

AUTHOR

Stephanie Yoffee
Independent Researcher

TITLE

A Basis for the establishment of a United States National design organization: the United States design alliance

SYNOPSIS

This paper is the outcome of research over a two-year period on the foundation and feasibility for a United States Design Organization to represent American design on a national level. Since 1989, there have been many efforts to establish a national design organization for the United States by American design professionals both inside and outside the United States federal government. These efforts include a conference of design professionals in Little Rock, Arkansas, in 1993 during the transition period of the Clinton Administration¹, in 1994 within the U.S. Department of Commerce², (appendix B) and in 1994 with the recommendations made by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), Design Program³ (appendix C). There are numerous factors influencing the current state of these efforts, and previous attempts, although unsuccessful, are certainly evidence that a recognizable and influential constituency for a national design organization exists. The debate surrounding the activities of the NEA and subsequent 40 percent congressional budget cut in 1996 have been significant setbacks to these efforts. However, these recent events have raised significant issues regarding the value and importance of design in American society and what efforts are now necessary to further the understanding of design in the United States.

In order to present the basis for continuing the efforts toward the establishment of a national design organization, a history of the modes of thought in design is discussed along with the formulation and analysis of a definition of design for a United States design organization, to be called The United States Design Alliance. The concept and necessity for design policy, currently not completely understood among professional designers, is presented and analyzed using several recent examples of design projects illustrating some of these obstacles. An exploration of design policy is

The Historical Basis for a United States Design Organization

In order to understand the current patterns of thought about design and its relationship as a discipline, both in practice and in research, to industry and the marketplace, it is necessary to trace the modes of thought on design.

Beginning in the 1940s, the central idea of design was simply that of the object or artifact functioning as a symbol of cultural values based on an aesthetic. The product's success as an acceptable form was based on its merits as an expression of the designer's personal vision. This emphasis on strictly aesthetic values presented many barriers for designers to gain a clear understanding of the importance of communication and social significance as equally necessary factors in judging the quality of their work. The underlying social context of rebuilding after the devastation caused by World War II was the impetus for design to become recognized as a distinct professional field. As an example, the field of industrial design became recognized in the United States as a distinct profession due to the significance of Raymond Loewy's work in the 1930s.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the debate about "good design" emerged from the premise that the form of an object could enhance the quality of life. The design ideal of this period was minimalism or "less is more" to create products that were unobtrusive. Design methodology and process became as important—and in some cases more important—than the aesthetic qualities of the end product, previously thought to be paramount.

The formality of design thinking in the 1950s and 1960s led to a reactionary period during the 1960s-to-1980s, focused on a dialogue about the psychological, social and cultural contexts that give products meaning and value. The discipline of design practice became formally recognized, due to the realization that objects in the human-made world take on meaning in a myriad of ways. The meaning of design as a visual language had not yet been explored or understood by those who established the groundwork for the design professions. The idea of pluralistic-based inquiry focusing on common issues experienced from human-made objects rather than technical refinement has become the most important breakthrough in design thinking. Unfortunately, as an outgrowth of design education in the United States, disputes among the various schools of design have impeded the development and widespread acceptance of design studies to provide a consistent framework for significant inquiry and research.

The idea that design is a liberal art of technological culture, as developed by Richard Buchanan, professor of design at

Carnegie Mellon University (Pittsburgh, Penn.), emphasizes the current importance of design as the impetus of the conception and planning of all of the human-made world: signs, images, physical objects, activities and services, and systems or environments⁴. "Liberal Art" is defined as a discipline of thinking that may be shared to some degree by all people in their daily lives and is, in turn, mastered by a few people who practice the discipline with distinctive insight and sometimes advance it to new areas of innovative application. More recent awareness about design in the marketplace is a result of the "designer-engineer-consumer"⁵ concept. This awareness is evident by the fact that consumers are increasingly becoming involved in the conception of products, thus requiring interdisciplinary teams that must solve complex design issues.

