DT- Week-3

L1   Empathise Tips
- customer persona creat" → storytelling map (customer journey map)
- then, you get list of problems → HMW (how might we) questions
- look at the entire story from the customers/user pov. → document their experience
- put a camera on that person's head → and watch from their pov.
- take different variety of personas. → learn from more & more types of people
- emotional + intellectual pts. (sad, neutral, happy is enough)
- open and flexible mindset.

L2   Empathise Problems
- problems have been captured by the insights (observa")
  - ↳ Spends too much time on phone, mindless snacking (not good for health), inclination to play outwards, etc.
  - ↳ Parents are impt. stakeholder in this process.
- list of problems should be consistent with the customer journey map.

L3   Empathise HMWs
- we need to solve this.
  - |↳ How to solve this? ✓✓
  - ↳ brain tries to solve the problem
- HMW → neat & simple tool to convert problem statements into problem questions.
  - → it ↳s the brain power remarkably.
- do not answer them right now, wait, first analyze them

L5 Guest Interac^n - Automobile Sector - Ravi Matrai (Ford)

- Ford has been existing for around 118 years now, revolutionized the automobile sector, 1st commercially viable automobile, good cultural ethos, etc.

- Passion and commitment in all the employees, transform from manufacturing to more of a digital company, data is present everywhere

- slowly ford's initiative towards electric cars, bit late becoz Tesla is the undisputed leader in this.

- design thinking, multiple leadership sessions
    └→ human-centric problems → what the customer wants vs the budget to reach that plan.

- they follow agile methodology (gen.- 2 weeks itera^n)

- multiple initiatives are going on so communica^n is key, use tools like webex, Jira, etc.

L6 Make a Statement

What Makes a Good Problem Statement?

A problem statement is important to a Design Thinking project, because it will guide you and your team and provide a focus on the specific needs that you have uncovered. It also creates a sense of possibility and optimism that allows team members to spark off ideas in the Ideation stage, which is the third and following stage in the Design Thinking process. A good problem statement should thus have the following traits. It should be:

- Human-centered. This requires you to frame your problem statement according to specific users, their needs and the insights that your team has gained in the Empathize phase. The problem statement should be about the people the team is trying to help, rather than focusing on technology, monetary returns or product specifications.
- Broad enough for creative freedom. This means that the problem statement should not focus too narrowly on a specific method regarding the implementation of the solution. The problem statement should also not list technical requirements, as this would unnecessarily restrict the team and prevent them from exploring areas that might bring unexpected value and insight to the project.
- Narrow enough to make it manageable. On the other hand, a problem statement such as , "Improve the human condition," is too broad and will likely cause team members to easily feel daunted. **Problem statements** should have sufficient constraints to make the project manageable.

What are "How Might We" statements?

Source: https://dscout.com/people-nerds/how-might-we-statements

"How Might We" (HMW) statements are small but mighty questions that allow us to reframe our insights into opportunity areas and innovate on problems found during user research.

They are a rewording of the core need, which you have uncovered through user research and help teams focus on user needs and problems, rather than just jumping straight to solutions. These statements help inspire user-centered design!

Why are they called "How Might We's?"

- "How" suggests that we do not yet have the answer. It allows us to consider multiple avenues for innovation and reinforces that we are still exploring the problem and solution space.
- "Might" emphasizes that there are many different paths we can go down when thinking about solutions. This allows for open-minded creativity and brainstorming and thinking about the problem from multiple perspectives. This "might" is where innovation becomes part of the process!
- "We" immediately brings in the idea of teamwork. "We" should all work collaboratively to come up with a joint understanding of the problem and put our heads together to come up with a joint solution.

How might we write "How Might We" statements

People have been using HMW statements for years to spark innovation, but they can be done incorrectly, just like many other models. How can something so open-ended go wrong?

First, HMW statements can be too broad and vague:

- How might we redesign our website to make it better?
- How might we make our app more usable?
- How might we innovate on weather apps?

