

Teaching Service Design: pedagogical reflections

Lara Salinas¹, Silvia Grimaldi¹, Maria Alejandra Lujan Escalante¹, Hena Ali¹, Marion Lagedamont¹ and Alison Prendiville¹

l.salinas@lcc.arts.ac.uk

¹Service Futures Lab, London College of Communication, University of the Arts London

Abstract

We present critical reflections from our teaching and learning, design research and knowledge exchange practices to posit a pedagogy of service design. A salient characteristic of this pedagogy is that we involve cohorts of postgraduate students in complex multi-stakeholder projects. We created the Service Futures Lab to provide infrastructure for these projects. When the Lab collaborates with courses across the university it bridges the requirements of the student curriculum with the requirements of our collaborators, aligning with university and our own research agendas and interests. We outline how the learning by doing approach of the Lab contributes to building a pedagogy of service design. We use three projects led by the Lab that involved students from MA Service Design between 2020 and 2022 to discuss how we apply the pedagogical principles we are positing, as well as reflect on the constraints, issues, and opportunities of such projects.

Keywords: pedagogy, design justice, knowledge exchange, project-based learning

Introduction

Context

The emergence and evolution of service design education has parallels with service design practice with early attention given to one-off projects, often with a specific focus on collaborative service design methods and tools (Stickdorm & Scheneider 2010) and as a contributor to specific aspects of new service development and service innovation (Sangiorgi, Prendiville and Jung, 2017). Concurrently, early service design education was very much focused on the 'how to' – which is now often critiqued for its overly prescriptive approach and its reliance on formulaic practices of customer journey mapping, personas, and blueprints. This application of

methodological tools frequently overlooked existing design legacies and the complexities that would lead to significant organisational changes (Junginger, 2014) Furthermore, in educational projects students were often limited to the amount of access they were given to key actors. As service design has matured as a practice, organisations have also opened-up to the opportunities of working with service design courses particularly in the third sector and local government.

At the Service Futures Lab at University of the Arts London (hereafter the Lab) we are design practice researchers and educators working in addressing societal challenges through design-led approaches and projects. The Lab provides space for experimentation and long-term engagements, where relationships are formed and developed over many years to build capacity and capability for partner organisation (Malmberg, 2017). Our collaborative projects become exemplars that support organisational change, new services, and policies.

At the Lab, we lead design projects that engage students (mostly but not limited to MA Service Design, hereafter MASD), partners, and stakeholders to critically deliberate alternatives, prototype solutions and preferable futures while offering opportunities for teaching and learning. We tackle challenges relating to social justice, public policy and services, climate emergency and public health. We collaborate closely with partner organisations facilitating mindset change towards more collaborative and inclusive ways of working. Our initiatives are transdisciplinary, building deep partnerships across sectors: with government, business, voluntary and community organisations, residents, students, and researchers. We are driven by principles of collaborative design, design justice, responsible research innovation, ethical engagement, and reflexive research, with particular focus on working with stakeholders in inclusive and accessible solutions that are co-created, reciprocal, synergistic and enduring.

A salient characteristic of the Lab is our know-how for involving postgraduate students in complex multi-stakeholder projects in a meaningful way, delivering impact for partners and their communities, learning for students and practice research for the academic team. We are informed by our engagement and collaborations with Public Collaboration Lab (Thorpe, Prendiville and Oliver 2016, p. 500). We build on this model, understanding the Lab as ‘a place for collaboration, experimentation and experiential learning [...] to explore new ways of working to develop and deliver policy and services that may improve outcomes for citizens’.

The following section reflects on the challenges and opportunities of this model to teaching and learning service design via the Lab’s projects.



Basic Principles for a Pedagogy of Service Design

At the centre of our pedagogy is ‘learning by doing’, inspired by critical pedagogy (Freire, 2020) and engaged learning (Weaver & Wilding, 2013; Neary et al., 2014).

Learning by doing projects in real-world settings equip service designers with skills to navigate the inherent complexity of the discipline. The team keeps a strong position about responsible and non-extractive practices in service design, aligning with ‘design justice pedagogies [which] must support students to actively develop their own critical analysis of design, power, and liberation, in ways that connect with their own lived experience’ (Costanza-Chock, 2020, p. 187).