This broadened approach has caused the emergence of many ethical issues to be considered in design thinking. Examples of these ethical issues include design for the disabled, resulting in products and architecture that follow rules and codes set forth by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

The contemporary view of design thinking is clearly a mode based on knowledge gained from various fields and disciplines, keeping in mind that design at its core is the facility to conceive, plan and present ideas about products. Design thinking and practice have been proven to have a positive economic effect in both business and government organizations, creating greater efficiency in manufacturing—which cuts costs—facilitates innovations for environmentally sound manufacturing processes and contributing to the sustainability of natural resources. In a recent *Time Magazine* article, the 21st century is being called "The Golden Age of Design" by Mark Dziersk, president of the Industrial Design Society of America (IDSA).⁶

The expanding U.S. economy during the 1990s has caused industries to compete on other levels beyond price and functionality of products and services. Design has become a mandatory aspect of distinction in business and manufacturing. The meaning of functional design has now taken on psychological and emotional dimensions. Design, therefore, should be understood and integrated as a means to plan policy that can improve the quality of life.

A Definition of Design for a United States Design Organization

The word "design" is often used loosely in the marketplace without regard to its actual purpose and value. Design is not only a visual product, but a process that leads to a product. This definition seems to communicate the contemporary idea of design thinking—form follows function—and form has content and purpose, not strictly an aesthetic. *Design* needs to be defined and understood not only by business and government, but also by the public. The distinction between design and art in the cultural arena is important for the purposes of increasing the understanding of the value and practical application of design.

To establish The United States Design Alliance and to clearly communicate the role such an organization would undertake, it is necessary to define *design*. The three-part definition would address Buchanan's aspects of consideration for design practice (see below). The multiple levels of constituents for a design organization are defined as: the layperson, the institutional agent and beneficiary, and the design professional.

According to Buchanan, there are four conditions for debate.⁷

To rethink design in context of new problems;
to analyze where design has been and where it is going;
to develop new well-grounded explanations of the nature and practice of design; and
to develop explanations about specific ways in which design can address issues that will be important to industry and society.

This debate is comprised of three broad points of view regarding design practice:
an approach from an art and aesthetics point of view, focusing on form and appearance of products;
an approach from an engineering and natural sciences viewpoint, making products that work; and
a human sciences approach, focusing on communications and the relationship between products and people.

The three-fold definition would be inclusive of the following:

The Layperson's Definition:

Design is the distinct activity performed by a qualified professional, of planning or conceiving an end product (building, machine, garment, printed communication) which takes into consideration the process by which the product will be made, as well as the way in which the product will be used. Design is distinguished from the activities of engineering, production, manufacturing and styling.

The Institutional Agent and Beneficiary Definition:

Institutions of business and government have the responsibility to provide their customers/citizens with the highest quality and most efficient products and services possible. To do this, these institutions will find it necessary to employ design as an integral part of the development process, and may find it necessary to implement design policy to guarantee the use of effective and responsible design processes.

The Professional Specific Definition:

Design professionals are specially qualified* to integrate divergent requirements into an economical and functional

whole. This should be the primary goal of an organization rather than a secondary consideration. A designer's underlying motivation for practice should be to act as an enabler of society to achieve ever greater quality of life. (*Note: "specially qualified" does not necessarily imply the certification or granting of a license to practice, however, it is necessary for the practice of architecture).

A Basis for Design Policy in the United States

The basis for developing design policy in the United States is clearly necessary in the current state of our technologically based society and economy. However, to elevate design thinking and policy to the levels other professions have attained, there are several central issues to address, and cultural obstacles to recognize. Design practice must be analyzed based on the vast number of perspectives that exist among individual designers and established schools of design. The only way to advance design thinking to a higher level is to identify the problems of understanding design thinking, rather than focusing on the perceived superiority of specific theories.

At a broader level, the perception of political leadership is particularly negative in relation to public support of the NEA. When asked how important public support of the arts is to a senator's constituents he responded, "The future of the NEA is at the very bottom of my priorities list. . . We politicians view you and your friends as without significant political constituency. You argue with each other on what we regard as irrelevant issues, thereby guaranteeing that, when push comes to shove, your cause will lose."⁸ What this senator may not know is in fact there are significant constituencies within the design community (see Appendix A). These constituencies include national and local chapters of professional design organizations that have thousands of members and numerous associations that promote awareness of design in society (see Appendix A). However, among design professionals, there are apparent conflicts among the various fields of design professionals, whether inherent or superficial, which are currently causing barriers to the development and implementation of design policy and a national design organization. These barriers exist in design education as well as in professional practice.

In education, the proliferation of science-based education has caused the development of two somewhat opposing perspectives in design thinking—one from a scientific grounding and one from an arts grounding. Even though these two approaches to design thinking can and have created confusion in practice, it may be productive to consider the benefits of harmonizing these modes of thought. Evidence of this can be seen in examples of technological advancement in the field of personal-computer software, which relies heavily on graphic interfaces, a collaboration of design thinking from both perspectives.

