>> PLIZGA: I will now turn it over to Keyon Smith, and he is going to begin the webinar for us. Keyon?

>> SMITH: All right. Thank you, Stacy, for the introduction. Good afternoon, everyone. Just excited about this webinar. You might be hearing a lot of buzz words Design Thinking is throwing around quite a bit, but now I'm going to really kind of just give you kind of more meaning and make it more of a tangible kind of idea. And hopefully after this it's something you want to kind of take action and want to do more of.
So Human-Centered Design or Design Thinking is interchangeable words, but the basis of it, or the premise of it, is to really put your users or whoever is using your product or your service kind of at the forefront of everything that you do. A lot of times we try to solve problems or tackle issue and we forget about the person who can actually benefit from the solution. And so we wanted to really tackle this or take advantage of this methodology because we – and the OFA grantees, you've got to tackle so many issues. In the case of HPOG we're trying to get folks jobs in the healthcare sector. In the case of healthy marriage, responsible fatherhood. We're trying to help fathers connect with their kids. We're trying to make sure that couples really stay together. And Tribal TANF, really make sure that folks can (inaudible), you know, find employment, really get the services that they need to really kind of move out of poverty. And so we thought a great problem-solving methodology like Design Thinking could be very useful, and so that's why we're just really excited about this.

So, without further ado, I'm going to pass it over to Blair Corcoran, and she's going to walk you through the process.

>>CORCORAN: Okay. Thanks, Keyon. Next slide, please.
You can actually move to the next slide. Perfect.
Okay. As Keyon mentioned, we in OFA were really interested in figuring out if Human-Centered Design or Design Thinking would work in the human service programs that we fund. And we piloted this through the three grantees that we'll be talking to in a few minutes. Before we introduce you to our pilot grantees and talk about their experience, we wanted to mention the particular methodology that we ended up using as part of this project. We worked with a design consultancy firm here in the D.C. area, who's name Mode of Strategies, and we actually utilized their methodology, which is on the screen right now. We're going to walk through it in a few seconds, but, you know, if you Google human-centered design or design thinking, you may find a lot of different methodologies. They may have different terms than the ones we're about to walk through, but they're all about the same thing because at its heart, human-centered design is just a set of tools that places for the empathy for the end user, like Keyon mentioned, at the center of any solution. The tools provide us different ways to test our assumptions about a particular issues without allowing our biases to triumph. This is different from how we normally solve problems. Traditional problem-solving approaches, like deductive and inductive reasoning, utilize declarative logic, encouraging us to jump quickly from problem statement to solution. Traditional approaches can often be singular or done by ourselves as well. Instead, in human-centered design or design thinking, adductive reasoning is employed, and it urges teams of individuals to consider a variety of possibilities instead of a singular solution. The possible

solutions are then tested by clients, those people who are going to use them, who will ultimately help determine which possible solution is the best.

So that's what human-centered design is at its heart, and now I'm going to walk you through each of the steps of (inaudible) model. Next slide, please.

The first step is investigate. As we mentioned, human-centered design is all about empathy. And empathy is all about understanding humans' needs and desires. In this phase you learn about people's needs and desires by conducting interviews and through periods of observation. These activities provide you with a more informed view of the context and environment in which your clients or customers live and work. During these interviews and observations, you should take notes about what you're hearing and experiencing. You do this because even those of us with the best memory may forget some really important comments, body language, or even aspects of the environment that can be important pieces of information for future phases.

And I just want to underline how important the investigate phase is. Because it's only when you understand people's needs and desires that you can create solutions that truly address the root cause of an issue. Next slide, please.

The next phase is called reframe. In human-centered design, you redefine the problem after the investigate stage so you can use what you heard and learned to make sure you're solving the right problem. This is the phase where the notes you took are very important. You'll work with your team and share all of your notes, grouping them into common themes or concepts. You will use those themes to create insights related to the particular problem that you're looking to solve. These insights help to focus you on key areas to consider for your solution. Next slide, please.

The third phase is ideate, and this is often considered the brainstorming approach. It's where you propose solutions to the redefined problem taking into consideration the needs and desires of your clients or users. Ideation is run without constraints, and people are encouraged to throw out wild ideas. You should try to build on one another's ideas and go for quantity, but meanwhile you want to make sure that you're staying focused on your problem statements because it can get wild and fun in this phase.
Okay. And next slide, please.

And finally I put the last two slides together here, of phases. And they are refine and implement. The refine phase focuses on prototyping some of the best ideas from the ideate phase. And the prototype is a visual representation of an idea. You can either (inaudible) simple like the ones on the screen that are a picture sketch or a storyboard with stick figures. And after creating your simple prototypes, you should take them out into the world to allow people to interact with them. This helps you to understand their strengths and weaknesses. And you should continuously test your prototypes with people and refine them based on user feedback. The more you test them and allow them to evolve, the better prepared they will be for when you actually invest time and money in your final product or service.

So those are the five elements of modus model that we used with each of the three pilot grantees.

