Design Research Society
DRS Digital Library

DRS Biennial Conference Series | DRS2018 - Catalyst

Jun 25th, 12:00 AM

Understanding How Design Action Plans Support the Strategic Use of Design

Emilene Zitkus
Cardiff Metropolitan University

Jea Hoo Na
chester Metropolitan University

Martin Evans
chester Metropolitan University

Andrew Walters
Cardiff Metropolitan University

Anna Whicher
Cardiff Metropolitan University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers

Citation

Zitkus, E., Na, J., Evans, M., Walters, A., Whicher, A., and Cooper, R. (2018) Understanding How Design Action Plans Support the Strategic Use of Design, in Storni, C., Leahy, K., McMahon, M., Lloyd, P. and Bohemia, E. (eds.), *Design as a catalyst for change - DRS International Conference 2018*, 25-28 June, Limerick, Ireland. https://doi.org/10.21606/drs.2018.538

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Conference Proceedings at DRS Digital Library. It has been accepted for inclusion in DRS Biennial Conference Series by an authorized administrator of DRS Digital Library. For more information, please contact DL@designresearchsociety.org.

Authors
Emilene Zitkus, Jea Hoo Na, Martin Evans, Andrew Walters, Anna Whicher, and Rachel Cooper

This research paper is available at DRS Digital Library: https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/drs-conference-papers/drs2018/researchpapers/64

DRS 2018 Design Research Society 2018 Catalyst

University of Limerick
25th–28th June 2018

Understanding How Design Action Plans Support the Strategic Use of Design

ZITKUS Emilene [a*]; NA Jea Hoo [b]; EVANS Martin[b]; WALTERS Andrew [a]; WHICHER Anna [a] and COOPER Rachel [c]

[a] Cardiff Metropolitan University
[b] Manchester Metropolitan University
[c] Lancaster University
* Corresponding author email: J.Na@mmu.ac.uk
doi: 10.21606/drs.2018.538

The strategic use of design at the national level to drive economic and societal impact benefits from coordinated activities that integrate and apply key stakeholder agendas. This study is part of a large research project that aims to develop an integrated action plan for design in the UK, generating insights that go beyond existing approaches in order to achieve greater recognition and application of design as a strategic driver of innovation. Drawing upon Nagy and Fawcett (2003) 'VMOSA' strategic planning process, the paper systematically analyses six European Design Action Plans (DAPs) to better understanding the key components required of action plans. The analysis demonstrates that while DAPs vary significantly in their format, structure and articulation of actions, the insights generated directly inform understanding of how these plans can effectively support the strategic use of design in the public and private sectors in the UK.

design action plan; design strategy; design policy; innovation.

1 Introduction

This paper presents part of an ongoing research investigating strategic ways to maximise the use of design in the United Kingdom through the development of a tailored UK Design Action Plan. The research is a collaboration between Manchester Metropolitan University and Cardiff Metropolitan University funded by Arts and Humanities Research Council to develop an action plan for the strategic use of design in the UK. The paper begins by reviewing what an action plan is and what design can learn from how action plans are utilised in other areas. This understanding can then be employed to inform the process of developing an action plan, as well as key elements that constitutes and are essential for action plans to be effectively implemented. Thus, by having framed the important aspects to consider in actions plans it will be possible to propose actions for design.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License.
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/

1.1 Research Context

In the UK, design is recognised as a strong and important contributor to the economy. The design sector grew by 16.2% in three years and its gross value added (GVA) increased by 8.0% in the same period compared with 5.4% for the UK economy as a whole, even faster than the financial services sector (DCMS, 2014). In 2015, design contributed to £71.7bn GVA to the UK Economy (Design Council, 2015). Research has demonstrated that UK businesses invest more in design (£50bn) than R&D (£15bn) (Moultrie & Livesey 2009; Eurostat, 2012) and according to the NESTA Innovation Index (2009), more innovation was generated by investment in design (17%) than traditional research and development (11%).