In design education at the post-secondary level, there has been a shift in the last 10 to 20 years to make programs increasingly specialized, possibly a function of the rapid growth in science- and-technology based education. Students are responding to this specialization by finding it necessary to study in a multidisciplinary way, earning multiple degrees, for example: architecture/landscape architecture, architecture/city planning, architecture/engineering, architecture/sociology, architecture/business, graphic design/business, graphic design/computer science, and industrial design/business. In practice, however, specialization is still prevalent, and it will take another 20 to 30 years for these professionals who are well versed in more than one discipline to attain leadership roles in government and business. This will entail overcoming biases toward the capabilities and value of design professionals who can serve in leadership roles. In practice, the current clash of views among design professionals exist in three broad areas:

1. architecture vs. interior architecture vs. engineering;
2. industrial design vs. engineering; and
3. graphic design vs. computer technology/engineering.

The differences among professionals stem from the philosophy in each profession's design education and manifest themselves in confusion about the roles and responsibilities of each profession in practice. A recent example is the situation surrounding the design of the new Getty Center in Los Angeles, California. The Center's design was not without differences in opinion among the various art and design professionals involved in the project.

"Mr. Meier (Architect Richard Meier) implacably opposed the garden's design (by artist Robert Irwin), and especially its considerable depth, which once you're within it, limits a panoramic view of the city; at one meeting several years ago he insisted angrily, and unavailingly, that losing such a view would be "an irresponsible act." The museum's director, John Walsh, insisted on bringing in the New York architect-decorator Thierry Despont to warm and soften Meier's work—though retaining his high-ceilinged spaces and magical suffusions of natural light...Mr. Walsh also commanded flower pots to be placed in public spaces around the museum in seemingly random arrangements instead of on Mr. Meier's beloved geometric grids.

Like Mr. Meier, Mr. Walsh now seeks to put these well-publicized disputes behind him. As he was showing me around the museum, with almost palpable pride and pleasure, I mentioned having seen a fascinating film, "A Concert of Wills," that the Getty commissioned to document the building of the Getty Center. Shot over a period of 12 years, the documentary is marked by several moments of dramatic conflict between and among Messrs. Meier, Walsh and Irwin. When I told Mr. Walsh that I thought the film spoke well for the Getty's willingness to keep such conflicts in the open, he said by way of acknowledging the compliment that he thought the film also proceeded from a journalistic impulse to reduce complex issues to personalities.⁹

In December 1989, an agreement was signed by the American Institute of Architects (AIA), American Society of Interior Designers (ASID), Institute of Business Designers (IBD), and International Society of Interior Designers (ISID)...This document, known as the "Accord," put an end to open hostility between architects and interior designers, and set up guidelines for future interior design licensing activities. Primary was the agreement that interior designers would pursue only registration of the title "interior designers" and not restrict the practice of interior design to licensed individuals.

In May, at the AIA conference, the voting members in attendance considered a proposal to rescind the Accord. The documentation distributed in support of the withdrawal challenged the behavior of ASID, IBD and ISID in fulfilling their responsible leadership and oversight to assure conformance with their members. Additionally, claims were made that

the Accord is being used by the interior design signatories in pursuit of practice legislation. The Accord has been challenged several times within the AIA since its signing; this may be due to a lack of historic perspective of what was achieved by the Accord, and the existence of only a short-term memory among some AIA members.

The AIA members voted not to withdraw, but the decision appeared to be based primarily on the protection of their image, not contentment with the current status quo.

...For the past three years, ASID and IIDA have together requested the AIA to enter into regular "Accord maintenance" discussions, but to no avail. The National Legislative Coalition for Interior Design (NLCID) [formed in 1991 to represent the interior design professional matters of interior design registration, certification and licensure] has initiated requests for discussion, and they have fallen on deaf ears. The efforts to open discussions will continue.¹⁰

There are many possible solutions to these professional views, one being simply the passage of time for the design professions to naturally progress. This is not to minimize the value and validity of inter-professional differences that can lead to overall improvements throughout the design professions. However, in order to push this process forward, further research on design thinking and methodology is absolutely necessary. There are insufficient ongoing studies regarding the design profession and design education to show the positive impact of these factors on the national/global economy and quality-of-life factors, not to mention insufficient documentation of the history of design education and the design professions in the U.S. A two-year

National Science Foundation study following the success of scientists who studied in liberal arts institutions of higher education would be valuable proof of the positive effects of design education.