Considering the position of three key actors: students, project partners, and their communities, we are driven by key principles that work as parameters for decision-making, to inform the scope of projects and terms of the collaboration. We only take up projects that have pedagogical and socio-environmental value, considering learning outcomes and impact upon intended beneficiaries.

We take an **asset-based approach**, carefully question who should be involved in a project, who benefits from it and how (Design Justice Network, 2018). We favour Creative Commons Framework, for project’s outputs and **outcomes to be co-owned by participants** and taken forward by anyone who is interested in making it happen.

We also find tensions between the need to deliver high quality outputs and outcomes to partners, while being mindful of not undercutting other businesses (e.g., the design consultancies that our students regularly join) and of creating a space for **students to experiment and fail safely**. We have developed frameworks and tools to reveal tensions, facilitate reflexive practice and consolidate learning, e.g., students are never to be considered ‘cheap labour’ (Salinas, 2022a).

Design projects

We continue by presenting three projects led by the Lab during the academic years 2020–2022, featuring different models of engagement to illustrate how we apply our pedagogical principles.

Climate Studio

It was a collaboration between University of the Arts London and organisations across three clusters in London to support place-based climate action. Salinas, who maintains an ongoing partnership with Southwark Council, led the South Cluster. Although Climate Studio was a 6-month-long collaboration, the 32 MASD students joined in in the context of the 8-week long Design Futures unit, which introduces



students to anticipatory innovation through critical service design (Salinas, 2022b; Service Futures Lab 2023). The unit combines lectures, independent study, fieldwork, and workshops with students working in teams. Students conducted secondary research to reframe local government objectives, built a catalogue of nuggets of information and services local to south London, and across latitudes, longitudes and timescapes, drawing on the multiculturalism of the cohort. The unit included rapid prototyping future services that would exist in a carbon neutral near future in the borough. Students were encouraged to co-design with local residents, and to that end six co-design workshops with children were arranged in collaboration with local organisations. As creative facilitators students designed the sessions, including co-creation methods appropriate for the participants. Discussion focused on whether the proposed future services belonged to a preferable future and for whom, exploring competing worldviews, for what is preferable is bound up with each participant's ideological narratives and worldviews (Inayatullah, 2013). Students engaged in a backcasting (Robinson, 1990) activity with children and public servants, further articulating the role of different actors, asking everyone 'what can I do now to attain this future?' and 'what support do I need from others?'



Figure 1 and 2. Student-led activities with children at two community organisations.

The project's objectives and deliverables were different for each set of actors. For Salinas, it was a learning opportunity to deliver her teaching, but also an opportunity to support the development of local networks driven to local action (Ehn, 2008). For the students, learning outcomes were concerned with design in government contexts, and to approach the design of services as complex and relational (Sangiorgi, 2011; Kimbell and Blomberg 2017). Additionally, the project enhanced their future acumen and literacy, as 'the ability to construct and problematise future scenarios and experiment with ways to deal with them'; facilitation as the ability to support people in communicating their needs and desires; and service prototyping focusing on the exploration of future roles in public service systems (Malpass and Salinas 2020, p.

47). After their involvement in Climate Studio many students chose to focus their Final Major Projects on design for public sector innovation, and upon graduation many have become inhouse service designers in various London local authorities.

For the local government, it was an opportunity to learn about collaborative approaches, and inform the development of the Sustainable Food Action Plan (Southwark Council, 2022). We are currently exploring opportunities to prototype future services in the borough. The continuous involvement of local officers with the Lab through this and other projects supports their design capacity and capability, and in some parts of the organisation 'design is a key strategic means of encouraging innovation' (Danish Design Centre 2001). The local government is now willing to embrace design-led civic engagement approaches to enable co-creation of services' (Salinas et al, 2018) and continue to engage in design practice research initiatives with the Lab.

For the local organisations involved this was their first contact with design and had openly unclear expectations. It was important for us to ensure direct benefits within the timeframe of the project, thus we designed each activity involving children and young adults to be in alignment with the local community's operational objectives, such as training the trainer in creative facilitation methods, design-led civic engagement on a local urban plan or complementing the lack of creative education in the school curriculum at an after-school club.