The increased attention that design has received from the European Union and several member states in particular, forms a backdrop for this study. While traditionally innovation has often been considered a technology-focused, R&D-driven activity, in recent years the EU has recognised the broader contribution design makes beyond traditional areas of technological focussed innovation. Understanding of the potential of design to drive service innovation resulting in service improvements as well as product innovations in both the public and private sectors continues to increase. The European Commission (EC) distinguished design as one of ten priorities for innovation in the 'Innovation Union' while stating that Europe's strength in design and creativity should be better exploited (European Commission, 2010). In 2011, the EC established the European Design Leadership Board (EDLB) that resulted in delivering enhanced evidence of the increasing recognition of design in the political agenda in Europe, proclaiming "never before has so clear an opportunity existed as now, for the European Commission, Member States and regions to take bold action to enable a new level of awareness about the importance of design as a driver of user-centred innovation across Europe" (EDLB, 2012:5).

Within a UK context, measuring the value of design has always been a pillar of the UK Design Council's work (McNabola, 2013). They have published widely on the value of design at enterprise (micro) and sector (meso) level demonstrating that "design can have a positive effect on all business performance indicators, from turnover and profit to market share and competitiveness" (Design Council 2007:12). However, design still remains under-utilised as a tool for innovation by the UK Government partly due to lack of suitable metrics and indicators for national design impact or effectiveness (DeEP, 2013), which would thus demonstrate the value of design at national (macro) level.

Nevertheless, broadly, design is recognised as a driver for innovation (Innovate UK, 2016; DeEP, 2013; European Commission, 2013) and economic success (EDII, 2012) and as such is of key importance to national competitiveness and prosperity (European Commission, 2009). Swann (2010) has previously made the economic case for a national design policy in a paper for the UK Department of Business, Innovation and Skills. Swann (2010:23) identifies specific design policy options "worthy of support from public funding" including the creation of national design assets; support for the design of complex systems and standards for design; strengthening the design profession; public expenditure on design, with stronger IP and tax credits; and support for design education. While Swann recognised the positive impact of design to UK competitiveness, little has been done to ensure that design plays an integral role in the national level, and thus their strategy has yet to be implemented. Clearly there is an opportunity to extend an economically driven case to also including the potential of design to address societal challenges (such as enhancing wellbeing, social cohesion, human experience, etc.) and as such deliver innovative solutions for products and services in the public as well as private sector.

Whicher and Walters (2014) claim that there is a need for approaches that explicitly support and promote design at a regional and national level, moving beyond the focus on micro level activities. At present, there is no clear consensus of what such a strategy for design at a national level should include; how it would be implemented; who would be the main actors and beneficiaries; what the impacts would be; and critically, how this would become manifest in an 'actionable' plan for design.

Demonstrating the commitment to design, the European Design Leadership Board made "recommendations on how to enhance the role of design … at the national, regional or local level and to develop a joint vision, priorities and actions, and thenceforth to integrate design as a part of innovation policies in Europe" (EDLB, 2012:5). Since then, the EC "seeks to actively promote design's relevance and value as an enabler of innovation amongst Europe's enterprises, public sector organizations and policymakers" (Evans and Chisholm, 2016:256). One way defined by EC was through Action Plan for Design-Driven Innovation (2013) thus an understanding of action plans and their role in design is warranted.

2 Action plans

Action plans identify detailed and specific steps that can be implemented to achieve organisational strategic visions (Baker and Taylor, 2007; Monks, 2011) or personal goals (Austin and Vancouver, 1996; de Vries, 2013). They are also considered as a way of effectively solving problems in various settings in both private and public sectors (VanGundy, 1988). In a corporate environment, action plans typically include company strategy, annual budget and investment programmes, and are used to monitor the progress of the action plan (Monks, 2011). Action plans are also one of most frequently used techniques for health promotion programmes as a planning intervention (Hagger and Luszczynska, 2014). Governments and non-profit organisations also often use action plans to provide credibility to the intention to change and to ensure important details are not overlooked (Baker and Taylor, 2007). The variety of contexts in which action plans are employed mean that it is difficult to define precisely what constitutes an action plan. Hagger and Luszczynska confirm that "there appears to be no definitive definition of action planning in the literature" (Hagger and Luszczynska, 2104:9). Therefore, it is beneficial to the scope of this research to contextually understand the Components of action plans in order to create an effective framework to underpin the development of a national design action plan.

2.1 Strategy (Action) Planning

The process of creating an action plan includes identifying problems in detail with contextual awareness and exploration of possible solutions. Once created, the action plan should be assessed for its effectiveness (VanGundy, 1988). Community Tool Box from the University of Kansas describes this development process in more detail, where the action plan is part of a strategic planning process (or sometimes referred as action planning process), structured around the VMOSA process - Vision, Mission, Objectives, Strategies, Action Plans (Nagy and Fawcett, 2003). Each stage of the process (Table 1) involves ensuring the integrity of overarching aim is delivered through the actions applied.