The Role of Design Policy in Design Research

The lack of information exchange between the specialized areas of the design professions makes it difficult to recognize and develop common interests to provide solid representation in the face of political challenges. Clearly defining and placing a value on design research and thinking in business and government—namely a body of industry specific or government agency specific design policies (general) with codes (specific) defining baseline acceptable requirements of the resulting design—will provide the overall guidelines to amass a history of design processes and products, creating a larger body of design research. It would be useful to reframe the scope of the application and usefulness of design in the following ways:

the information environment;

the built environment; and

the manufacturing environment.

By providing this tri-fold framework, designers from the various specializations (graphic design, architecture, industrial design, graphic design and fashion design) can identify solutions and realize results through collaboration on projects that address problems within and across these environments. This cross-fertilization of design thinking is likely to yield new approaches to design research.

By recognizing contributions of individuals who have been trained in the theory and practice of design, it is evident that these professionals significantly influence every aspect of our planned environment. The recent completion of the building for the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, Spain, by architect Frank Gehry is an example of a significant contribution to design thinking. Gehry used advanced computer technology, the type used to design fighter planes, to calculate structure, curvature, material and cost to such extreme accuracy that the geometric forms of the building, previously impossible to build using traditional methods, can now be built within budget and schedule.¹¹

Urban planner Ken Greenberg describes the significant contributions of Jane Jacobs, self-taught urban planner (author of *Death and Life of Great American Cities*, 1961), to the redevelopment of American cities: "[she] has become an iconic reference associated with renewal of interest in cities". Detroit, Michigan, a prime example of urban decay, is adopting Jacob's principles to redevelop the downtown area. Collaborators from business, including the "Big Three" auto makers, and city government are concentrating on developing the "border vacuums" between the city's existing developed areas to create areas with varied uses, mainly by converting hundreds of derelict buildings in the central downtown area to residential and commercial use.¹²

Unfortunately, the design professions are typically thought of as low-pay, low-reward professions making design education of lesser importance than other recognized educational disciplines such as law, business, medicine or engineering. This fact contributes to the lack of value placed on design education and the skills that are learned and encouraged in schools of design, design programs within universities, and at the elementary and secondary level. The undervalued attitude toward design professionals is a result of cultural biases based on the misunderstanding of art and design. The dominant aspect of contemporary design thinking is not strictly a mode of self expression of the individual artist (art), but a philosophy geared toward problem solving in a specific situation (design). Proof of this is the existence of design teams assigned to projects in business and government environments. Design teams are capable of integrating the divergent aspects of problems presented to them, they are planning a software program or creating a consumer product. Even though much of the business world understands this distinction, these cultural biases and misconceptions creep back when a problem arises in the business environment, and design becomes the easiest target to blame for things going wrong. This is an unfortunate but common occurrence, and usually is the result of insufficient resources dedicated to the design stages of a project. Design research is important in order that all aspects of a project be given the same attention by the design team as by other functions along the development process. For example, at Motorola there is one designer for every 400 engineers, and at Texas Instruments there is one designer for every 30 engineers.¹³

Similar misconceptions exist in government, but many of the obstacles are due to inefficient procurement processes and neglect of the application of qualifications standards for design professionals.

Obstacles to Understanding Design Policy

In order to direct the formation of design policy, designers brainstorm on three central issues:

- 1) the subject matter of design;
- 2) the methods of design working and thinking; and
- 3) the purposes or goals sought in design practice and thinking.

Jacques Giard, former director of The School of Industrial Design at Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, had interpreted the Heskett Model of National Policy in terms of existing design policy in various forms:¹⁴

Statist: Industry is owned by the national government, the design policy is created and implemented by a central government authority, and customers/consumers have no voice in the marketplace. The design policies of the former Soviet Union and the former Eastern bloc countries were good examples.

Centrist: The national government plays an important role in determining and implementing economic policy in a cooperative manner with industry. The design policy of Taiwan is a good example.

Devolved: There is no national policy on design, but where a government or paragonment agency plays a role in promoting design. Most European design councils or centers fall into this category—in Denmark, France, Spain for example.

Indirect: The government implements laws, rules and regulations for the benefit of the general public. Design, like any other sector, must be responsible for its own survival. The United States and, to a certain extent, Germany are examples. (Canada is on the cusp of the devolved and indirect models.)