Now I'm going to turn it over to Stan so we can hear from the grantees.

>>KOUTSTAAL: Thanks, Blair. This is Stan Koutstaal, and it will be my pleasure to introduce the grantees that the Office of Family Assistance worked with. One of the things that was unique about this project was that it was a project that cut across programs. In the Office of Family Assistance, we have three discretionary grant programs, Tribal TANF, Child Welfare, Health Marriage/Responsible Fatherhood, and the Health Profession Opportunity Grant. And they have kind of unique missions that Keyon talked a little bit about before.

So we took one grantee from each of the three grant programs and asked them if they'd be willing to pilot design thinking as a process to solve challenges or make a change in the way that they were working with others delivering service. And so the three grantees that were selected were the Confederated Tribes of (Inaudible) Indians, and Megan Hawley and Angela Ramirez are going to be joining us from there. We'll also be joined today by Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, and Katherine Vastine and Gaye Jenkins who are there. And we'll also be talking a little bit to First Things First, and in particular Julie Baumgardner who is there.

But it will be my pleasure to talk to Megan Holly and Angela Ramirez from (Inaudible). We'll simply have a conversation for a few minutes, and then I'll pass the baton so that you will hear from the other pilot projects as well.

So Megan and Angela, just to talk a little bit about – to provide some context, we talked the other day, and this is how I understand what it is that you do. And please add to this if there's something that I'm missing.

But you are implementing a project called Healthy Families, Healthy Child and Tribal TANF Child Welfare, even in a long name like that, it sort of captures the idea that your grant is all about collaboration. So in this case you're building a relationship between the Tribal TANF program and the Child Welfare. But really your project extends across a lot of other programs and organizations.

And there's a couple of main ways that you build these collaborations. One is through multi-departmental team meetings and the other is through wraparound meetings. The multi-departmental team meetings, you bring together other organizations that are focused on things like self-sufficiency, child welfare, vocational rehabilitation, home visiting, behavioral health like drug and alcohol recover, the school, law enforcement and others. And you explore ways that you can leverage your relationships and your resources to better serve people.

In the wraparound meetings, you adopt a holistic approach and actually invite in an individual or family, and they form a support team often made up of representatives of some of the other organizations, and then you work together in a way that makes most sense to that family.

Did I get that right in terms of what it is that you're doing?

>>HAWLEY: Yes, that's pretty spot on.

>>KOUTSTAAL: Okay. Good. So, tell me, what was the challenge that you selected as part of the design thinking process?

>>HAWLEY: So we selected our multi-departmental team meetings. So like you said it's really a way for us to connect with all of our social service programs that are associated with our families' wraparounds or those who could potentially be wraparound participants. And we selected that activity because we found that there was – we were seeing some spotty attendance. There was also the barriers in communication, and so we were looking at a way to really redesign how we went about (inaudible) our meetings, and so we thought this was a perfect opportunity to really problem solve that.

>>KOUTSTAAL: When you thought about that, you decided to – the first step was the investigative phase. What did that look like and what did you do?

>>HAWLEY: So myself and Angela, we interviewed all participants to (inaudible) part of our multi-departmental team meetings, and so we have an 11-county service area and four area offices. So we have an office in (inaudible), Salem, Eugene and Portland. So we interviewed the key players in those areas and we really looked at trying to establish what they thought the needs were rather than us making assumptions as to how we thought the meetings should be ran. And so we collected information from all those key players, and we really took the majority of the ideas, found what were the commonalities among those to really begin redesigning how we went about holding the meetings.

>>KOUTSTAAL: So one of the things that I think that you and I had talked about before is you used what's called a how might we statement.

>>HAWLEY: Yes.

>>KOUTSTAAL: Tell us a little bit about what a how might we statement is and what that looked like, and I think that you told me you ended up talking to as many as 40 people. What are those how might we statements and what type of things did you being hearing?

>>HAWLEY: So we looked at things like even just the overall atmosphere of – and the direction that the needs were going in. So for the how might we statements, it was really sort of looking from the shoes of the individuals or the participants in those meetings to think about as many

aspects of (inaudible) as possible. So we thought of things like how might we encourage our participants to want to attend the meetings? And how might we create the environment that promotes more comfort in having discussions about our families? And basically we created quite a list of how might we questions. Can you think of any other ones that we –

How might we better serve our clients as a team instead of individual programs?

And how might we increase attendance by multiple programs instead of just – like there were six primary programs going, but we have as many as ten. So how might we increase participation overall?

>>KOUTSTAAL: So you came up with a series of how might we statements, and you did that in collaboration with the people you were interviewing. And even though there were a bunch of people, there were some similar themes that began to emerge that you kind of talked about. Tell me how did you get from those interviews and the how might we statement to solutions? What did you come up with?