Table 1. VMOSA Process Descriptions (Adapted from Nagy and Fawcett, 2003)

VMOSA Steps	Descriptions	Examples
Vision	Brief proclamations that covey ideal future with beliefs and governing principles of an organisation to the stakeholders.	"Education for all," "Safe streets, safe neighbourhoods"
Mission	Description of what the organisation/ initiative is going to do and why with concise, out-come oriented, inclusive statement.	"To develop a safe and healthy neighbourhood through collaborative planning, community action, and policy advocacy"
Objectives	Referrers to specific measurable results for initiative's broad goals consisting of behavioural, community-level outcome or process objectives.	"By 2012, to have made a 40% increase in youth graduating from high school," "By December of this year, implement the volunteer training program for all volunteers"
Strategies	Explanation of how the organisation/ initiative will reach the objectives (includes broad and specific strategies).	"scholarship offers to students who would be otherwise unable to attend college"
Action Plans	Detailed description of how strategies will be implemented to accomplish the objectives with specific changes and action steps.	Plans including Action Step, Person(s) responsible, Date to be completed, Resource required, Potential Barriers or resistance, Collaborators

There are many possible descriptions of the steps identified in VMOSA process as the semantics of each term differs depending on different authors and theories being drawn upon (e.g. Michael Porter's Competitive Strategy). However, this research uses the description provided by the Community Tool Box because of its close relevance with action plan formulation. The vision, mission and objectives, also can be classified as a 'goal', provide an overall concept of what is trying to be achieved which can apply to a whole organisation or an individual initiative. Setting these 'goal' is important because it distinguishes the type of plan between "if-then" plans which are situation dependent action plans, and "implementation intension" that focuses on desired outcomes and end-state (Hagger and Luszczynska, 2014). Following stages of the VMOSA are the strategy and action plan which are classified as implementation stages where specific targets are set and provides 'how' the strategic planning can achieve the 'goals' identified in the development process. Especially in the stage of creating an action plan, stakeholders (or interest group) should be included to ensure the action plan being developed provides feasible problem-solving action steps that can be implemented by or for the stakeholders (Nagy and Fawcett, 2003). The VMOSA process, therefore, is valuable in creating a shared understanding among the stakeholders of the importance and necessity of changes required to overcome the identified problem.

2.2 Components of an Action Plan

The components that are required in an action plan can vary depending on the usage and the situation which the action plan tries to address. Nonetheless, it is important to create a comprehensive list of the components as it can be used to conduct state of the art research and be used to establish a framework to provide the focus and establish parameters (Rallis and Rossman, 2012). Drawn from various context including academic research (Fleig et al, 2017), business (Bradt et al, 2011), community organisations (Nagy and Fawcett, 2003) the Government (Innovate UK, 2014) and local community/authorities (City of London, 2016) key components of action plan are summarised in table 2:

Table 2. Key Components of an action plan

Key Components	Description
Actions (What)	Actions that will occur through the action plan
Responsibility (Who)	Person / department / members who will be responsible for carrying out the action(s)
Duration and deadline (When)	By when the proposed actions/changes will occur, including start and end date
Location (Where)	Location of where the action will take place
Measure/Outcome	Measurable outcomes expected from the actions
Barriers (How)	Potential barriers or resistance to the actions and plan to overcome them
Resources available/needed (How)	Resources (e.g. funding, staff) currently allocated and necessary to implement the actions
Communication/ Collaborators (How)	Communication plan including who should know and what information should be provided

The components relate to specific actions, timeline and people responsible as well as contextual issues such as potential barriers and communication/collaborators. Depending on the specific purpose, the components used in action plans vary, however, in order for the action to be successful, it is necessary for action plans to be specific and thorough (Nagy and Fawcett, 2003). Therefore, consideration should be given to include all relevant components identified in order to create an effective action plan. One example is inclusion of measurable the outcome - found in some action plans where the outcome of an action proposed can be measured and provides acceptable targets such as "number of youth offenders accessing interventions Youth justice settings" and "E-safety workshops held in schools" (City of London, 2016:10). This provides a mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of actions which is important to ensure action plans are effective against stated aims.