A multifaceted paradigm shift in policy formation would be necessary to codify design policy in the U.S. First, it is necessary to make an assessment of the effectiveness of policies initiated and implemented by a design-specific special interest organization versus a government agency. Second, understanding that in many ways design can lead or reflect the development of technology is a major consideration for defining such policy as cultural policy. There may, in fact, be many parallels drawn between design policy and science/technology policy, providing for a model by which both policy bodies can complement and enhance the other. Compared to European countries, the United States does not have a long history of cultural policy, strictly speaking only 34 years since the establishment of the NEA and National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). As a result of the direct involvement of the federal government in legislating the NEA and NEH, state support of the arts went from four to all fifty states within a few years, making the arts accessible to the public. This shows the importance of continued government support of cultural policy at the Federal Level, in order to provide impetus for cultural policies and programs in all other levels of government. Due to its short history, the notion of cultural policy has been the victim of prevailing political opinion and has suffered at the hands of budget cutting and criticism without much basis in fact. Under the current U.S. political climate in relation to design, it would be advisable to consider the Heskett/Giard model and implement an infrastructure for design most like the combination of the devolved and indirect models.

The U.S. should take the European model as an example, understanding that it may not provide the exact form for further developing U.S. cultural policy or design policy, but that there are many lessons to be learned from these examples. An important justification for continuing to develop U.S. cultural policy and making design policy a subset, is the idea of paving the way for a design tradition (research), application and innovation. Cultural policy would provide the framework to measure growth and progress of design-policy by design criteria, rather than evaluating progress using the results of technological implementation of design. To make this possible, a prime goal would have to be the good uses and effects of a product; profit would be a secondary goal. These aspects of design policy would promote self-confidence and autonomy in American culture and lifestyle and make it possible for a profound societal value shift to occur—from artificially stimulated perceived needs to more generally satisfying fulfillment of more basic and inherent needs.

The cultural obstacles that design-policy advocates face are numerous. Unfortunately, the state of the arts in the U.S. today, as it relates to government support and public perception, has deteriorated. Because design is typically referred to in the context of The NEA as "design arts," this imposes many political and media-generated misconceptions about the actual meaning of design practice. The NEA, Design Arts Program's mission states, "The Projects improve our communities and civic infrastructure, provide education and training opportunities, protect and cultivate our American Heritage, and encourage wise and sustainable land development." In order for design practitioners to "release" themselves from the overwhelmingly negative reputation generated by political debate, designers must speak clearly for themselves by forming a policy platform that reflects the characteristics specific to design practice and the effects of design on society.

Design Councils operating within government in most developed nations (see Appendix A) promote and demonstrate the importance and necessity of design in industry, other institutions and the global marketplace through policy-making activity. Such policy in the U.S. would encourage the public use and understanding of design and its value to the national and global economy and quality of life, reflecting on the context of the state—economic, political, cultural and technological contextual policies— rather than policies that are non-contextual, similar to foreign policies.¹⁵ The establishment of U.S. national design policy would be based on special interests rather than a narrowly focused policy dictating an aesthetic, particular style or regulation of the professions by certification or licensing. The policies would be distinct but referent of design protection policy that is widely understood as intellectual property protection both in the U.S. and abroad.^{16,17,18}

The current proliferation of communication graphic design on the world wide web presents new challenges to promote and protect design in the marketplace. The following example shows new problems in design protection and promotion as part of the new technological economy:

Fonts are hot. Everywhere you turn these days, fonts are in your face: typography of every shape and description on computer screens, packaging, even clothing. But you can't copyright fonts. Over-the-counter designs sell for next to nothing, if the user pays at all. Then Chank turned to the World Wide Web. Teaching himself to program, he put his work on display and made it available for sale via download or disk.

When amateurs began asking him for free fonts, he obliged. The revenue wasn't growing, but the traffic was...he then

asked for \$10 from anyone downloading "free" fonts from his Web site... Next he offered to send a disk with three mystery fonts and a catalogue to anyone who mailed him \$10 in advance. More paid.¹⁹