Good Help for Families After COVID: Camden Family Changemakers

A co-design project led by Grimaldi in collaboration with Camden Council's Family services team, involving collaborators within local government, including a group of 23 Parent Changemakers, service delivery leads and workers within a range of family services, and other stakeholders and experts such as headteachers, local charities, and policymakers. Within the HEI this project involved five academics, two MASD alumni working as interns within the council, and 42 students from MASD and MA Data Visualisation. The entire project was carried out during the third COVID-19 lockdown in the UK, hence conducted fully online.

Parents, students, and stakeholders co-designed a vision of what "good help" for families would look and feel like after COVID-19, and materialised and prototyped this vision into a series of service proposals. The project was structured around different phases. The interns, guided by the academic team, ran fortnightly co-design sessions with the Parent Changemaker group to explore what it is like to be a parent in the area, their experiences of giving and receiving help, and ultimately designed a manifesto of "good help" for families (Bailey, 2022; What Does Good Help Look Like After Covid, 2021; Camden Family Changemakers, 2021a)





Figure 3. Good Help Value Statements from the Good Help for Families Manifesto

The students' involvement was organised in three phases. Firstly, students researched and mapped the complex network of help services and access points available to families. The main learning outcomes in this phase were about System Design (Meadows, 1999) and visualising complexity, but also using visualisations to tell a story and engage residents. Secondly, MASD students used their maps as co-discovery tools working with parents and stakeholders to validate their findings and points-of-view. Students were introduced to Design Justice Principles (Design Justice Network, 2018) and were asked to interrogate their work in terms of who benefits, who is harmed, and whose voices should be centred in the project. Thirdly, students co-designed a service design response to the parents' manifesto, prototyping what the application of the policy principles could look like in practice through 8 proposals focused on service transformation, policy design, and reimagining futures. The project ended in a presentation to Council leaders as well as national leaders from other family services and charities. The presentation was led by parents and students and culminated in the request to Council leaders to pledge in what ways they would implement this approach.

Working at different scales from systemic understanding and policy to detailed implementable interventions meant that the outcome could be on a policy level (the manifesto) and could inform policy decisions, while at the same time provided clear

examples of the applications for service delivery, bringing the manifesto to life, and making it less abstract. The outcomes and outputs of the project have been used by the Camden Family Services team to inform practice, reflection, and planning, as well as being used as a building block for other projects. Within Camden Council in particular, where there is a wider shift towards relational, participatory, and strengths-based work; the methodology has been shared and used as an exemplar.

The Parent Changemakers reported that the project impacted their confidence, pride in their achievement, skills (including IT and English language), wellbeing, creating new connections, family relations, and appreciation for Camden, in addition to supporting their confidence and motivation to pursue further employment and professional opportunities (Co-Production Collective, 2022)

Family Services	Education	Other
Presented and discussed in detail at the Camden Children’s Partnership Trust Board	Mentioned in conversations with the Department of Education	Ideas, language and approach reflected in Health and Wellbeing Strategy
Ideas, language and approach influencing the Camden Resilient Families Framework and informing the programme refresh	Cited in Camden’s new education strategy, ‘Build Back Stronger’ and its implementation plan	Mentioned in conversations with the Ministry of Justice and the Department of Health and Social Care
Directly influenced Camden’s successful application for funding from the Department of Education to expand advice and guidance provision in community settings – with roles for residents in this work.	Recommended as the ‘practice standard’ to inform schools’ engagement with families	Influencing approaches to co-design and support for families in hostels and temporary accommodation.

Table 1. Documented impacts of the project (Co-Production Collective, 2022)

Service Design Training for Digital Services Teams at UAL

This training for digital service teams at UAL was led by Lujan Escalante and Grimaldi. It aimed to 1) support a culture shift towards focussing on student-first and frontline academic staff, 2) demonstrate the impact of centring student experience, and 3) build capabilities within existing teams to reimagine service delivery. Additionally, the Lab’s pedagogical aim was 4) engaging students in developing a training proposition for capacity building in service design which could be replicated across organisations.