>>HAWLEY: Well, we found that the biggest commonality between all of the interviews was that there was a very similar vision and mission. And so we looked at that, and so the next meeting that we held, we all together went over what our action vision and mission for the meeting is. So something that we found in one questions we asked, what is the value of the MBP meetings and in an ideal world how would you envision them being? And everybody that we interviewed said that they just wanted to be able to help our families in the best way possible by working as a team. And so we really took that and it was a great reminder as to why we were all there. And so I think part of that really encourages more participation, and it was a really great (inaudible). And then we – oh, go ahead.

>>RAMIREZ: No, if you got it, that's fine.

>>HAWLEY: And we also found that there was another aspect that we really wanted to go back over and that was the way that we went about sharing our information. And confidentiality in these meetings because we talk about our families without them being there. And each of our programs has a different relationship with the families. So that was another commonality that we found was how could we go about sharing the information so that each of these individual programs is comfortable with the information being shared. And because we have such a unique community, many of the individuals in our meetings, they are actually relatives to some of the families that we talk about. And so it was really trying to move beyond hearsay and trying to establish more actual fact in the discussions that we were having. So just going back over that and really being clear about what is appropriate to share in the meetings and what is not and really making clear what the rules of confidentiality are in those meetings.

>>KOUTSTAAL:So that's a great example. What really jumped out at me was that even the interview process itself, reaching out to stakeholders, it sounds like that went a long way toward building relationships almost immediately and having some sense of a shared vision. But it also led to some very practical solutions in terms of developing a new release of information that would enable people from different agencies to talk more openly.

I just have one more question for you because we're short on time. Can you tell me about you're working more closely with these other organizations now. How have you seen that translate into actually serving a person better or differently?

>>HAWLEY: Well, an example that we had just in our last meeting was there were three referrals made to our programs that were there, so we have a new home visiting program here. And so just by having more open communication about where families are at and what their needs are, we were able to find that there's two families that would be great candidates for beginning our home visiting program. And we also had another referral into wraparound. So just by having more open communication and having that confidence and knowing that it's okay to talk about certain situations in these meetings that we were able to problem solve for our families. Can you think of any others?

>>RAMIREZ: We also had one where somebody was going to potentially lose their home. And the workers that see her don't necessarily know how these rules are, but Housing was able to tell us, and staff who were there that work in Housing, were able to tell us like four other options that she had instead of losing her home, that she could do to save her home. And so that was really valuable information to be able to give to her as a client that none of the staff that were there were acutely aware of. And had we not had the other staff members who work in Housing or know the information of the possibilities that she had, that client could have lost her home by now but currently she still has her home.
We also found that the timing of the meeting has increased as well because we have so much positive communication that we used to cut our meetings kind of short because we would run out of things to talk about, really, with our families. So at the last meeting we actually went over time. So just having that time difference really displays to us that we have more comfort in communication and talking in those meetings, and so there's more time for talking.

>>KOUTSTAAL: That's really great. Angela and Megan, thank you so much.
We're going to pause the camera here, and I'm going to turn things over to Blair so that she can continue with Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit.

>>CORCORAN: My name is Blair, and I'd like to introduce you to Katherine Vastine and Gaye Jenkins from the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit. Gaye is an Academic Specialist and Katherine is the Program Manager of the WATCH program. WATCH stands for Work Attributes Towards Careers in Health, and it's a health profession opportunity grant program, which is the program that I work on here in OFA. And Katherine's program helps low-income individuals from a largely rural, ten-county region in Pennsylvania get education and training in high-demand healthcare fields like nursing assistant, practical nursing, nursing and paramedics, EMTs, things like that. So let's get started.

We mentioned earlier that human-centered design and design thinking is often used with problems. But Katherine and Gaye took a little bit different approach to their pilot project, and they decided to take a strength that they had, which was some great relationships with a

number of their partner colleges, and to scale it using human-centered design. And one thing that's important to note is that Central Susquehanna works with colleges – provides for services and then works with their partner colleges to provide the health training. And so they're hoping with this pilot project that they could build even stronger relationships to support the students that they and their partners share.

So, Katherine, why did you want to approach scaling a strength using human-centered design?

>>VASTINE: Hi, Blair. We chose to work with our (inaudible) ten-county area because we work with so many different schools. During our team meetings that we host each week within the WATCH project, we really recognized and picked up on the fact that there were some schools that we had really super strong relationships with, at least we thought we did, and that there were other schools that we had better communication with. So as a design thinking project, we decided that we would explore that a little bit further and figure out what was working really well in the schools and where we could improve. And with the idea of figuring out what worked well, we would then be able to replicate that within our other partnering organizations and schools.

So it was really a unique opportunity to conduct those interviews and just explore those connections better and understand them.

>>CORCORAN: Great. Katherine, if you – cameras not on and I do want to share with everyone what you guys look like, too, if you (inaudible).

>>VASTINE: Okay.

>>CORCORAN: In the meantime, I was wondering, you know, design thinking, human-centered design, these are new terms, new methodologies for creative problem solving. I'm just wondering, did your leadership support your participation in this pilot project, and if they did, why do you think they did?