Policies that would tend toward standardization would most likely be interpreted as restrictive to innovation. To do this, a perceptual shift about design must be directed to all segments of the population from a perception of design being a luxury to design being a necessity. This raises many questions of equality, exploitation, justice and oppression as part of a design policy framework, making it necessary to conduct research to support the needs of specific interests²⁰ in relation to design perspectives. Design research would promote action toward needs of specific interests by making the issues known through political and legal initiatives. Translating the design perspectives on specific issues into policy will make design, typically perceived as inherently elusive and transparent to the layperson, a tangible entity as part of a cause-and-effect relationship:

design policy → example → outcome → benefit

The specific topics about design policy that would be discussed within The United States Design Alliance would span many different disciplines by establishing specific programs: policy research, analysis and initiatives; educational outreach to colleges of design, university design programs and K-12 levels; design in business; design in government; design and special interests; and support of design research to further develop theory and policy. Policy will become the vehicle for systematically documenting and protecting design research and innovation. The policy goal would be to examine and analyze existing policy to determine how these policies can be improved by looking at the issues from a design perspective. In essence, a paradigm shift would be used to improve existing policies and initiate new policies that would benefit individuals, business and government by considering these issues as the design community's responsibility.

It is important to identify the specific negative and positive aspects influencing the formation of national design policy and a national design organization:

Positive Factors:

Contribution of design to U.S. economic competitiveness, nationally and globally.

Promotes innovation.

Benefits in education and learning skills.

Fosters visibility of business and government.

As a federal government agency (based on an indirect/devolved model), a design organization can be a centralized advocacy group for all design professions.

A federal government agency would be able to coordinate design activities across all U.S. federal government agencies.

Negative Factors:

Standardization of a national design aesthetic.

Dictation of stylistic standards.

Certification or regulation of the professions.

Public perception of the lack of accomplishment from existing cultural Federal Government Agencies, and lack of tradition for cultural policies.

Centralized policies might have a "Big Brother" perception, especially when addressing issues of visual material.

In relation to the business constituents, development of policies to give an incentive for implementing company-wide design programs would improve performance, assist business to become pro-active in dealing with environmental issues, and ultimately respond to customer needs. In addition, a major effort to encourage graduate business programs to include design as a topic of study and research would be developed and implemented as a required course of study. When considering government constituents, policies for improving and implementing design as a core competency within all government agencies would be paramount. Rules and guidelines for procurement of government contracts should include a section for design services as a separate aspect of projects being done to produce any tangible product or service, and any contract award require mandatory professional qualifications.

Programs at the state level, similar to the Slater Center for Design Innovation, are a means to facilitate commercialization and entrepreneurship for design professionals at a "grass-roots" level (see Appendix D). These programs would become the foundation for the policy and organizational goals at a national level.²⁰ The mission statement for The Slater Center supports the commitment of encouraging two categories of design projects—royalty projects and business projects:

The Slater Center for Design Innovation at Rhode Island School of Design (SCDI) is the culmination of the Rhode Island School of Design's commitment to research and creative exploration as expressed through a partnership of the RISD Research Foundation and the Rhode Island Economic Policy Council's Slater Center Program, which nurture the transfer of university-developed technology to the commercial market. The mission of SCDI is to support and mentor the continuous cycle of design innovation and enterprise. This mission has been formulated as a means for establishing Rhode Island as a world class design and innovation center, with RISD at the leading edge of this effort.²¹

Programs in K-12 education would be mandatory for all students in order to promote and advance public awareness of design and the design professions. Public-awareness programs would be implemented by convening round-table discussions on a regular basis between representatives from business, government, education and the general public (for example, since 1986, England has published *DesignWeek*,

a weekly magazine about the state of design in England and abroad). These dialogues could be called "The State of Design." An extensive awards recognition program would identify significant accomplishments in the areas of the design professions as well as in education and research. Concurrently, The Design Alliance would work directly with design schools and university design in education to incorporate this policy perspective into the curriculum for all of the design professions—architecture, industrial design, graphic design, landscape architecture, interior architecture, fashion design, engineering design and urban planning.

There will certainly be some broad, over-arching issues that relate to the design professions, and without question the needs of minorities and disadvantaged sectors of the society and community would be central to development of design policy. Within its scope would include intellectual-property issues, small business, quality in design, continuing education for professional practice, entrepreneurship and tax issues. This program would be achieved by forming alliances with various public-interest groups that could benefit from design thinking. Examples would include The Environmental Council of the States, The Research Institute for Small and Emerging Business and The American Association for Homes and Services for the Aging. By collaborating with special-interest organizations, common goals to develop policy can be identified and implemented.