2.3 Action plans in design

It is increasingly being recognised that design provides important value for businesses (Rae, 2013) and for the national economy (Design Council, 2015) as well as being an important mechanism for driving innovation (Innovate UK, 2016). However, the rate of take-up of design by businesses and governments has been acknowledged by policy makers as problematic, which in Europe informed the establishment of the European Design Leadership Board with a remit to create an action plan to accelerate the take-up of design (EDLB, 2012). For design, the use of action plans could provide analytic frameworks to understand the capacity of design to drive innovation and promote awareness of the value of design to users and other stakeholders whilst creating specific actions that require implementation. However, there has been limited study of design action plans and thus what constitutes good practice is only partially understood. Therefore, further study of the current use of action planning in design will help better define the current state-of-the-art in order to create more effective frameworks for future development.

Drawing upon Rallis and Rossman's (2012:92) model of a conceptual framework for data analysis (and in the context of the 'Developing an Action Plan for the Strategic Use of Design in the UK' project), our research uses the principle of framework in two parts: (i) the initial exploratory stage investigates the principles of a design action plan, and (ii) further studies will conceptualise the findings with additional research to create a framework as part of developing an effective design action plan for the UK. This paper therefore presents the analytical framework of an action plan based on the VMOSA process and the key Component of action plan identified through the exploratory literature review. The goal of the study is to identify elements that contribute to a clear format and achievable actions in a national plan.

3 Design Action Plans across Europe

In recent years a number of countries across Europe have developed design action plans (or similar policies or strategies) to better utilise and integrate design into their innovation eco-systems. Scherfig et al. (2010) notes that Denmark has produced national design policies since 1997 although the focus of these policies has evolved over the years and, as a result, four design policies have been developed between 1997 and 2013. Other European countries have followed the same path in producing design dedicated official documents. Although these documents vary in their names, some of them formally named Design Action Plans, others Design Strategy or Policy Framework, they aim to promote design in their country. Thus, it is important to understand what has been proposed through these documents, what are the scope of such plans, the type of actions proposed, etc. The next section is an initial analysis of some of the design action plans developed in Europe.

3.1 Six European DAPs

This research is part of an ongoing project investigating ways to develop an action plan for the strategic use of design in the UK. During the initial stage of the project, six design action plans from European countries were selected and analysed to enable an understanding of a range of approaches currently being utilised. The main criteria for the initial selection process was the availability of an English version of the action plan thus excluding countries including Italy (Italia Creativa, 2014) and France (Pour Une Politique Nationale de Design, 2013). Also, this initial excluded excludes dedicated regional level action plans, such as design policies formulated to the Italian region of Lombardia (Mortati et al, 2016) and the Belgium region of Flandes (Valcke, 2010). Finally, the study initiated with design action plans formulated in the last five years to enable a contemporary perspective to be developed, which resulted in the below six documents:

- European Commission (2013): Implementing an Action Plan for Design-Driven Innovation;
- Denmark (2013): Denmark at Work - Plan for Growth in the Creative Industries · Design;
- Estonia (2012): National Action Plan for Design 2012-2013;
- Finland (2013): Design Finland Programme - Proposals for Strategy and Actions;
- Ireland (2016): Policy Framework for Design in Enterprise in Ireland;
- Latvia (2014): Creative Latvia 2014-2020 - Design Strategy.

It should be noted that this paper presents the initial steps in understanding the components of effective design action plans, and future research will encompass more comprehensive DAPs in order to be representative of what has been proposed as design action plans at a national level. Moreover, as our research develops we will extend our time horizons beyond the last five years in order to include the British design action plan such as 'The Good Design Plan' developed in 2008 (Design Council, 2008), the 2011 'Design for Innovation' and other relevant documents.

3.2 The DAPs Format

The six DAPs presented here differ in their format or in the way, they present future actions to support design growth. In some cases, the documents start with a report of the current scenario of the design sector in the country (i.e. Policy Framework for Design in Enterprise in Ireland). In others, it includes the proposed actions to be taken by the design sector, followed by a report of the economic value of design (i.e. Denmark at Work: Plan for Growth in the Creative Industries · Design). For example, Latvian Design strategy starts by presenting the current scenario through a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of the current design sector. In the Latvian document, the initial section (around 30% of the document) is followed by a design strategy, which presents the vision for design and the necessary actions. Differently, in the Irish document, the economic value of design and its contribution to the business sector represents the major part of the document; whereas a section dedicated to the six objective actions for design is ten percent of the document. Other documents are more objective. For example, the Action Plan of the European Commission for instance, defines and contextualises design in the two initial pages only (approximately 16% of the document), the other 10 pages are dedicated to objectively describe the