>>CORCORAN: Well, they definitely did. In exploring the idea of design thinking, when we had the invitation we did take that to our administrator and shared that with her. And she was familiar with design thinking although she's never gone through it before. One thing that she did recognize, though, is that it did support our mission of service and innovation, and fit really nicely with that. And then she also knew that we would learn a lot through the experience. So when the time came for interviews, she was one of the first individuals that we did interview. I actually was the one that conducted that particular interview. And it was really a unique opportunity to really explore her idea on our partnerships and our communication. She also oversees our LPN program, so she had that unique perspective. And she's really a neat person in the sense of an out-of-the-box-type thinker. So it was just wonderful to have that opportunity to understand her perspective on a lot of different components of both of the programs, not only the WATCH project, but also within the LPN program.
Sorry. We're working out the technology over here.

>>CORCORAN: That's really interesting, and it's actually a really great segue to the next question I had, but I think it's really powerful that not only had she heard about it before, but she was able to experience it as far as the project as well during the investigative phase. And Gaye, during the investigative phase, which is the phase where you interview a number of individuals, I remember you guys telling me that you interviewed deans of nursing, instructors, members of your staff, students from your partner colleges, and now also your own leadership. I'm just wondering, how did you manage to get all those individuals to meet with you about this project?

>>VASTINE: We did – first of all, just to give you a background, we only had about three weeks to do it because I was going on vacation during this time. So we felt kind of rushed, but it ended up working out really well. We started using the contacts we already had, and we talked to them, explained what we wanted. Made it clear that we saw this as a win-win opportunity simply because we had the same goal and that was we wanted our students to have success in their program and get jobs, which is also what our schools want. So how we did it was, for instance I interviewed the Director of Nursing of one of our programs, one of our schools, and she then suggested the teacher that I interviewed. And so we were able to get more of that going on, like, you know, you would ask one person, interview them, they would suggest somebody else, and so we got a whole group of people. We ended up interviewing we figure around 20 in a three-week period. And it was in person and phone interviews.

>>CORCORAN: That's powerful. So that was even helpful. So you weren't even done with the design thinking process and already you were able to improve relationships with other staff and people just through the interviews themselves. So that's –
Oh, yes. Everybody was really interested in it, too.
That's great. So, again, Katherine, I know you guys were the two point people on the project, and in our intro we mentioned that it's great to have a team of people doing this together. I know that in the two phases reframe and ideate you brought in members of your staff to help. Why did you bring in your team for those particular phases?

>>VASTINE: Okay. I'll answer that one, too. We did – we brought – first of all, the reframing process simply because we had so much data that we just felt that we couldn't organize it all ourselves in a timely fashion because we wanted to get moving on it. And so we asked two of our colleagues to come in, and as I noted before, it was a great opportunity because we happened to be having a meeting with them that day anyway, so (inaudible) well, hey, come early, we're going to use you. And the other part was that we felt we had looked at the data enough that we needed some fresh eyes on it to give us some ideas. And so that – they helped us through that reframing phase. And then just it was really valuable for us to have that new insight from other people.

>>CORCORAN: Great. Really powerful. I mean, one of the things that we've learned in OFA about design thinking is the power of teams and everybody's different perspectives and how that can really add to a solution or to a brainstorm or reframe.
Katherine, I'm just wondering, I know that previously your team has received training in human-

centered design. How would you describe the set of training you received previously compared to this, and which do you think you might recommend to others?

>>VASTINE: Sure. Right. Well, we were first introduced to design thinking at the HPOG conference. And it was really intriguing to us, and we feel that our team is the type that really collaborates well together, throws different ideas out there, and that they might be open to this. So when the opportunity came about for technical assistance, we did take you up on that. And the team of trainers, there were two individuals that came, and they worked with the WATCH program, all of our staff. And they introduced us to the methodologies and the process, and then we worked through a pre-determined scenario. We felt that it provided a lot of insight into the process and the team did learn a lot, but I don't know as though it gave us enough support to go out on our own and implement it on our own. So that's where when the pilot project came about, it offered us the opportunity to – Gaye and I went down to D.C. We met with the (inaudible) staff, the other grantees that would be piloting this process. And then also we were introduced to the (inaudible) team.

When we came back, we then were set up with individual monthly calls, conference calls. You participated. The (inaudible) staff participated. And we basically were given this plan that over the next several months this is what phase we would be doing, we would be reporting back out on results, and you just had that support of the coach throughout the entire process. And they could answer our questions. I just found it very valuable in the sense that you had such good support and they kept you on track.
I would definitely recommend a coaching style because if you do run into snags or what you need to do next, you have that support.
And then the other really nice piece to this was we had a lot of ownership in it. It wasn't a pre-determined scenario. It meant a lot to us, and because of that, you take a lot of ownership in it.

>>CORCORAN: That's great. Well, I want to thank you, Gaye and Katherine, for joining us today and talking about your experiences. I think what you shared with us was really powerful how brining in your team, designing a process helped to empower your team. And even the process, having the coaching and focusing on the fact that you wanted to scale a strength and it was something you were vested in also made utilizing the methodology so much more (inaudible). So thank you guys.