Recommendations for Implementation of a National Design Organization:

Possible Models

Based on the first meeting of the Implementation Committee for The United States Design Alliance held on November 14, 1997, the following recommendations were made:

Cultural-Institution Centered (congressionally funded):

Develop an advisory panel within the Smithsonian Institution with a representative from each of the design professions, business, government and the public sectors. The goal would be to implement the programming explained above, but there would be no policy-making or lobbying activities because this would be contrary to the Smithsonian Institution's mission. The panel could act in an advisory capacity to the U.S. Congress in order to recommend certain design policies based on the results and findings of the programs.

Independent Alliance (privately funded):

Form an alliance organization with representatives from each of the design professional organizations and design educational organizations under the auspices of a larger organization such as The Worldesign Foundation, in order to form a national-level organization. As an association, this type of organization would be able to exercise all of the programming, policy making and lobbying activities necessary to achieve the organization's missions.

Business/Government Cooperative Mode (similar to The Slater Center, but on a national level):

Toward a mission statement for The United States Design Alliance:

A. Design Research:

A research and data collection and repository for all design disciplines to measure the impact of design in business, government and among individuals; developing case studies in the business, government and general public environments; promote the value of design in the United States for competitiveness, efficiency and quality of life. Promote cooperation and understanding of designers between agencies of the U.S. federal government, among the business sector and general public sector.

B. Design Visibility:

To promote the visibility of design by educating the public, corporate and political world of the importance of design and the contribution it makes to our economic and cultural world.

C. Education

Develop an orientation toward increased representation and use of design theory and problem solving in the K-12 educational system and to incorporate all of the two-dimensional and three dimensional design disciplines into these educational programs.

References

1

Pearlman, Chee with Michael Sorkin and Sylvia Harris Woodward; "Designing America," I.D. Magazine; Vol. 40 No. 2; March/April 1993.

2

Congressional Hearing, U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science, Space and Technology—Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation; 103rd Congress, 2nd Session; June 21, 1994; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., ISBN 0-16-045986-9 and U.S. House of Representatives, Joint Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space and Technology; Bill H.R. 4673, 103rd Congress, 2nd Session; June 29, 1994. (see appendix B and C)

3

"Introduction", National Endowment for the Arts; A Proposal for a White House Council on Design: A Strategy to Harness the Power of Design"; June, 1994.

⁴Buchanan, Richard and Victor Margolin; "Introduction," from *The Idea of Design: A Design Issues Reader*; ed. by Victor Margolin and Richard Buchanan; MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.; 1995.

⁵Buchanan, Richard; "Wicked Problems in Design Thinking," from *The Idea of Design: A Design Issues Reader*; ed. by Victor Margolin and Richard Buchanan; MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.; 1995.

⁶Gibney, Frank and Belinda Luscombe, "The Redesigning of America." *Time Magazine*, March 20, 2000; Vol.155 No. 11, p. 66-75.

⁷Buchanan, Richard; "Wicked Problems in Design Thinking," *ibid.*

⁸Freeman, Robert; "How to Save the NEA," *The Wall Street Journal*, November 11, 1997; p. A10.

⁹Morgenstern, Joe; "Getty Opens Mammoth Hilltop Center to Public," *The Wall Street Journal*, December 16, 1997; p. A16.

¹⁰Hastings, Judith; "The Strength of Collective Efforts," *Interiors and Sources Magazine*; July, 1995.

¹¹Huxtable, Ada Louise; "New Guggenheim: Art and Architecture as One," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 16, 1997; p. A20.

¹²Greenberg, Larry; "Jane Jacobs Sounds Off—Again: Renowned Urban Thinker Worries About Fate of City Economies," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 8, 1997; p. B12.

¹³Vogel, Craig M.; "From Design Awareness to Design Integration: Influencing Corporate Strategy and Research in the United States," *Design Management Journal*; Vol. 7, No. 3; Summer, 1996.

¹⁴Giard, Jacques; "Canadian Design and the National Agenda: Toward the Year 2005," *Design Management Journal*; Vol. 7, No. 3; Summer, 1996.

¹⁵Giard, Jacques; "Canadian Design and the National Agenda: Toward the Year 2005," *Design Management Journal*; Vol. 7, No. 3; Summer, 1996.

¹⁶Jehoram, Herman Cohen; *Design Protection*; Sijthoff, Leyden Publishing; Amsterdam, 1976.

¹⁷Johnston, Dan and Michael Edwardes-Evans, Geoffrey Adams; *Design Protection*, Fourth Edition; University Press, Cambridge/Gower Publishing Limited, Hampshire England; 1995

¹⁸Kase, Francis J.; *Designs: A Guide to Official Literature on Design Protection*; A.W. Sijthoff, Leyden/ Oceana Publications Inc., Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.; 1975.

