



Course Description

Service Design

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Grant agreement no.: 2014-1-DE01-KA203-000706

Project Consortium: University of Applied Sciences Magdeburg-Stendal (Germany); Aalborg University (Denmark); Lapland University of Applied Sciences (Finland); University of Lincoln (United Kingdom); University of Ljubljana (Slovenia); Potsdam University of Applied Sciences (Germany); Tampere University of Applied Sciences (Finland); University of Tampere (Finland); YMCA University of Applied Sciences (Germany)



Service Design

*James Field, University of Lincoln
July 2017*

Abstract

This short course was conceived out of a desire for staff and students at the University of Lincoln and The Hague University of Applied Sciences to collaborate on a shared subject. The subject in question was to be Service Design which corresponds to a unit of study for the Dutch students. The output of the course was to be a visual realisation of a service design concept. The theme for the service was at the discretion of the students but they were advised to tackle real world issues in order to test any concept's hypothesis and substantiate the desire and appropriate response to the matter in question. Although The Hague University of Applied Sciences are not part of the immediate OnCreate consortium, they are an extended partner and have collaborated on additional projects with the University of Lincoln.

Course Description

As Lincoln were guests on this course in Communication Multimedia Design run by The Hague University of Applied Sciences, the course was not designed by us. For the context of this document, the student-facing course description is provided below:

Topic

In this project you will learn about Service Design. In a way you could say that Service Design is the ultimate User-Centred Design. When designing a service, it is essential that we depart from the perspective of the customer of the service. The approach of service design is to focus not merely on achieving the business goals, but on how the customers' experience can be optimised, which in turn will lead to better business results. Service Design is very much a process of discovery, exploration, expe-





rimentation and creative thinking. In this project you will be briefed on the ways of Service Design and then engage in the process yourself. You will learn to work with a variety of techniques to elicit customer needs and find opportunities for innovation in services. Through co-creation, working with both the customers and service providers, you will develop concepts for new services and service experiences.

Results

In Service Design, not only the outcome is important: the process itself is very much part of the value created. The result of your project is therefore a compilation of both the design process and the designed service.

Learning Objectives

On completion of this course, students are able to:

- Design interventions that innovate services and create value for stakeholders;
- Understand and manage/organize the Service Design process, deal with uncertainty in this process;
- Understand the value of co-design and organize co-design processes;
- Actively explore social relevance;
- Gain deep insights regarding a design problem and translate these into useful ideas;
- Apply Service Design techniques.

Collaboration Mode

- **Mutual Consultation:** Two or more partners agree on a day where they want to meet online. The students make short presentations, then they consult each other (e.g. using Adobe Connect breakout rooms). This may or may not involve co-creation, depending on the tools chosen.
- **Parallel Assignments:** Student groups from different universities work on the same assignment.
- **Synchronous Collaboration:** Collaboration using live tools like chat, google docs live editing and online conferencing software. Please note that this was restricted to iterative design feedback only.





Duration, Intensity & ECTS

As with all student participation in OnCreate courses, Service Design for Lincoln students was an extracurricular commitment. This is due to the inflexibility and inability of most British HE curriculums to support the ease of swapping credits for ECTS. This didn't prevent participation however, it just meant extra incentives were required to promote and recruit to the course as an extracurricular activity (see Experience Report).

In extracurricular mode, the course ran for 6 weeks (5 weeks in Lincoln and 1 week in The Hague) with a physical studio meeting of all Lincoln participants on Wednesday afternoons. The intensity was moderate with students working intensively during the 3 hour Wednesday studio sessions and contributing/augmenting ad hoc in between.

There were 0 ECTS awarded to Lincoln students but all who participated were eligible to have the time spent working on this course counted towards an optional rewards scheme for volunteer work. Additionally, Lincoln students were rewarded with a trip to The Hague in order to present their response alongside their Dutch counterparts and have the presentation undergo the same attack/defense from the assessment panel.

Platforms

Eliademy

With 2 partner institutions working in a connected fashion on a single course, it was important to find a platform to host the course materials and provide structure to programme.

Eliademy was selected because it is free and available to all students, regardless of their institution, geographic location and status as a student. More can be found on Eliademy as a host for online courses on the document **Learning Space Description — MOOC-Platform Centred Courses**.

Google Hangouts

As there was only the need to connect two groups, it was decided that Google Hangouts was to be used as the synchronous communication platform of choice because of its ease of use and relative stability. Additionally, Hangouts offers the additional benefit over Skype because the sessions can be recorded and archived as evidence if required.





Padlet

Collaborative practice was at the heart of this design task so shared mood boards were essential for group development and ideation. Padlet was selected as Eliademy did not support this feature directly.

Padlet provided accessible evidence of collaboration and public-facing view of the students ideation and development process.

Method

OnCreate Teaching and Evaluation Methods

Although in theory the course was supposed to be collaborative and on-line in nature, it quickly became apparent that the intended level of collaboration could not be maintained over the course duration and instead we experimented with fewer touchpoints building mainly on peer-feedback.

This Course Description is still relevant however because of the information regarding management of such disparity in collaboration and the tools/processes as described. See the Experience Report section for more information.

Borrowing from IDEO HCD Course

In the spirit of reusing and developing prior experience on delivering appropriate learning and sharing information between different institutions, a number of lessons learnt from participation in the HUD Course provided an excellent model for how communication should be managed and the curriculum shaped for this course.