actions. Similarly, the actions are presented very objectively in the Finish Strategy, though the document is longer and in more detail than the EC action plan. Around 40% of the Finish document highlight the actions for design, with the most of the other parts contextualising design and presenting the vision for 2020. Our analysis (albeit in a small sample) has identified a wide range of different approaches to the format, structure and focus of the various action plans. Table 3 summarises the format of the six DAPs.

Table 3. DAPs format

DAP	Contextualising Design (approximate % of the document)
European Commission	16%
Denmark	70%
Estonia	50%
Finland	60%
Ireland	90%
Latvia	30%

3.3 The Purposes of the DAPs

The DAPs vary in their purposes. Although all six DAPs aim to maximise the take-up of design in at least one sector (as can be understood through the actions proposed), the purpose of the documents are stated different. In some of the DAPs their purpose is clearly stated; whereas in others, it is missing or it is described in terms of its development and contribution to economic growth of design sector. A summary of the key driver for the purpose of the action plans are outlined below:

1. The EC Implementing an Action Plan for Design-Driven Innovation states that its aims are "to accelerate the take-up of design in innovation policies and to create the capacity and competencies needed to implement these policies." (European Commission, 2013:6)
2. The Danish "Plan for Growth in Creative Industries & Design has been drawn up on the basis of recommendations made by the Growth Team for Creative Industries & Design and with contributions from a wide circle of stakeholders from the creative industries." (The Danish Government, 2013:2)
3. The Estonian "National Action Plan for Design 2012-2013 sets out the main courses of action, most important principles, specific activities and programmes for promoting the development of design and for removing shortcomings that hinder development in the immediate future." (Estonian Enterprise Policy, 2012:21)
4. The Design Finland Programme - Proposals for Strategy and Actions, defines its purpose as "to improve the competitiveness of Finland through design competence and its effective utilisation… These include the capacity of businesses to survive in intensifying global competition, user-friendly public services and a clean living environment and nature… the vision and strategy of the programme will be implemented through 29 actions. The target year for the Design Finland vision is 2020." (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2013:11,15)
5. The Policy Framework for Design in Enterprise in Ireland "focused on enhancing design activities in the enterprise base in Ireland, and was developed as part of the legacy of ID2015." (Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation, 2016:2)
6. The Creative Latvia 2014-2020 - Design Strategy does not state the purpose or intention of the strategic plan, instead it starts with a SWOT analysis followed by actions.

By stating their purposes each country demonstrates the different approach taken when defining actions, whether they consider implementation, responsibilities, resources and so on. The DAPs indicate the following:

1. The EC DAP describes four elements of an Action Plan: action, capacity (which may include resources and/or collaboration) and competencies (responsibility) for its implementation;

2. The Danish focus on its contribution to the creative sector, instead of describing the depth of considerations around the actions;
3. The Estonian DAP presents two components of its plan: actions and programmes (which may involve resources, duration, collaboration and responsibility for its implementation);
4. The Finish presents its plan in more general terms based only on actions, without details of other components;
5. In the Irish DAP the focus is on actions only; and
6. The Latvian DAP does not define its purpose or the components.

Format and purpose are only two of several differences among the six DAPs. The VMOSA process described in Table 1 and the key components of an action plan presented in Table 2 are used to further understand the differences of the six European DAPs. The analysis allows consideration on what is important to include, develop and implement in a comprehensive action plan for design in the UK.

4 Design Action Plan Analysis

The analytical framework presented below is used to understand the selected DAPs in two stages. First, through the VMOSA process we can understand the development of action plans through consideration of four aspects - vision, mission, objectives, strategies - and then the action plan (Nagy and Fawcett, 2003). Second, through the eight key components that contribute to an effective action plan, which includes the action itself; responsibility; duration; location; barrier; resources; communication and measure (City of London, 2016).

4.1 VMOSA process

In this section, the six-selected European design action plans are analysed through the VMOSA process to understand to what extent they cover the four aspects before proposing the necessary actions.

