are aware of the abstraction level of Kanban and how to embed agile frameworks into the Kanban flow
- Participants are able to define and develop the Kanban workflow for their working context
- Participants are able to define the criteria for a product increment in their working context
- Participants are able to use the Lead Time Distribution chart for planning with the Story Map and the Product Backlog in their working context
- Participants are able to use the Lead Time Distribution chart for forecasting and defining Service Levels in their working context
- Die Teilnehmer kennen das Konzept einer Goal Oriented Roadmap
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Ziele für die Goal Oriented Roadmap zu beschreiben
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die Beziehungen und Abhängigkeiten von Zielen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die Ziele aus dem Inception Deck abzuleiten
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, die Ziele und die zugehörigen Metriken aus dem Value Model abzuleiten
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich des Unterschieds und der Beziehung zwischen Deliverables und Goals bewusst
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die Goal Oriented Roadmap als Werkzeug zur Erstellung eines Plans, nicht zur Erfolgsmessung
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die Goal Oriented Roadmap als Hilfsmittel für die Kommunikation mit Stakeholdern
- Participants know about the concept of a Goal Oriented Roadmap
- Participants are able to describe goals for the Goal Oriented Roadmap
- Participants are aware of the relationships and dependencies of goals
- Participants are able of derive the goals from the Inception Deck
- Participants are able of derive the goals and the corresponding metrics from the Value Model
- Participants are aware of the difference and the relationship between deliverables and goals
- Participants are aware of the Goal Oriented Roadmap as a tool for drafting a plan not for measuring success
- Participants are aware of the Goal Oriented Roadmap as an intermediate tool for communication with stakeholders
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die Konzepte von Story Maps, Backbone und Walking Skeleton
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, eine Story Map für die Release-Planung zu verwenden
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, wie man mit verschiedenen Benutzern in einer Story Map arbeitet
- Die Teilnehmer kennen den Unterschied zwischen dem Walking Skeleton und einem Minimum Viable Product
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Story Maps für ihren Arbeitskontext zu erstellen

- Die Teilnehmer kennen die verschiedenen Möglichkeiten, die Swimlanes von Story Maps zu nutzen und deren Auswirkungen auf ihren Arbeitskontext
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Story Maps für die Planung der nahen und fernen Zukunft zu nutzen
- Participants know about the concepts of Story Maps, Backbone, and Walking Skeleton
- Participants are able to use a Story Map for Release Planning
- Participants are know how to work with different users in a Story Map
- Participants are aware of the difference between the Walking Skeleton and a Minimum Viable product
- Participants are able to create Story Maps for their working context
- Participants are aware of the different ways to use the swimlanes of Story Maps and the effects in their working context
- Participants are able to use Story Maps for near and far future planning
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, zwischen Kunden und Anwendern zu unterscheiden
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, typische Kunden- und Anwendergruppen als Personas zu beschreiben
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich bewusst, welche Aspekte von Personas hilfreich oder notwendig für die Erstellung von Empathy Maps sind
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich bewusst, welche Aspekte von Kunden oder Nutzern für die Erstellung von empathy maps in ihrem Arbeitskontext relevant sind
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, zu entscheiden, welche Persona-Vorlage am besten zu ihrem Arbeitskontext passt oder eine spezifische Vorlage für ihren Arbeitskontext zu erstellen
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage zu entscheiden, ob Personas oder Empathy Maps in ihrem Arbeitskontext sinnvoll sind
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, den Trade-off bei der Verwendung oder Nichtverwendung von Personas oder Empathy Maps in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu beschreiben
- Die Teilnehmer sind sich des Informationsdefizits bewusst, wenn Personas oder Empathy Maps in ihrem Arbeitskontext nicht verwendet werden
- Participants are able to distinguish between customers and users
- Participants are able to describe typical groups of customers and users as personas
- Participants are aware of which aspects from personas are helpful or necessary for the creation of empathy maps
- Participants are aware of which aspects of customers or users are relevant for the creation of empathy maps in their working context
- Participants are able to decide which persona template best fits their work context or create a specific template for their working context
- Participants are able to decide whether personas or empathy maps are useful in their working context
- Participants are able to describe the trade-off of using or not using personas or empathy maps in their working context

- Participants are aware of the lack of information when personas or empathy maps are not used in their working context
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, wie sie Experimente und Tests beschreiben können
- Die Teilnehmer kennen die fünf Kernelemente von Feedbackschleifen
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, wie man zwischen Experimenten, Tests und Feedback-Schleifen unterscheiden kann
- Die Teilnehmer wissen, wie man zwischen Latenz und Kadenz in Feedbackschleifen unterscheidet
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Experimente und Tests in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu definieren
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, zwischen Rauschen und wertvollem Feedback zu unterscheiden
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, verschiedene Werkzeuge mit wertvollen Feedback-Schleifen in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu verbinden
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Feedbackschleifen in ihrem Arbeitskontext zu beschreiben
- Die Teilnehmer sind in der Lage, Feedbackschleifen in ihrem Arbeitskontext anzuwenden
- Participants know how to describe experiments and tests
- Participants know the five core elements of feedback loops
- Participants know how to distinguish between experiments, tests, and feedback loops
- Participants know how to distinguish between latency and cadence in feedback loops
- Participants are able to define experiments and tests in their working context
- Participants are able do distinguish between noise and valuable feedback
- Participants are able to connect different tools to valuable feedback loops in their working context
- Participants are able to describe feedback loops in their working context
- Participants are able to apply feedback loops in their working context