

An Analysis of the Framing Sprint

My team focused on framing the opportunity of reducing negative physiological impacts from the use of digital screens (computer vision syndrome). The purpose of this analysis is to reflect on what went well and what could have been improved when using tools to focus the report on the important aspects of the framing. This will include how we used the stakeholder analysis as the primary source driving forward the development of the objectives.

During our first meeting, we developed our team culture by setting down what was expected from each of us, and began brainstorming ideas (perceiving), some of which are provided in table 1.

Alternate Opportunity	Rationale for Rejection
Improving the quality and accessibility of mental health resources students have access to.	Resources already exist, and we evaluated the challenge to be beyond the scope of our abilities.
Reducing the lack of engagement that online universities can impose on students.	Engagement is difficult to measure and there was not a lot of research done on the subject.

Table 1. Two other alternate opportunities that were discussed, but ultimately discarded.

Our main objective when choosing the opportunity was to ensure we could make a considerable impact on our primary Stakeholders, the students at UofT. This objective carried over to our stakeholder analysis, where we carefully went over their interests to develop our objectives. As students ourselves, it is tempting to project our own interests onto the entire UofT student body. Doing so makes it easier to identify important issues to address, but is dangerous as we are too small of a sample size. This was why creating a survey was important, as it allowed us to verify that students from other years and faculties were experiencing the same issues with digital screens as us.

However, there were several interests we identified that are based mostly on anecdotal evidence. For example, minimizing the cost was an objective that was important to us and from our experiences, other students we've interacted with want to save as much money as possible, even for academic-related tasks. As a result, we projected this interest to the entire population but did not quantify how many people were interested in paying for a possible solution and how much they would be willing to spend. In the future, we should spend more time researching not just *what* the interests of our stakeholders are, but the *degree* of these interests.

When writing our claims, we followed the Toulmin argument form, when assessing current options such as the use of blue light filters. I have broken down our argument down into the important parts in the table below:

Argument	Commentary
<p>A common solution [...] is using screen filter apps (ex. f.lux)...</p> <p>However, these apps only change the color of the display, and can not prevent blue light bleeding through the backlight of the screen.</p> <p>This means these apps do not completely eliminate these effects as blue light exposure,</p> <p>...as small amounts of blue light exposure can significantly impact melatonin production.</p>	<p>Ground: We also indirectly introduced the counterclaim, which is the status quo.</p> <p>Introduced the claim and justification.</p> <p>The qualifier indirectly acknowledges that the filters can block a significant portion of blue light.</p> <p>Further evidence (justified with reference) shows that a small portion of unfiltered light can lead to big differences.</p>

Table 2. Commentary on a sample Toulmin Argument. The arguments are color coded to show the various parts.

The largest flaw in our teamwork was by sometimes setting out unclear and ambiguous expectations. For example, I perceived myself constantly making statements like “Let’s try to have a finalized rough draft by tomorrow’s meeting.” This can be interpreted as both finishing it before the meeting starts or before the meeting is concluded. It was only after I showed up to the meeting confused about why some people had not filled in their sections was I able to assess the poor choice of words. From that point onwards, we were under time pressure and made sure to be more specific on when certain tasks were due.