Table 4. VMOSA Process among the six European Design Action Plan

VMOSA Steps / European Design Action Plan	Vision	Mission	Objectives	Strategies	Actions
European Commission			X		X
Denmark	X				X
Estonia	X		X		X
Finland	X		X	X	X
Ireland					X
Latvia	X		X		X

Although the six DAPs vary in terms of format, with some dedicating 50%, 60%, 70% and even 90% to contextualise the design sector before proposing actions (see table 3), they do not necessarily all cover the four aspects of the VMOSA process. For example, the Danish DAP presents a report related to creative industries in 70% of its content, in which a vision for creative industries is presented. However, the other aspects - mission, objectives and strategies - are not included. Another example is the Irish DAP where approximately 90% of its content relates to the economic value of design, which does not cover any of the four aspects of the VMOSA process that precedes actions. The Finish DAP is the one that covers most of the VMOSA process, presenting three aspects – vision, objectives and strategies – before proposing actions. Mission, however, is the aspect missing, not only in the Finish DAP, but also in all the others.

4.2 Key components

Another way to analyse the DAPs is to understand whether they cover the key components presented in Table 2. This table presents eight components that could contribute to an effective

Action Plan: actions; responsibility (implementers); duration (deadline); location; barrier; resources; communication (collaboration); and, measure (outcome). Interestingly, although the definitions of the purposes of the DAPs do not present the approach of the DAPs, closer analysis shows that in some cases the action plans present more of the key components, beyond the actions only. For example, although the Latvian DAP does not specify its purpose, the actions are followed by responsibility (implementers), collaboration, resources and in some cases its duration (implementation). Similarly, with the Finish DAP, which presents its purpose in more general terms, the 29 actions encompass at least three other key components: responsibility (implementers), duration and collaboration (implementation). Thus, the analysis of the key components presented in the table 5 are related to the entire document, covering how the majority of the actions are approached – whether the eight key components are addressed or not on the majority of the actions.

Table 5. Key components of an action plan across the six European Design Action Plans

Key components / European Design Action Plan	actions	responsibility	duration/ deadline	Location	resources	communication/ collaboration	barrier	measure/ outcome
European Commission	X	X	X		X			
Denmark	X							
Estonia	X	X	X		X			
Finland	X	X	X			X		
Ireland	X							
Latvia	X	X			X	X		

This table demonstrates that none of the DAPs presents all the key components. In fact, location, barrier and outcomes are not part of any of them. The other components, such as responsibility, duration, resources and collaboration are in four of the DAPs. However, apart from the Finish DAP and EC DAP, in which every action follows the same structure, the other DAPs are not consistent. For example, Latvian DAP presents a timeframe for a third of the actions, thus the duration is not included in the table 5, as it is not consistent in the whole document. Similarly, in the Danish DAP, responsibility is part of few actions, not in the majority of the actions, and therefore, it is not in the table above. On the other hand, although responsibility, duration and resources are not presented in every action proposed in the Estonian DAP, the majority present these components, and thus they are included in the table. The Irish DAP only states the actions without any reference to any other component contributing towards its implementation. In summary, the analysis found that:

- the VMOSA process helped to understand the DAP documents as a whole, to understand how their format could contribute to consolidate a plan, clarify the intension of the actions and add credibility for what has been proposed. None of the DAPs considered vision, mission, objectives and strategy jointly before proposing the action plan.
- the Key Components assisted in recognising that the six DAPs differ considerably in terms of structure and details composing each action (how, when, who, where). None of the DAPs presented the eight key components jointly, and in most of the cases, only few details supported the implementation of each action. Additionally, the actions vary significantly in every document, which calls for better understanding of the DAPs.

These observations present a number of key questions for further investigation:

1. How do the actions link to the achievement of stated goals?
2. What are the applications of the actions in different DAPs?

3. Who are the beneficiaries of different DAPs?
4. Is there any correlation between the level of details (Key Components) of each action and the beneficiaries?
5. Who is responsible for the implementation of actions?
6. What is the role of the vision in the DAP? Does it affect the actions proposed?
7. What do the differences among DAPs tell us about the strategic degree attributed to design at a national level?
8. Is it more effective to have Design Action Plans or to have design integrated into Innovation Policy?

The next stage of the project will be to focus on in-depth analysis of a wider range of DAPs – including French and Italian – and the questions raised in this paper, contributing to the creation of a conceptual framework as part of developing an effective design action plan for the UK. Also, further research will focus on what contributes to successful DAPs, considering the domains of design being addressed in the plans (whether it encompasses architecture, information technology or other areas).