The problem with vague and broad HMWs is that they give minimal direction or inspiration. These statements are meant to spark ideas you can later test with users. Without any focus, where should you start? A good HMW statement helps you focus on solving a problem.

HMW statements can also be too narrow:

- How might we make our app's add to cart experience more functional?
- How might we make the perfect weather app by telling people the weather before they wake up?

- How might we make children less hyper during school by extending recess for 20 minutes?

When HMW statements are too narrow, we lose all the incredible, innovative ideas that can come from them. With too much focus, we are stuck on one particular solution already. We want several different ideas to test at the end, so focusing too much on one solution will limit creativity and innovation.

So how to do it right? Here are the steps I always take when generative HMW statements:

Step 1: Start with a point-of-view/problem statement

A point-of-view (POV)/problem statement allows you to focus on your users and their needs. From your research, you should identify the essential needs or pain points of your users. You can create this by combining three elements: user, need, and insight into a fill-in-the-blank.

A model to use for this is: user (fill in user) needs to (fill in need) because (fill in insight)

For example, a person expecting their first child (user) needs to set up an investment savings account (need) because they want to plan for their child's future education but are overwhelmed by choice and how to set up a proper savings account (insight)

Step 2: Break down the POV/problem statement

Once you have a POV/problem statement, you can begin to brainstorm How Might We statements. Break the larger problem into smaller, actionable pieces.

If our research showed people expecting their first child need to set up an investment savings account but are overwhelmed by choice, we could break this down into a few areas:

- Helping with choice
- Helping with the process
- Helping with what investment savings account means
- Helping with educating on investment savings accounts

Step 3: Write as many How Might We's as you can

After breaking down the problem statement/POV into smaller chunks, you start writing How Might We statements for each of these ideas.

There is a fantastic model you can use to generate HMW statements, and that is: How might we (intended experience) for (user) so that (desired effect).

Essentially, you put "How might we" in front of these smaller ideas.

- How might we make choosing an investment savings plan easier for expecting adults so that they feel confident in their choice?
- How might we make the process of choosing an investment saving account clear, so future parents are not overwhelmed?
- How might we educate expecting parents about an investment savings account so they are not so confused?

Step 4: Decide on which to move forward

Once you brainstorm as many HMW statements as possible, you can decide what to move forward next.

If you are in a group, you can vote on the one to use, or if you are working alone, you can either poll some colleagues or choose the one you think would be best to explore next.

Some examples

HMW statements may be difficult to come up with sometimes, and you might find it challenging for yourself and others. My best advice is to break the bigger problem down and then start writing HMW in front of every aspect of the problem—it is okay to write some that are too narrow or too broad since you can assess them after. Just write!

If you are still feeling stuck, **Stanford's d.school** suggests ways to make the most HMW by changing the questions' goal. Here are their suggestions, plus examples for you to follow.

POV/problem statement: People who like to listen to podcasts need to be able to easily bookmark or save interesting parts of podcasts while commuting because having to find these points afterward is time-consuming and difficult

- Amp up the good: HMW make an entire podcast interesting for users?
- Remove the bad: HMW present interesting parts of podcasts to users?
- Explore the opposite: HMW make finding interesting parts of podcasts the most exciting part of listening to podcasts?
- Question an assumption: HMW make podcasts more tactile or voice-assisted?
- Go after adjectives: HMW make bookmarking or saving easy instead of difficult?
- ID unexpected resources: HMW use other apps to make searching within podcasts easier?
- Create an analogy from need or context: HMW make bookmarking or saving interesting parts of podcasts like a game?
- Play against the challenge: HMW make searching for interesting parts of a podcast something people want to do?
- Change the status quo: HMW make the search experience inside a podcast more delightful?
- Break POV into pieces: HMW make searching entertaining? HMW make it possible for people to bookmark on-the-go? HMW reduce time spent searching for interesting parts of a podcast episode?