Initially, while the intention was to work in collaborative teams, the NovoEd platform was going to be used to facilitate effective inter-institutional collaboration. However, the scope collaboration was scaled back and the cost of using NovoEd was not practical. We still wanted to use the peer review aspect of the HCD course and the Design Thinking approach to the curriculum as they were both appropriate to the processes and outcomes of this partnership course.



Curriculum

As the participation of this course was extra-curricular from the perspective of students under the OnCreate consortium, plus the fact that collaboration in terms of teaching & learning did not happen the way it was intended, the following curriculum is provided as a guide as to how the course was managed devoid of centralised organisation. In many ways it was a compacted version of the original course curriculum:

Week	Theme & Activities
Week 1	Introduction to Service Design <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research by exploration and presentation of understanding, interpretation and comprehension of the function of Service Design and its important to effective user experiences• group selected a 'theme' to operate in and propose a service to design
Week 2	Inspiration Phase <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Informal presentation of researched examples of Service Design at its best with explicit discussions around the core themes and implemented functionality of Service Design• Aesthetic consideration for appropriate User Experience also considered and examples presented
Week 3	Ideation Phase <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each individual presented ideas based on interpretation of issues that needed solving with the selected 'theme' (from Week 1).• Democratic voting process with winner selected on basis of: potential for impact; ease of measuring impact in the context of this task; desirability to work on; best scope for utilisation of team's skills
Week 4	Development Phase <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Team to consider scope of overall service and that to be visually realised as part of assessment of task



Week 5	Development/Implementation Phase <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continuation of development from previous week• Implementation in the form of target audience exposure to concept• Refinement based on feedback• Preparation of final deliverables for assessment
Week 6	Presentation of response to task and defence - physical meeting in The Hague

Experience Report

Lincoln University — James Field, Lecturer

FOREWORD: Although not strictly an OnCreate course in the sense that it has been designed and run with online collaboration in mind, it is still pertinent to the themes of this project (i.e. collaboration, online communication, etc.) and therefore warrants a place here in this project’s official output.

This particular experience highlights both the highs and lows of collaboration within higher education. It also demonstrates the most impactful issues Lincoln tutors and students faced with the majority of their contribution to the OnCreate project.

Before the details of the above are treated, there now follows a summarised reflective journal of how the project came about, was run and the experiences of the participants:

The Hague University of Applied Sciences were keen to expand their network of international partners and approached us some time back to suggest an exchange programme and collaboration on projects. Chris Detweiler of the Multimedia Communication Design programme expressed an interest in the two institutions running a module collaboratively. In practice this sounded great but two serious issues quickly identified themselves:

Firstly, our semesters, programme structures and award weightings do not align. This would mean a late start and finish if we were to run the module to sync with its start/duration in The Hague. This would have been logistically impossible with our assessment calendar so, almost





instantly, a true collaboration and equal participation from the Lincoln students was ruled out.

Secondly, the module is titled Service Design. That in itself is a huge topic worthy of spending an entire module exploring. However, to Lincoln students, this is way too specialised to warrant dedicating serious time or give up an opportunity to work on something more appropriate to their programme and interest.

This meant we had to run the course from an extra-curricular perspective (as we have done with all our involved with OnCreate thus far). This instantly raises issues of commitment because Lincoln students were not directly affected by the outcome of this project whereas students in The Hague were been formally assessed on the outcome.

It was decided that with a disparate vested interest, it would be inappropriate to create mixed teams of Lincoln and The Hague students. Therefore, it was decided that one team (4) of students from The Hague would “connect” with the 4 Lincoln students (who had applied to work on this project) once a week to share knowledge and provide mutual feedback. In a bid to bring the Lincoln student’s knowledge of Service Design to a point where they could start working on their task, I created a short course on Eliademy and shared it with all involved. The idea was that this course could act as a social hub for the sharing of documents and feedback.

Unfortunately, none of the above happened. The Lincoln students did use my Eliademy course to learn and share links, and we did attempt one ill-fated communication session with students in The Hague but technology and logistic disparities conspired and we didn’t communicate in a collaborative nature again.

We could not give up on the project because the Lincoln students were promised a trip to The Hague to present their work. We therefore continued to meet as a small collective where I guided the students to their end result from my existing and developing knowledge of service design.





During our trip to The Hague, the students did what they promised and presented their concept - which they had done a great job of making visual (using Adobe Spark tools) - and had to defend it from the assessment panel. The feedback they received and gave to other student teams was encouraging and all parties seemed to take something from the experience.

Personally, I think all parties would have preferred a more engaging collaboration but institutional differences in the way we manage student accreditation of achievement and our semester calendars simply did not make this practical.

A summary of the student experience mirrors what I've stated above although the students did appreciate the hospitality they were shown by staff and students at The Hague, but they felt they were unable to demonstrate their best work because of their comparative lack of knowledge in the field of Service Design and the inability to commit enough time to their response.

The project became more poignant as a cultural exchange and even though the outcome of work and the collaboration in general was not held in the highest regard, the experience of learning from online materials and the logistics of communicating with a team of remote colleagues was valuable for the student's continued professional development.

Material

As the course was not connected to any direct teaching and learning, the materials used to structure the course came from the same content used when participating in the **IDEO Human-Centred Design course**. As these materials are subject to redistribution rights, they can not be shared here.

This was additionally supported with content from the d.school.

Literature

Design Thinking

<https://dschool.stanford.edu/resources/>

In order to get into the correct 'mindset', it was suggested to the (Lincoln) students that they understand and follow the d.school's approach of Design Thinking. There are a number of resources available through the link





above that support a human-centred design approach.

Polaine, A (2013); *Service Design: From Insight to Implementation*
(ISBN13: 978-1933820330)