At this time we're going to pause the camera again, and I'm going to turn it over to Keyon so we can talk to First Things First.

Thank you guys.

>>SMITH: All right. So next up, as I said, is Julie Baumgardner. For those in the Healthy Marriage, Responsible Fatherhood field, we're working in, she needs no introduction. I call her the matriarch of the Healthy Marriage movement. She's also the – Julie Baumgardner is the Executive Director and Founder of First Things First. But also she started the NORMS Conference, which every year brings, man, over 300 folks in the Healthy Marriage field together,

and they just kind of talk about kind of best practices and discuss ways they can move the field forward. And one thing about Julie, she has big ideas, and she's always thinking about, man, what can we do to make you feel better, what can I do to make my organization better, and so she was a tremendous asset to this pilot project. And so I'd like to just welcome Julie Baumgardner.

Julie, can you hear me? Okay. Maybe –
Yeah, Julie, we can't hear you.
Julie, are you muted on your end?
I think we lost her. Now for those – Julie Baumgardner actually – Tennessee are in the midst of a terrible storm, so we did expect maybe there might be some technical difficulties, so we just ask for your patience.
(Inaudible.)
Ah, yes. Okay. So while we're waiting for Julie to connect, just kind of give a quick background kind of to her project. So as you all may know, the Healthy Marriage and Responsible Fatherhood are coming to an end. We only have a few months to go. And one thing Julie Baumgardner is really passionate about is sustainability. Like how can we keep these programs kind of, you know, keep the operations going on even once the grant kind of goes away. And so she wanted to use design thinking as a methodology to kind of explore a sustainable business model. And she really came away with some great insight, and hopefully you're going to hear from her versus me, but we're just going to check in.
(Inaudible.)
In a second. Okay. Just continue to bear with us.
(Inaudible.)
Oh, we – Julie, is that you?
Is that you?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Yes. Can you hear me?

>>SMITH: Yes, we can.

>>BAUMGARDNER: Okay. Sorry. I don't know what happened. Everything froze up, so - .

>>SMITH: All right. Well, we just want to check it – how's the weather? You have to check in.

>>BAUMGARDNER: Uh, well, we're waiting for about four to six inches of snow.

>>SMITH: Okay. And I think the audience would like to know, are you home? Are you safe?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Yes. Yes.

>>SMITH: All right.

>>BAUMGARDNER: Thank you.

>>SMITH: So while the connection was lost there I kind of gave a quick kind of background kind of into your project. But just kind of start a little bit. So, as I mentioned earlier, the Healthy Marriage, Responsible Father (inaudible) is coming to an end in a few months. And as I mentioned earlier, you wanted to really kind of tackle sustainability. Why is sustainability so important to you and why did you want to use design thinking to kind of explore a sustainable business model?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Well, we're in kind of an interesting situation in that we had product funding with no grant funding at all, and then in 2006 we received a federal grant. And so over time we have been doing both raising product funding and we have been having the grants. Knowing that the grants are going away, there have been a number of classes that we have provided for free, and we recognize that we're not going to be able to do that once the grant goes away. So the design thinking was really a process for us to help us connect with people who have been through our classes to figure out how we make this transition smooth, how do we figure out what we could charge that people would be willing to pay for, what excited people about the classes that we think would bring other people back, and how do we move forward with having the grants since we don't have any idea if we'll get a grant in the future.

>>SMITH: Okay. You mentioned charging participants. Now that's a hotly-debated kind of question. So given kind of your process and your research, should grantees charge participants? Do you think that that's a viable strategy?

>>BAUMGARDNER: I do think it's a viable strategy, and I also actually think it's really important. I think, having been on both sides of this fence, people tend not to value what they don't have to pay for. Where's there's no accountability, they might say that they're going to come, but if there's no skin in the game, so to speak, if they wake up and they're tired, or it's been a long day at the office, they don't feel any sense of accountability to come. And I can tell you that even charging $5.00 for something makes a huge difference in terms of people actually showing up for the experience. Not that we charge for grants. We charged for something else, and just $5.00 made a difference.

>>SMITH: Wow. And so how did design thinking in a sense kind of help you reach that conclusion or kind of confirm your suspicion that charging participants is a good strategy?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Well, we, like the others, went back to some of the people who have attended classes in the past, we went to people who had just recently completed a class, and asked the question – we asked several questions actually – about their experience in the class, what was really meaningful to them. Especially for people who had attended a long time ago, we wanted to know what do you remember about the class? What have been the most important things that you learned from the class that you're still using today? And then we asked the question, in terms of value, if you had had to pay for the class, would you have come? And without – we had everyone say, most definitely, well worth it, would have paid. Now clearly that's after the fact, so hindsight is 20/20, but - .

>>SMITH: And so I'm wondering, how many folks did you interview?

>>BAUMGARDNER: We ended up with about 22.

