

https://edmentum.atlassian.net/wiki/spaces/XT/pages/5154406514/Design+Technology+Collaboration





Court Crawford

these options are selected based on the strategic significance of the opportunity. Ideation vs Satisficing.

Court Crawford

Question templates unique to different roles for XD lead to use with each Enabler (including all XD roles) that clarifies what kind of *input* is being requested and, critically,

what the lead designer

| confirmation biases by providing a diversity of perspectives, ideas, and information. BUT collaboration also creates the potential for: Design by Committee: Too many cooks in the kitchen: | specific process and roles to: Avoid groupthink by requiring individual contributions during information gathering Limit micromanagement by directing Enabler input | listen to, for what inputs? What are the stakeholders'\enablers subject matter expertise/ scope of influence? Data Science: is the required data available? | solution violates a long- term principle, or when a local solution will introduce user confusion in other areas of the application outside that solution, it is XD's duty to change short-term local | of design principles and then design within appetite/budget. Even if we question whether we agree with | | | | What if we have little to no data at this stage? David Straight | what we have within the appetite and budget of decide to adapt the constraints to support data gathering. We will gather data on an ong basis anyway, but we have opportunity to basis anyway. |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Conflicting priorities and micromanagement slow down or stall progress. Groupthink: Amplified biases; diverse perspectives are squelched for the sake of group cohesion. | towards specific, limited, helpful questions Accelerate timelines by limiting 'choice' activities to only essential participants Court Crawford | Efficacy: does the data proposed for inclusion in the design accurately reflect our best science regarding high fidelity deployment of Edmentum products? PO: monitor for eventual | solutions in favor of more global principles. This might be more expensive today. Not doing so will be far more expensive tomorrow in lowered user ease leading to lower renewal rates. | the principled pattern or guideline in a specific instance, it makes sense to align to it anyway. We can reflect on the guideline itself outside of that instance. Then, if necessary, change all future decisions as a | | | | | incorporate feedback or rely on success crit and baselining. There will be points w we stop incorporating feedback. Court Crawford |
| | | PO: monitor for eventual input on feasibility within budget. Identify front-end engineer which UXD can partner with in the solution design phase. PdM: can we secure a commitment to measure UCSM and iterate on the design based on the result? PdM: what are the business requirements of the design solution, stated in a measurable way? LD: does the scope of this effort impact the student experience? If so, identify a LD partner for the solution design phase. PdM, UXD, UXW, what research questions do you need to be answered to increase confidence we're creating a solution that meets user's needs? | | result. Court Crawford Warning Flag: Will we always move forward or might we decide not to move into solutioning or completion? Would we ever decline to move forward because we can't find a way forward? or defer and plan to come back when more data, appetite, or budget is available to implement a more valuable solution? David Straight | Resolution: Escalate to management if there is significant risk. At any critical junction we could assume the alternative to move to the next phase is escalate to management if the outcome of that phase suggests significant risk. Then there would be a reflection on the constraints established in the scoping document, cost/benefits will be weighed, and a decision reported back to the team. | Our approach to the solution phase would be to try to consider multiple possible solutions that provide different levels of value or different approaches to providing that value, but all must address the UCSM. Then we discuss how to right size. The idea being that with some amount of exploration we might have a better idea of what we are willing to commit to now and later. Which might mean we don't always say yes, when we shouldn't. | Warning Flag:What happens if the representative for a particular enabler role changes in the middle?Like a different PDM, UXD, etc takes over?Do we have to re-establish everything to that point? Or do we commit to what was previously established at each decision point till that moment?David Straight | Resolution: we must commit to their predecessor's decisions. It will be incumbent on the XD feature lead to inform the new participant what has already been decided and is therefore out of scope for discussion. If the new participant objects, recognize it will blow up the budget and escalate the matter to management. David Straight | |
| | | Court Crawford | | Warning Flag:Edmentum culture currently doesn't know about and therefore align with the guiding principles, therefore they can't accept that the principles are foundational. We're at risk of running endless loops of people pleasing. | Resolution: A road show is a deliverable Court can help contribute to while David evolves the principles. Principles are central to evolving the position of XD as advocates for the user (as opposed to order takers for PdM and other stakeholders). | David Straight | | | |
| | | XD Management (MGT): | | | David presenting to the XD & IPS Team at our team | | | | |
| | | Who does XD need to listen to, for what inputs? | | | David Straight | | | | |
| | | stakeholders'\enablers | | | | | | | |
| | | subject matter expertise/ scope of influence? | | Warning Flag: | Resolution | | | | |
| | | Data Science: is the | | What if there is conflict | The controls are | | | | |
| | | required data still available? | | among enablers about the | appetite. If the projected | | | | |
| | | Efficacy: does the data | | can't align? | is), then infinite iteration is | | | | |
| | | included in the design accurately reflect our best | | How do we know when to | tactlessly as possible, we | | | | |
| | | science regarding high fidelity deployment of | | David Straight | exhausted our budget, or | | | | |
| | | Edmentum products? | | | until the feature lead and enablers feel further | | | | |
| | | PO: what is the probability the design will be | | Warning Flag: | iteration will yield insignificant | | | | |
| | | buildable within the PdM defined appetite? Does | | What if things take longer than expected? | improvements. | | | | |
| | | the front-end engineer have confidence the | | | As to conflict amongst enablers about the design | | | | |
| | | solution is buildable? | | Devid Otraint | details, the RACI established prior to the | | | | |
| | | PdM: is there any | | David Straight | kickoff should clearly delineate lanes of | | | | |
| | | no longer meets the | | Warning Flag: | expertise and who's consulted and who's | | | | |
| | | market need? | | We keep looping and can't | informed. | | | | |
| | | PdM: engage with stakeholders (probably | | How do we recus formula | David Straight | | | | |
| | | ELT, not enablers), partner with UXD to present the | | How do we move forward? | | | | | |
| | | design, partner with UXR to present the evidence. | | David Straight | | | | | |
| | | solicit buy-in from stakeholders if you feel it | | | | | | | |
| | | is necessary. Note, | | | | | | | |

stakeholder/enabler input

is best captured as business requirements, not ui suggestions.

PMO: it might be a good