The program was delivered over 10 weeks following the double diamond Framework for Innovation (Design Council, 2019). Participants, staff working in university



services, were supported by students in the role of Service Design Facilitators (SDF) and learned about the principles of service design informing and transforming organisational values through working on projects based on current real university issues, co-discovered using user-centred methods. (Service Futures Lab, 2022)



Figure 4. Service Design Training for Digital Services Teams

The process started with research prior to the training, in which SDFs shadowed, interviewed, and observed teams working to generate insights for the training course, considering aspects such as power relations within the working teams, gender, abilities and seniority. The course was delivered in 5 by-weekly sessions with the expectations that participants would develop independent work in between sessions, guided by specific tasks and supported by the SDFs. The sessions included 1) introduction to service design, ways of working and user and context research tools 2) research synthesis, ecosystem and value mapping 3) ideating and defining, creative methods, and prototyping, 4) ethical impact assessment and discussions 5) delivering projects and future work, ending the training course by co-developing a manifesto. All the sessions were led by our team from the Lab in collaboration with the SDFs. Together we designed and adapted service design, co-design, and responsible research innovation tools, and prepared SDFs to facilitate the engagement with participants, thinking critically about the impact on the participant teams and organisational changes.

The Lab was interested in creating a training package with further applicability in other teams of the university and in external organisations. The training included a program of parallel evaluation that used creative, qualitative, and quantitative methods to gather evidence on the experience of participants from the beginning of the program and allowed us to assess the impact and areas of learning, as well as reflect on opportunities for improvement. This evaluation process was led by Salinas and delivered by a SDF.

The impact of the training for the university teams is around the learnings of the participants and, on another dimension as organisational changes. We clustered learning outcomes around a) learning to identify own assumptions and how they influence organisational decision making, b) understanding users' needs and how to meaningfully collaborate with users during the ideation and prototyping, c) acquiring experience using prototyping techniques not just for services, but to understand problems, communicate and test ideas. Finally, d) learning the importance of seeking diversity to produce inclusive outcomes. In terms of the organisational impact, participants documented applying service design thinking and processes as new practices in their teams and reported awareness of a change in working culture. As a result, new projects and teams emerged, and these awakened the interest from other services at the university that are keen to learn more about how to work with the Lab to achieve culture change within their teams. The Lab is currently using the training package to tailor it to other training programs within the university and outside the university for the upcoming year.

Discussion: Pedagogical Insights

Creating and managing projects with external partners is central to the Lab and the MASD offer. Engaged teaching via knowledge exchange projects in which students lead and collaborate is part of a pedagogical ethos of learning by doing. And expanding the context of service design applicability is crucial for teaching Service Design. In this section we discuss pedagogical priorities, foregrounding our uncertainties, strategies and tactics.

We want to become an asset to our communities

A condition for becoming an asset to our communities is to establish long-term relationships, whereby we contribute to granting the resources necessary for experimentation (Thorpe and Rhodes, 2018). While collaborations often start as a one-off project, the 8-to-14-week in-curricular projects are often part of larger ongoing collaborations. We thrive to continue collaborations via different mechanisms, either



as extra-curricular to postgraduate taught degrees, through Final Major Projects, or continued by the following student cohort; in doctoral or collaborative research programmes (e.g. Delina Evans, MASD alumni, doctoral researcher and senior service designer at Camden Council, developing pluriversal design approaches to account for ethnic diversity within the borough); and with alumni joining as in-house service designers.

Moreover, we are committed to embody and practise the principles of Design Justice (Costanza-Chock, 2020), actively develop frameworks to include traditional and indigenous knowledges and embrace values of communities (Lujan Escalante et al. 2021, Mortimer and Lujan Escalante, 2022; Lujan Escalante and Mortimer, 2022). Often our students are more familiar with traditional ideas of designers-as-problem-solvers: solutionist and extractionist approaches (Keshavarz, 2020) in which a designer brings a solution with the expectation that people will engage, participate and ultimately produce the designer's concept. Paraphrasing Costanza-Chock (2020), the solutionist approach makes it harder for students to understand communities, organisations, citizens, not as data sources or test beds, but as co-designers and experts in their own experiences. However, asset-based processes are long, require embeddedness and a deep understanding of values and narratives, including those that are often excluded, systematically discriminated against and misportrayed.