>>SMITH: Twenty-two?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Yes.

>>SMITH: And you kind of give us a breakdown of how many folks are maybe current participants and then folks who may – they're kind of alumni of your program from previous years?

>>BAUMGARDNER: We felt, so there were probably seven or eight that were current, like had just completed the program. And then the rest were over time.

>>SMITH: Okay. So I hear this quite a bit, and I'm sure you've heard this, too. You know, you're serving a low-income population. How are you going to come up with the money to pay for a class? Isn't this going to be more of a deterrent or barrier to participation? So the effect (inaudible) opportunity between two folks. What did they say about all this? How did they say they were going to come up with the money and how much they're willing to pay for it?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Well, that's the really interesting piece because they all said that they would be willing to pay. And we did press this conversation with them as we started talking about the money piece that it has always been our policy that we would never turn anybody away. So money is not going to be a barrier for us. But we also did things like, okay, if you couldn't afford it but we asked you to volunteer to help at registration, or to help us with some aspect of the program, would you be willing to do that? Hands down yes, very willing to do that. And even before we had the grant, we served low-income populations. And that was always our stance. If someone said, we want to come, we can't afford it, then we would figure out a way to make sure that they were in attendance. And I do think that that's a very important piece because I want people to have this information, as do other grantees. This is significant and important across the board. So it isn't about keeping people out, it's about helping them to value what they have. And basically, we've gone back through and looked at our population. At least 50% of the people that we serve are at the poverty level or below. And they all believe, even $5.00 would make a difference in accountability level. So it's not like we're talking lots of money. We're talking about accountability to show up and participate.

>>SMITH: And also I thought you just made a good point. Not every one of your programs are low income. So you've got folks who are kind of middle class, or kind of maybe more affluent, and then maybe they can kind of be charged a fee and that can subsidize the folks who may are having trouble coming up with money or things like that, who are kind of financially strapped.

>>BAUMGARDNER: True. And I will tell you this. The one – well programs that are not grantee

programs that we are currently doing, these people who put something in, that there's some accountability, it is like their countenance changes because they changed the way they think about themselves in this process. And there is something to be said for that versus - , you know, it's that whole thing about teaching someone to fish versus just always giving it to them. And I think many of them would say to you, yeah, there is a big difference there.

>>SMITH: All right. So, (inaudible) investigator says you found something really interesting. You found that kind of financial literacy was a big opportunity. In fact, (inaudible) a missed opportunity for First Things First. Can you just shed some light on that real quickly? We have about two minutes.

>>BAUMGARDNER: Okay. Just very quickly, I wasn't expecting that. I thought that they were going to talk with us, when I said what were the things that were the huge takeaways for you, communication was one and the financial literacy piece was the other because so many of them had not talked about money, had not talked about budgeting, had not thought about how that could impact their relationships. And so in the conversations that we had concerning that, it made us note that the piece we were doing, we really needed to add more to that, and we have since done a number of things to enhance that in our current programming, and we are looking at ways to take it even deeper in the future.

>>SMITH: Absolutely. Hey, last question. What was your favorite phase and also what was your least favorite phase, or the phase you found the most challenging implementing?
My favorite phase was the prototyping just because we started – we really started – we did the brainstorming things, and then we put some things together, and we let some people experience that, and we realized, oh, wow, okay, they love this. We can continue to do this with excellence and people would want to pay for it.

Least favorite. I'm not sure that I really had a least favorite. Probably reframe was not my favorite, but I don't thing I had anything that was really my least favorite. I love the concept of it. I think it's very helpful as we're thinking about sustainability, and we will not only use it for what we've just worked with in terms of premarital, we will use this as we move forward with a lot of our different programming.

>>SMITH: All right, (Inaudible). And would you recommend – it sounds like you would recommend it to your fellow grantees?

>>BAUMGARDNER: Yes. Definitely.

>>SMITH: All right. Amazing.
Well, Julie, thank you so much. Thank you for your hard work and continuing to move the HMR field forward. And please be safe, and hopefully you won't get four to six inches. Hopefully it was just kind of overreaction there, and you (inaudible).
Well thank you for allowing us to be part of this experience.

>>BAUMGARDNER: Absolutely. Thank you.

>>SMITH: All right. And our next slide?
All right. So you really heard it from, again, three grantees about their experience using design thinking. So I'm going to kind of tally some insights real quickly, kind of some key takeaways from kind of everyone's experience with this methodology.
So kind of the first thing I'm going to say kind of involves our storytelling. One of the things we heard from grantees was that they had trouble with creating a storyboard, and I think kind of moving forward, we'll probably provide greater TA there. But I think for design thinking, storytelling, (inaudible) trying to message the problems you're solving, getting stakeholders on board, really conveying the solution, is going to really get folks excited. So I think we could do a better job molding storytelling.