4.3 Limitations

One of the limitations of analysing the DAPs is the lack of authorship or acknowledgment of the stakeholders involved in the developing process. Apart from the Finish DAP which refers to the procedures taken for its development in the introduction and details them in one dedicated appendix, giving the names of institutions and leading individuals involved in the process, none of the other five DAPs detail the procedures contributing to final plan. The Irish DAP has a footnote referring to a stakeholder workshop conducted as part of the development of the actions, and the Latvian states the name of the DAP authors. This limitation unable us to understand the extent of which representatives of the design sector had their needs and expectations addressed in the DAPs and to investigate what was meant to be achieved with the DAPs, as the objective is not always clear in the documents.

5 Conclusion

This paper has discussed the notion of national Design Action Plans as initiatives to support, promote and implement activities that enhances the take-up and use of design across public and private sectors. It proposes that a DAP for the UK would be beneficial to the economy and therefore has presented an analysis of DAP's from the EU and five national plans using an analytical framework based on the VMOSA process. As a preliminary exercise this analysis investigates the differences among DAPs across Europe, highlighting key components of the DAPs development process, as well as components that are part of each action proposed. It has demonstrated that the DAPs vary significantly in their format, structure and detail of actions. The investigation has also demonstrated that the outlined two-part framework is effective as a means to analyse components of the DAPs; however, it also highlights a need for further study in which individual actions of every DAP can be analysed against the framework. This initial study has identified a number of further questions for study and has illustrated overall that the language and structure of design action plans vary considerably as does the focus. In order to develop a DAP for the UK, it is clear that these questions need investigating with a number of stakeholders in order for any proposals to gain traction and influence.

6 References

Baker, D., & Taylor, K. (2007). *Strategic change management in public sector organisations*. Oxford: Chandos.

Bradt, G. B., Check, J. A., & Pedraza, J. E. (2011). *The new leader's 100-day action plan: How to take charge, build your team, and get immediate results* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, N.J: Wiley.

BIS (2011) *Innovation and Research Strategy for Growth.* (Cm 8239) *December 2011.* The Stationery Office. London, UK.

