Summary Report

Planning Stage

Training Objectives

The overall idea with this section was to outline overall objectives, however there wasn't much depth compared to how it could have been should another method be used. This step of the process could be improved greatly by having a mind-map diagram, having extra objectives listed and a decision process shown, or having an overview of some of the main topics in the target area and rating which ones are important for delivery. I'm happy with the 4 objectives I came up with, however, as I feel they accurately represent the overall issues around the subject area.

Todo more?

Audience Planning

The audience planning that I focussed on for this plan overall relied on 2014 US census data in the IT industry overall, so I ended up making some generalisations based on information from 5 years ago. I mentioned in the planning documents that using gender and age aren't the best determinants for whether or not people have different life experiences or level of understanding, however the lack of prior knowledge about the group as a whole makes finding out the best solution to this problem fairly difficult.

I didn't properly mention the different learning style information that we were given, specifically the "15% of visual learners, 10% aural learners, 5% reading/writing learners, and the rest kinaesthetic". This would have helped tailor the specific workstations to have a mix of different delivery styles.

Format and Techniques

Teams link very well with the split station format and room layout and having a competition at the end fits very well into the pre-existing group dynamic, adding to a competitive sense and team identity. This section of the report easily could've showed a few other options for format, using a problem-solving model or a mind-map to plot out some potential solutions. While I'm very happy with the option I chose, I could've done more to show how exactly I got to this solution demonstrated. As well as this, I could've added in some opinions from my peers about my solution, hearing potential opinions and critiques of the method produced.

Room Layout

This links with the previous topic of format and techniques very closely. The room layout diagram produced shows only 6 seats for each team, however it's easily scalable should the groups get any larger. As well as this, it can be scaled up to having 4 groups and fit into a larger room. The only real constraint regarding the room layout is the amount of time the event goes for, as having too many stations in half an hour would reduce the quality and quantity of what's taught.

The room layout demonstrated shows the ideal solution to the issue, with any other possible solutions not leaving space for the stations or the introduction/questionnaire at the end. This could've been better illustrated, however.

Feedback

This section again didn't have much room for different options, as the solution was clear-cut. The options decided on were direct interaction at the stations that the groups rotate through, as well as having a segment at the end with a deposit box for anonymity.

Uses of IT in the event

Again, a simple section, listing all the potential uses of IT during the event. I didn't use a formal structure like a mind map, however I did list everything I could think of as a potential use-case.

Presentation Time Plan

Given the invariability of the length of the event, this section didn't have many options for the time plan. I tried having a 10-minute introduction but having 5 minutes for the quiz at the end wasn't nearly enough, and there were no contingencies should the event run over in any of the sections. The layout of the diagram is unique, using colour coded elements to represent which team is in each station at a time.

Problem Solving Models Analysis

This section of the planning materials lists four of the problem-solving methods that I researched, along with the steps involved for each, as well as a small feasibility analysis for each of them. I didn't list positives and negatives for each model, however I think it's clear that some of the models fit better in this scenario than others, given how the SSM Model in particular is designed to be as verbose as possible to help with writing reports for evidence of problems being solved. The GROW Model had issues with some of the steps being redundant in this use-case, and the PDCA Model relies on having the ability to perform tests regarding the feasibility, rather than an analysis.

Overall, I chose the OODA Loop as it was the most relevant to this project. The choice worked well, as it allowed for listing of objectives and studying what each problem involved. The most important part of this, I felt, was observing and orienting, as it allowed for proper visualisation of the issues involved and understanding of *why* the different solutions needed to be applied.

Accessibility Handout (User Guide)

Serving as a simple mock-up of a handout that would be given to people in the event, this page outlines some of the major decisions regarding accessibility changes that I've decided on, quickly and easily showing the differences while using some of the information discovered; non-justified line width, near-monochromacy using a dark colour, and a large font size (compared to the small handout size). This handout features simple wording which I feel helps convey the information presented, however it could easily be more accessible. I didn't use a dyslexia/colour-blindness specification for it, which could be remedied by reproducing the document with specific specifications in mind.

Accessibility Analysis

Using the OODA Loop was ideal in this situation as it allowed for research and determining factors related to each accessibility point. The observe step being the research worked incredibly well, with orienting

being empathising and understanding, determining what is required for each condition and how it relates to the presentation, with deciding and acting being reserved for finding and implementing the solutions.

The overall decision process involved listing potential solutions and comparing feasibility. The decisions around dyspraxia were simple and so didn't need much consideration, however the other two benefitted from having a step entirely for deliberation and consideration. The dyslexia segment was interesting as it involved listing recommendations from a style guide and considering how those would be helpful for legibility was very informative.