Another piece we just wanted to highlight. It's kind of like think like a reporter. The investigative phase was mentioned quite a bit. And it's really important that you really think about, okay, what's really the story here, what problem or issue should we really tackle, or that's really worth tackling? How can we really get in front and ask the right questions to the right people. And then kind of (inaudible) how can we message our findings in a very concise way but an effective way. So kind of think like a reporter or journalist I think is really important.

And the last insight was actions speak louder than words. One thing we noticed with the normal TA process is grantees might come across a problem, think about it internally, talk about it internally. That could take maybe two days, two weeks. Then they come to OFA and say, hey, we have this problem. Then we talk with the grantees about the problem. Then we say, hey, request TA. So they request TA. The next thing you know, two or three months have passed by before any action has been taken. But what we saw doing this pilot project is that folks, once they got the training and they went back home, actions happened. They were doing things. They were making things happen. And I figured that was kind of like a benchmark with Susque. And so we're really happy about that.
And next slide, please.

And so one of the things we really want, you know, the purpose of this webinar was that if folks are really excited about design thinking, they feel like it could benefit their program or their organization, we want to know. So please contact either myself or Blair to say, hey, we took part in the webinar, and we would like to know more about design thinking. If you're interested in sort of training opportunities and things like that, please let us know because, again, we really want to see if this is something that folks want, then we want to make sure we can kind of meet that demand. Because as you see, we're really passionate about this and we think design thinking has tremendous utility, for not only grantees, but even at OFA as an organization. So please do not hesitate to contact us. You have our email address there. And we'll just leave us this slide for a second here so folks can kind of just jot this down.
And with that, we can turn it over for Q&A. Here's your opportunity to ask these amazing

grantees kind of any questions about the process, the issues that they tackled, and to learn more about design thinking.

>>PLIZGA: Thank you, Keyon. We are now going to take this opportunity to take questions. And just a quick review. If you have a question, please click on the hand at the bottom of your participant window. We will let you know that we will be taking your questions, and we will take you off mute to ask your question. Once your question has been answered, please click on the hand to put your hand down and we will place you back on mute. So at this time, go ahead and raise your hand if you have a question.

Okay, Patricia Houston. We see that you have a question. We're taking you off mute. Go ahead.

>>HOUSTON: Can you hear me?

>>PLIZGA: We sure can.

>>HOUSTON: One of my questions was what is the length of time to get to the solutions, to the end? What was a favorable length of time to use this? Can it be done quickly or is there a thought process about how much time we should spend within this think tank.

>>CORCORAN: That's a great question, Patricia. This is Blair at OFA. We're going to give our answer, and I know that our grantees have talked to us a bit about this.
We gave the grantees – this is about a six-month process where they came in in the beginning for in-person training, and then we had five calls after that for each of the phases of the design thinking process. And I don't know if any of the grantees want to reflect on whether that was long or short.

>>HOUSTON: It's fairly long within the grant cycle. You know, with us dealing with time constraints and having to produce results and things like that, six months would be a huge window to take out of a grant process that's just three years.

>>CORCORAN: Absolutely. But what's great about the design thinking process are the tools, and each of them – and those you don't have to use within the process. You know, you could do brainstorming or interviewing on your own, and you could shorten it to meet your needs.

>>SMITH: Absolutely. And I think you'll hear this from the grantees. I'm sorry, this is Keyon. They were tackling the issue, you know, it kind of dealt with impacting their day-to-day operations. And so it really kind of dovetailed nicely with what they were doing day in and day out. So at least just from my vantage point, it didn't seem like it would be a major distraction per se. It seemed like it was actually a great opportunity to kind of revisit their original kind of plan or their original thinking when they applied for the grant, and (inaudible) scale (inaudible) success, or really kind of fix a lingering problem. So it seemed it really did just mesh really well with what they were doing day in and day out and not serve as a distraction. But I guess it would be great to hear from one of the grantees.

>>HOUSTON: Looks like Julie is talking, but can't nobody hear her.
Julie!

>>BAUMGARDNER: Okay, can you hear me now?

>>HOUSTON: There you go.

>>BAUMGARDNER: Okay, I was saying that we did it simultaneously. So we didn't stop anything we were doing. We just kept right on, but we did this simultaneously, and honestly I know it sounds like a very long length of time, but it actually went by very quickly and it was helpful to do it at the same time that we were carrying on with everything else.

>>HOUSTON: Well I was thinking, as I watched, I was thinking about an awesome process, and as we are going and looking at this next round of funding, I was wondering if, you know, this would be something that would allow me to be able to look at some others ways of doing what we're doing that can eventually help us be able to put into the new RFP when it comes in.

>>HAWLEY: Angela and I were just talking and we were doing the same thing. We were implementing this at the same time that we were doing all of our other grant activities. So I think if you're really just focused on sort of at the beginning of an activity, but you could probably move through each phase almost every week. I mean, when we do our investigative (inaudible), I think it took us like two weeks, and we interviewed –

>>RAMIREZ: Twenty people.

>>HAWLEY: Twenty-eight.

>>RAMIREZ: Twenty people each.