To maintain meaningful relationships over time, we thrive to offer tangible solutions to our partners' needs. There is an imbalance inherent in the fact that students will be gaining educational credits towards their (very expensive) postgraduate degree, and a project to place in their portfolio for employment, while participants don't have this reward built into the project. This doesn't come without its own internal tensions. In the *Good Help* project for example, while on the one side the partners' and the community's interest was to recognise the wealth of expertise within our participant group, we also had to make sure the students felt ownership over their own contribution to the project and their own expertise. This was also an opportunity to enable the students and the participants to make deliberate decisions about who should be included in the project and why their voice is important.

We use the Lab to provide continuity beyond the curriculum and build partnerships over the years that enable us to be perceived as an asset by our partners and communities. We advocate for creating community ownership, in which partners,



communities and stakeholders have agency and are involved in the different stages of a project from start to end.

We want to be responsive to local contexts and communities

Projects with organisations are situated within particular values, such as access, democracy, privacy, participation, equal opportunities on the one hand and on the other, diversity and inclusion, wellbeing, health, family. Such values are situated within a Western understanding, and hyper-localised within the social fabric of London realities, histories, narratives, social codes, political agendas. Our student cohorts are international (we have a small percentage of London-based students) coming from places where these values mean something very different and play out in different ways in people's lives. The pedagogical uncertainty is around the implications of this change of values for international students at their return to their own countries.

We want students to be responsive to local contexts and communities, initiated in anthropological and ethnographic approaches (Blomberg and Darrah, 2015). Thus, the MASD starts with a research-intensive and asset-based localised project so students can really get close to some London communities. The course includes expert guest lectures from micro and macro perspectives, on local history and values. Many students choose to embed themselves in local communities, for example by volunteering locally. However, the MASD is already a full-time course, not all students can afford this level of embeddedness while working part time or having caring responsibilities, and the assumption of Western values as positive may remain.

We enact multiple and diverse roles as designers

Working within these types of multi-stakeholder collaborations demands a change of role, from design expert to a collaborative designer, a design action researcher, activist, valuing diffuse design expertise (Manzini, 2015). This is a point of tension with students, who often have extensive industry experience, expect a consultancy-client type of relationship, and ask 'who is the client?' hoping for a straight short answer. However, the 'client' in *Climate Studio* were the residents of the borough, and the students' role was to use design to facilitate conversations about preferable futures, bringing different local actors together in a collaborative and generative



space. Although students recognize the contribution of diffuse designers, they are often resistant to co-design, build on proposals, to borrow, to truly co-create. In response, we articulate projects that approach design for services as sense-making rather than problem-solving and embed the design practice with reflections around the different roles of actors.

We want to develop critical thinkers and design researchers

Students come to the MASD with a specific interest in learning service design, design thinking, co-design tools and methods, the type of tools that have become famous for facilitating innovation. In a way these frameworks are easier to teach as they exist as templates, inviting re-tailor, and ready to use. However, these approaches are often about *externalising*- inviting participants to ideate, share opinions, rate, categorise, cluster, connect, create key words for complex things / processes / systems. In *externalising* one tends to jump directly to either disagreement or consensus, which often involves ignoring the voices with less power, representation and marginalised identities (99U, 2018).

Aiming to mitigate this issue of externalisation and in favour of balancing the student demand, we constantly work in recentring students to the project's aim, interrogating the use of tools, and being critical about what the specific tool *does*, *why* it is used, whether it is appropriate or not to the particular context, whether a different method should be used, aiming to get students to create processes of *internalising*. We do so by imagining and designing dynamics to support encounters that value difference, based on joy, humour, play, and memories. This is a difficult and an ongoing effort from the duration of MASD.

We want students to have agency and autonomy

By including students in the collaboration, the Lab's projects offer them an opportunity to build trust and exercise expert agency. The "trust-agency-combo" means that beyond getting experience on how to design for policy and civic participation or consultancy and training, students gain the confidence of being equal collaborators with their lecturers and project researchers. In other words, the students "facilitate rather than being facilitated".



Throughout the MASD we aim to support students' ownership and autonomy over their project brief, direction, and methodology, within the limits of what is necessary to fulfil the learning outcomes. Equally, we give students authority over their own learning management, asking them to lead on certain areas of the stakeholder relationship, as well as to organise learning sessions around particular skills. This is in line with ideas of critical pedagogy, where the educator is setting the space and the problem to facilitate the learning, but the action comes from the students' agency (Freire 2000). While this enables students to have agency in the way they develop their projects and outcomes, it also allows them to draw on each other's lived and professional experience. For the academics and partners this means having less control on the projects' outcomes, risking losing relevance or coming with solutions that may not be closely aligned with academics' research interests.