¹⁹Petzinger, Jr., Thomas; "For a Designer Known as Chank, Letters are Art," *The Wall Street Journal*, November 7, 1997; p. B1.

²⁰Kash, Don; "A National Design Policy: Of Questionable Value and Unlikely," *Design Management Journal*; Vol. 4, No. 3; Summer, 1993

²¹*Request for Proposals*; Slater Center for Design Innovation, 2000. (see appendix D)

Additional Sources

Interviews with the following individuals also were part of the research for this project:

Roger Mandle, president, The Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, Rhode Island
Gerry Proctor, vice president, Bally Design, Pittsburgh, PA.

Jan van Toom, director, Jan van Eyck Akademie, Maastricht, The Netherlands

The Alumni Executive Council of The Rhode Island School of Design Alumni Association, Providence Rhode Island

Tracey Doddenhoff, director, The Slater Center for Design Innovation at The Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, Rhode Island

The meeting referred to in the paper was held on November 14, 1997 at The Strathmore Hall Arts Center, Rockville, Md. and the following people were in attendance:

Stephanie Adler, MFA Candidate, Visual Communications Program, School of Fine Arts, The George Washington

University, Washington, D.C.; William O. Barrett, director, Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design, San Francisco, Calif.; Robert M. Beckley, professor and dean emeritus, FAIA, The University of Michigan, College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Gresham Riley, president, The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Philadelphia, Penn.; Stephanie Yoffee, graphic designer and MBA Candidate, The School of Business and Public Management, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Appendix A

U.S. Based Design Professional Organizations:

American Center for Design (ACD)
American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA)
American Institute of Architects (AIA)
American Society of Interior Designers (ASID)
American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)
Association of Professional Design Firms (APDF)
Industrial Design Society of America (IDSA)
Institute of Business Designers (IBD)
The Design Management Institute (DMI)
The Fashion Council (New York)
Package Design Council (PDC)
Society of Environmental Graphic Designers (SEGD)
Society of Newspaper Designers (SND)

Design Councils/Government Agencies:

Product Development and Design Center of the Philippines
Pasay City, Manila The Philippines
The Designer's Institute of New Zealand
Association of Dutch Designers (BNO)
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
The Design Council
London, England
The Malaysian Design Council
Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
The Finnish Association of Designers (ORNAMO)
Netherlands Design Institute
Design Forum Finland
Agence pour la Promotion la Creation Industrielle [Agency for the Promotion of Industrial Creation] (APCI) (France)
Associazione Industriale Design (ADI) (Italy)
Norsk Designrad (Norway)
Barcelona Centro de Diseño (Spain)
Svensk Industridesign (Sweden)
Design Center Stuttgart (Germany)
Danish Design Center
TDC Design Gallery
(Hong Kong Trade Development Council)

International/Global Design Organizations:

ICOGRADA
London, England
International Design Network Foundation
New York, N.Y.
Sustainable Solutions/Design Association
(supported by Green Foundation, Danish Ministry of the Environment and Energy for development in the sustainable textile industry)

International Council of Societies of Industrial Designers
International Society of Interior Designers
Design Research Organizations (National and International)
Design Research Society
School of Design Research
Birmingham Institute of Art and Design
University of Central England
Birmingham, England
Design Futures Council
Reston, Virginia
Arche Works
Chicago, Illinois
The Worldesign Foundation

New York, N.Y.

U.S. Design Educational Associations:

American Center for Design

Chicago, Illinois

Corporate Design Foundation

Boston, Massachusetts

National Endowment for the Arts, Design Program

Washington, D.C.

The Center for Universal Design

School of Design

North Carolina State University

Raleigh, North Carolina

Pratt Institute Center for Community and Environmental Development (PICCED)

Brooklyn, New York

Consortium on Green Design and Manufacturing (CGDM)

University of California, Berkeley

American Colleges and Schools of Architecture (ACSA)

Washington, D.C.

Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design

San Francisco, California

Appendix B: U.S. House of Representatives, Joint Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space and Technology; Bill H.R. 4673, 103rd Congress, 2nd Session; June 29, 1994.

Appendix C: National Endowment for the Arts; "A Proposal for a White House Council on Design: A Strategy to Harness the Power of Design"; June, 1994.

Appendix D: Slater Center for Design Innovation: Request for Proposals