>>HAWLEY: Yeah, 20 people each. So, I mean, it's definitely doable.

>>HOUSTON: Awesome. Thank you.

>>RAMIREZ: It all depends on what it is you're trying to problem solve. Like ours was an ongoing monthly meeting that we had every month regardless if we solved the problem or not.

So we went quickly through the process to get to a forced solution to test, you know, by our next meeting. So it kind of depends on the problem you're trying to solve and how you're using it. But it can be five weeks or five months.
But, you know, it's a very good, powerful tool.

>>HAWLEY: Yeah. And another example that we have is we just took on managing a new grant that has a little bit of different focus. It's about school (inaudible). But, I mean, we just naturally

immediately went into the process of design thinking. The first thing that we've done is we've sent out surveys to our community and our community leaders to really establish what the needs are before us assuming what we want to do with this new grant. So we're trying to collect as much investigative information as possible so that we can really utilize the design thinking approach on something brand new. And it has been really helpful.

>>HOUSTON: So it's become a way in which you guys do your processing of whatever situation or problem you've got going on or even establishing a new grant?

>>HAWLEY: Yeah. We just kind of –

>>HOUSTON: Awesome. Awesome. Awesome. All right. Thank you.

>>PLIZGA: Any more questions out there? Go ahead and raise your hand. Great. I see that Laila has a question. Or Leila. I'm going to take you off of mute. Go ahead.
Leila, check and see if you are taken off of mute on your end.
Okay. We cannot hear Leila. Is there another question out there?
Okay. We are going to take Leila's question via message. She's going to Chat it to us, so if you give us just one moment, we will relay her question.

>>CORCORAN: And Stacey, this is OFA. Just to be cognizant of everyone's time, this will be the last question that we'll take, but if you'd like to submit more questions, you can do that via Chat, and PRI will get them over to us and the grantees. Or you can feel free to email Keyon or myself, and we'll be sure to get back to you.

>>PLIZGA: Thank you, Blair.
Okay, Leila's question is, So I've sat in on a few design facilitation sessions, two to four hours in duration, and they end with some sort of plan or takeaway, but the actual implementation piece is a bit more of a mystery to me. Can the speakers shed some light on this step? Strategies or insight.

>>CORCORAN: So I think all the grantees actually took their ideas and put them into implementation. I don't know – does anyone want to speak to that? Katherine, go ahead.

>>VASTINE: Blair. Yeah. And I think that's where I struggled with it because we went through a one-day training and then we were sort of just trying to figure out how we could make it our own. But this experience allowed it to, right from the beginning, the problem or what we wanted to scale, was, again, we had ownership in that. And we were able to, through the support of the coach, really get (inaudible) each step and understand exactly what we were supposed to do. We knew what the methods were, what the process was. So that's what I would say is that the (inaudible) ideal behind this experience was that we can replicate that now. And Gaye and I were talking already about different ways that, number one, we (inaudible) go back. It's a cyclical process where you go back and you again conduct interviews, and figure out what's

working, what you can tweak. And then we also wanted to take a step where we look at our marketing and then implement the design thinking process for that.

>>HAWLEY: Well, and something that Angela and I did was when we came back, we made sure that everyone who we thought would be involved in this process was very aware of what step we were on, and so we let everyone know about the process. You know, we just sent out emails like, hey, we just went through this really awesome design thinking training, and sort of gave them some information and back story on it and let them know that we wanted to basically take them along in our journey with design thinking. And so we really kept them up to date with the different processes that we were on, and we even in our meetings we brought in some of the exhibits that we had from the training, like the diagram showing the different phases and all that information so everybody knew what to expect.

>>VASTINE: Can I say something? I think the other part that we have to keep in mind is that you may have had the solutions in that data. It's just you have to be willing to suspend how you usually respond to things. And think more creatively. Because we tend to get into ruts about what we think the answers to problems are. And the whole purpose of this process is for you to step outside those regular processes and think more creatively and more collaboratively.

>>BAUMGARDNER: You do have to be willing to step outside of your comfort zone. Listen to what people are telling you, and then try some things. And I mean you may actually go, oh my gosh, we will not do that again. That didn't work. (Inaudible.) But I mean it does, as far as the team goes, it gets you out of that, we've never done it like that before phase. It gets you out of being in a rut. Or maybe you've just always done it this way and it's kind of dull and you've got to do something different. And this process has been super helpful and will be helpful in that way in the future.

>>PLIZGA: Okay. Thank you. And as Blair had said, that was going to be our last question for this webinar. And I want to thank you for your attendance today. And when you exit out of the webinar, an evaluation will automatically open. Please take a couple minutes to complete the evaluation of today's session. It will greatly help us in planning future technology-based events for you. So I'll turn it over to OFA if you have any closing comments.

>>CORCORAN: Nope. We just really encourage you to take that survey because we want to learn from your feedback on this experience. Thank you everyone for joining us.

>>PLIZGA: All right. Thank you. Have a wonderful day. Bye-bye.