In the *Service Design Training* we decided to refer to our students as 'Service Design Facilitators' (SDF). Four students were involved as facilitators, one of whom was also project manager, another ran the evaluation activities, and another worked as a graphic designer. SDFs carried out the preliminary research of the services, led activities, facilitated workshops, participated actively and meaningfully in the planning and decision making and, most importantly, each of them was responsible for guiding a team, creating opportunities for tutorials and guidance outside and during the workshop sessions. Another aspect that the students appreciated was the experience of being "behind the scenes" of the project, from the early stages of project design, being able to also experience how research collaboration and learning experiences are planned and scoped. Particularly, students highlighted how they learned from how inclusivity and diversity of the teams, ethical considerations, and issues of representation were managed in the interactions planned.

In *Good Help* we implemented experimental pedagogical practices partly out of necessity, because we were operating in lockdown and the teaching team was overstretched, and partly to capitalise on the learning about collaboration. The students helped to plan and manage the project and the unit, having input on the content and the delivery, and co-delivered the teaching on the unit capitalising on their strengths and past experiences. Final presentations were led by students, as well as town halls and other public events with stakeholders. In addition, the teaching team also capitalised on their diverse disciplinary expertise. This gave both the students and the academics involved of a sense of ownership not only on the project outcomes but on the learning as a whole.



Design for services requires (resource intensive) infrastructuring

We want to acknowledge the complex socio-technical systems in which we learn and teach to design for services, and which present a great learning opportunity for students. However, there is a salient challenge around the resource intensity of the live-project-based curriculum. Even without considering the preparation for the project, the delivery itself is resource intensive, for example engaging with communities requires the academic team to go beyond working places and hours. The Lab was partly created to surface and make explicit this infrastructuring work.

For *Climate Studio*, forming a partnership among local actors was a desired outcome in itself. The intention was that students would form strong relationships with local partners, which would be continued as part of their Final Major Projects. The external funding secured for the project translated into additional capacity that allowed us to hire alumni to support students in their journey.

The amount of resources and extra efforts from the Lab and the course teams we collaborate with is difficult to calculate and communicate. We operate within a model of Higher Education becoming corporate, students becoming customers and lecturers' capacities being overstretched and under-supported. We reflect on the cost of our pedagogical principles and efforts: while we commit to operate at this intersection of design research, teaching and learning, and knowledge exchange to bring about the most needed social-environmental impact for our communities into the classroom and forming students as agents of change, we are also conscious of the difficulty of designing an engagement that is fair for us (design academics) too.

Conclusion: A Pedagogy of Service Design

While some of the uncertainties remain and we work within entangled tensions and interests, we hope that our experience can inform colleagues, educators and design practice researchers with interests in working with similar approaches. For this we



have compiled the discussions and principles that enlighten our practice into a resource table as a mode of conclusion:

Why? From a pedagogical perspective	Principles	How? Strategies and tactics
<p>We want graduates to understand complexity of service design in real world settings</p>	<p>Learning by Doing, Project-based Learning, and Design Justice.</p>	<p>Involving students as stakeholders of live projects to teach and learn while researching in collaboration with external partners including local authorities, voluntary and community organisations and residents.</p>
<p>We want graduates to have a clear understanding of their role and power within an ecosystem.</p> <p>Understand services as complex socio-technical systems.</p> <p>Teaching through live projects provide opportunities to become part of these ecosystems.</p>	<p>Principle of Meaningful Engagement and Non-extractive practices.</p> <p>Designing and equipping participants for meaningful collaborations considering ethics and power relations.</p>	<p>Using design methods to understand active narratives, values and stories that may offer or rest power to stakeholders.</p> <p>Surface the infrastructuring work and identify its contribution to research and knowledge exchange.</p> <p>Tie student projects into different phases of building research and knowledge exchange partnerships.</p> <p>Students are embedded with the communities.</p>
<p>We want graduates to understand how to cooperate in a responsible way.</p> <p>Unpack the organisational culture and value of collaborators, and the role of designers as agents of change outside and inside organisations.</p>	<p>Pluriversal perspectives.</p> <p>Align expectations with and among partners.</p> <p>Avoid having clients, try to have partners, collaborators and participants.</p> <p>Beyond one-off projects, collaborations should be understood as a partnership</p>	<p>Asset-based approaches.</p> <p>Ensure that those who benefit ('users') are actively and meaningfully engaged.</p> <p>Conduct initial research before involving students in the project, aiming to identify who is involved and who should be involved in a project.</p>