BIS (2015) *Mapping Local Comparative Advantages in Innovation: Framework and Indicators* (Cm BIS/15/344) July 2015. London, UK.
Cadix, A. (2013) *Pour une Politique Nationale de Design* - Mémoire remis au minister du Redressement productif et à la Ministre de la Culture et de la Communication.
City of London (2016). Suicide Prevention Action Plan. *City of London*. Retrieved from http://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s59970/Appendix%202City%20of%20London%20Suicide%20Prevention%20Action%20Plan.pdf
DCMS (2014) *Creative Industries Economic Estimates January 2014*. Statistical Release. London, UK.
DeEP (2013) Design in European Policy. *Design Policy Lab*. Retrieved from http://www.deepinitiative.eu/wpcontent/uploads/2012/12/DEEP_FINAL-PUBLICATION.pdf
Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation (2016) *Policy Framework for Design in Enterprise in Ireland.* Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation
Design Council (2007) *Value of Design Factfinder*. Design Council. London, UK.
Design Council (2008) *The Good Design Plan: National design strategy and Design Council delivery plan 2008–11.* Design Council. London, UK.
Design Council (2015) *The Design Economy*. Design Council. London, UK.
EDII (2012) *Design for Growth & Prosperity: Report and Recommendations of the European Design Leadership Board.* European Design Innovation Initiative. Helsinki, Finland.
Estonian Enterprise Policy (2012) *National Action Plan for Design 2007-2013.* Estonian Design Centre and Enterprise. Tallinn, Estonia
Evans, M. & Chisholm,J. (2016) Design for Europe: Employing Scenarios to Benchmark the Effectiveness of European Design Policy, *The Design Journal*, 19(2), 253-268.
European Commission (2010) *Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative: Innovation Union. Communication from the Commission.* COM (2010) 546 final. European Commission
European Commission (2013) *Implementing an Action Plan for Design-Driven Innovation. Commission Staff Working Document.* SWD (2013)380. European Commission
Eurostat (2012) *Science, Technology and Innovation in Europe 2012*. European Commission.
Hagger, M. S., & Luszczynska, A. (2014). Implementation intention and action planning interventions in health contexts: State of the research and proposals for the way forward. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being,* 6(1), 1-47.
Innovate UK (2015) *Design in Innovation - Strategy 2015-2019.* Technology Strategy Board. Swindon, UK.
Innovate UK (2014). High-value manufacturing action plan 2014 to 2015. *Innovate UK.* Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/high-value-manufacturing-action-plan-2014-to-2015
Italia Creativa (2014) *Primo Studio sull'Industria dela Cultura e della Creatività in Italia*. Italia Creativa
Latvian Design Council (2015) *Creative Latvia 2014-2020 - Design Strategy*. Latvian Design Council.
McNabola, A. (2013) The UK Design Council: Putting a Value on Design. *Design Management Review*, vol.4, no.4, p.22-23.
Ministry of Education and Culture (2013) *Design Finland Programme - Proposals for Strategy and Actions*. Ministry of Education and Culture
Monks, R. A. G., & Minow, N. (2011). *Corporate governance* (5th ed.). Chichester: Wiley.
Mortati, M., Villari, B., Maffei, S., Arquilla, V. (2016) *Le politiche per il design e il design per le politiche*. Collana Politecnica: Milano.
Moultrie, J & Livesey, F (2009) *International Design Scoreboard: Initial indicators of international design capabilities.* Institute for Manufacturing. Cambridge, UK.
Moultrie, J & Livesey, F. (2009) *Company spending on design: Exploratory survey of UK firms 2008*, AHRC / EPSRC 'Design for the 21st Century' initiative.
Nagy, J., & Fawcett, S. B. (2003). An overview of strategic planning or "VMOSA" (vision, mission, objectives, strategies, and action plans). *Community Tool Box.* Retrieved from http://ctb.ku.edu/tools/en/ sub_section_main_1085.htm
Nesta (2009) *The Innovation Index - Measuring the UK's investment in innovation and its effects.* Index report: Nov, 2009. Nesta. London, UK
Rae, J. (2013) What Is the Real Value of Design? *Design Management Review*, vol.4, no.4, p.30-37.
Rallis, S. F., & Rossman, G. B. (2012). *The research journey: Introduction to inquiry*. New York: Guilford Press.
Scherfig, C, Brunander, M & Melander, C (2010), 'From the World's First Design Policy to the World's Best Design Policy', *Design Management Review*, 21(4), pp. 6-14.
Swann, P. (2010) *The economic rationale for a national design policy, BIS Occasional Paper No.2.* Department for Business, Innovation & Skills. London, UK.

The Danish Government (2013) *Denmark at Work - Plan for Growth in the Creative Industries and Design.* Ministry of Industry, Business and Financial Affairs. Copenhagen, Denmark.
Valcke, J. (2010) Design Policy in Flanders, Belgium. *Design Management Review, 21*(4), 38-43.
VanGundy, A. B. (1988). *Techniques of structured problem solving* (2nd ed.). Wokingham: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
Whicher, A. & Walters, A. (2014) *Mapping Design for Innovation in Wales and Scotland*. PDR, Cardiff Metropolitan University.

About the Authors:

Dr Emilene Zitkus is an early career scholar at PDR Cardiff Met. She holds a PhD at University of Cambridge, has lectured, and conducted research in product and user-centred design. She has more than 10 years of experience in industry.

Dr Jea Hoo Na is a Research Associate at Manchester Metropolitan University. He has extensive experience in design research focusing on design-led innovation in social and commercial context. He holds a PhD in Design Innovation Management at Brunel University London.

Professor Martyn Evans is Professor of Design and Head of Manchester School of Art Research Centre at Manchester Metropolitan University. His research interests explore the potential of design as a catalyst for innovation in a variety of organisational and societal contexts.

Professor Andrew Walters has eighteen years' experience of Research and Innovation projects that aim to improve design performance within both public and private sector organisations on subjects around Product Design, Service Design, User Centred Design, Design Management and Design Policy.

Dr Anna Whicher is Head of Design Policy at PDR - Cardiff Met and is an AHRC Leadership Fellow. She has implemented design interventions with governments across Europe. She is a board member of the Bureau of European Design Associations (BEDA).

Professor Rachel Cooper is Distinguished Professor of Design Management and Policy at Lancaster University, where she is Chair of Lancaster Institute for the Contemporary Arts and Imagination@Lancaster. Her research interests cover design thinking, design management, design policy and across all sectors of industry.