	over time, where the outputs and outcomes are shared.	
We want students to feel ownership over the learning experience.	Students are a key stakeholder themselves.	Students are encouraged to experiment and fail safely
Create spaces for students to learn and experiment safely.	Student have shared ownership of the experience.	Structuring projects that deliver multiple outputs and outcomes, increasing the likelihood of implementation by partner organisations.
Ensure that students can integrate different backgrounds, experiences and knowledges into the project delivery and the learning experience.	Tutors support the project, being responsive and dealing with uncertainty.	Using research and design capacity to summarise and pull together student projects to create a deliverable for the partner.
We want to stay in academia, as service design researchers and educators and live to tell the tale.	Making visible our work, and the resources required for infrastructuring design collaborations.	Talk the talk, not just walk the walk.
Pedagogically, the design of a unit according to these principles is significantly more time and energy consuming.	Advocating for the importance of an ethos of teaching in engaging projects is part of the infrastructuring, with the hope to get the management on our side and support our work.	Allocate resources for valuation and evaluation. Report to different audiences in different formats, including diverse voices and accounts of value. Be true to the value of your practice, do not just adopt standard KPIs.

Table 2. Teaching service design: pedagogical reflections

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude and acknowledge the contribution of all the students, colleagues, organisations and residents that have collaborated with us at the Service Futures Lab over the years. Climate Studio was funded by UAL Higher Education Impact Fund.



References

- 99U (19 Mar 2018) Natasha Jen: Design Thinking is Bullsh*t [video] Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_raleGrTdUg
- Bailey, J. 2022. Practice Research in Social Design: Definitions, Contexts, Futures. Case Study #3 Camden Family Changemakers. Published by Social Design Institute. University of the Arts, London. Available from https://www.arts.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0026/366515/03_SDI-Practice-Research-Case-Studies_Camden.pdf
- Blomberg, J. & Darrah, C. (2015). Towards an Anthropology of Services. *The Design Journal*, 18(2), 171–192.
- Camden Family Changemakers (2021a) Available from <https://vimeo.com/554302686>
- Camden Family Changemakers (2021b) The Good Help for Families Manifesto, Available at <https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/876898/Changemakers+Good+Help+for+Families+Manifesto+-+JPEG.jpg/6edfb712-1706-6ad1-8fb0-458999cf2b22?t=1622572799327>
- Co-Production Collective (2022) Camden Family Changemakers: Evaluation Report, Available at https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rw0hTsvvKxMLSn4TVyTEjpN5mJWZj_S8/view?usp=sharing
- Costanza-Chock, S. (2020). *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*. The MIT Press. <https://library.oapen.org/handle/20.500.12657/43542>
- Danish Design Centre. (2001). *The Design Ladder: Four steps of design use*. Available at https://issuu.com/dansk_design_center/docs/design-ladder_en
- Design Council (2019) Framework for Innovation: Design Council's evolved Double Diamond. Available at <https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/our-work/skills-learning/tools-frameworks/framework-for-innovation-design-councils-evolved-double-diamond/>



- Design Justice Network (2018) Design Justice Principles. Available at <https://designjustice.org/principles-overview>
- Ehn, P. (2008). Participation in design things. In Participatory Design Conference (PDC), Bloomington, Indiana, USA. ACM Digital Library.
- Freire, P. (2000). Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th anniversary ed). Continuum.
- Inayatullah, S. (2013). Futures Studies: Theories and Methods. 30.
- Junginger, S. (2014) 'Design Legacies: Why service designers are not able to embed design in the organization', *ServDes.2014*, (Service Futures – Fourth Service Design and Innovation Conference), p. 9.
- Keshavarz, M (2020) 'Violent Compassions: Humanitarian Design and the Politics of Borders' in *Design Issues*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 20-32
- Kimbell, L. and Blomberg, J. (2017) 'The object of service design', in D. Sangiorgi and A. Prendeville (eds) *Designing for Service Key Issues and New Directions*. Bloomsbury Visual Arts, p. 14.
- Lujan Escalante, M. A., & Mortimer, C. (2022, August). Value-mapping transitions into the Pluriverse: Design notes on Participatory Methods, Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Emergency Community Resilience within the Ring of Fire. In *Proceedings of the Participatory Design Conference 2022-Volume 1* (pp. 50-62).
- Luján Escalante, M., Moffat, L., Harrison, L., and Kuh, V. (2021) Dancing with the Troubles of AI, in Leitão, R.M., Men, I., Noel, L-A., Lima, J., Meninato, T. (eds.), *Pivot 2021: Dismantling/Reassembling*, 22-23 July, Toronto, Canada. <https://doi.org/10.21606/pluriversal.2021.0037>
- Malmberg, L. (2017) *Building Design Capability in the Public Sector: Expanding the Horizons of Development*. Ph.D. Linköping University. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3384/diss.diva-134167>.
- Malpass, M., & Salinas, L. (2020). *AHRC Design Fellows Challenges of the Future: Public services*. Available at <https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/15838/7/Malpass-Salinas-2020-AHRC-Public-Services.pdf>



- Manzini, E. (2015). *Design, when everybody designs: An introduction to design for social innovation*. The MIT Press.
- Meadows, D. (1999). *Leverage Points, Places to Intervene in a System*. The Sustainability Institute. Available at http://drbalcom.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/35173014/Leverage_Points.pdf
- Mortimer, C., & Escalante, M. A. L. (2022). Response-able pedagogy: teaching through Shakespeare in a Higher Education (HE) transnational partnership. *Culture and Organization*, 28(3-4), 345-361.
- Neary, M., Saunders, G., Hagyard, A., & Derricott, D. (2014). Student as producer: Research-engaged teaching, an institutional strategy.
- Robinson, J. B. (1990). Futures under glass: a recipe for people who hate to predict. *Futures*, 22(8), 820-842.
- Salinas, L. (2022a) 'I am not cheap labour' A visual conversation to unpack the ethics of involving students in knowledge exchange. In: 2022 UIIN Conference, 13-15 June 2022, Amsterdam. Available at <https://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/id/eprint/18771/>
- Salinas, L. (2022b) Designing for local policy: exploring preferable futures in the UK, *Policy Design and Practice*, 5:4, 516-528.
- Salinas, L., Thorpe, A., Prendiville, A., & Rhodes, S. (2018). Civic engagement as participation in designing for services. In *ServDes 2018*. Milan, Italy.
- Sangiorgi, D. (2011) 'Transformative Services and Transformation Design', *International Journal of Design*.
- Sangiorgi, D., Prendiville, A. and Jung, J. (eds) (2017) *Designing for Service: Key Issues and New Directions*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Service Futures Lab (2022) *Service Design Training Programme*. Available at <https://vimeo.com/734864294>



Service Futures Lab (2023) Climate Studio South Cluster. Available at
<https://vimeo.com/769027746>

Southwark Council (2022) Exhibition showcases young people's vision for food of the future (no date) Southwark Council. Southwark Council. Available at
<https://www.southwark.gov.uk/news/2022/jun/exhibition-showcases-young-people-s-vision-for-food-of-the-future> (Accessed: 26 July 2022).

Stickdorn, M and Schneider, J (ed) (2010). This is Service Design Thinking. Basic - Tools - Cases. Amsterdam: BIS Publisher

Thorpe, A. and Rhodes, S. (2018) 'The Public Collaboration Lab—Infrastructuring Redundancy with Communities-in-Place', *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, 4(1), pp. 60–74. Available at:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sheji.2018.02.008>.

Thorpe, A., Prendiville, A., & Oliver, K. (2016). Learning together by doing together building local government design capacity through collaboration with design education. 6.

Weaver, L., & Wilding, M. (2013). The 5 dimensions of engaged teaching: A practical guide for educators. Solution Tree Press.

What Does Good Help Look Like After Covid (2021) Available
at <https://vimeo.com/554667644>

