

3

The previous issue of *Study in Design Education and Craft* achieved an unprecedented response from readers. In part this arose from the developments in the production and presentation of the journal. But it was also due to the remarkable interest in the theme of the issue – the integration of the design subjects. There is no doubt that design educators are deeply interested in the practice and consequences of integration. They are concerned with the practical problems of implementing integrated schemes, with the implications for professional roles and status and, even more fundamentally, with the underlying justifications of many of the new approaches.

In response to this concern we have devoted this issue of *Studies in Design Education and Craft* to the further consideration of these matters. The discussion commences with an illuminating account by Jenkins on the ways in which an ambitious and impressive scheme of integrated studies was undertaken and, in particular, of the ways in which art and design educators played a major part in it. The range of initiatives and achievements of art and design studies is illuminating. As Jenkins says in her conclusion "Integrated studies seem to be nothing less than an interest in life and living."

How has this build up of integrated studies come about? Clement, in a perceptive paper, reviews some of the complex paths that have led us to our present day enthusiasms. But he goes on in a salutary way to look at the problems as well as the advantages of integrated schemes. He has many hard-hitting comments. For example, "It is surprisingly rare to find the new Departments making an imaginative use of the flexibility that block time-tabling allows by setting up a chain of sessions, alternating or changing the subject emphasis as appropriate to the development of the teaching programme, using each specialist in turn as the theme requires. The rigid acceptance of

the materials circus with each section working with the same size groups and for the same periods of time assumes a unanimity of working methods between the section that does not exist. The acceptance of common themes for different sections tends to reduce the range of work to the lowest common denominator and to ignore the very different and valuable processes and means of expression that the different sections can offer to children." Yet he concludes, on a note of cautious optimism that "Design Education will develop and prosper as teachers gain more understanding and experience of what it can offer to children. It will be a great pity if that development is side-tracked because Departments are established for the wrong reasons: if the philosophy and purpose become congealed by the tensions and frustrations of enforced integration for the sake of a few small political and administrative gains."

How may we make sound judgments on our philosophy and purpose? Hebden takes us forward usefully in this area in a short but important contribution on the nature of knowledge in art and design and the particular problems of communication that this requires. But there is no easy agreement in this area and a challenging letter from one of our readers makes this abundantly clear. In it Rush asks incisive questions about what he considers to be assumptions of Gregor in her article in our last issue.

But there are other aspects of integration in the design field that might equally be explored with advantage. At a time when the redefinition of teacher training as well as art education is taking place might we not look at some elements of integration of the work of the Colleges of Art and the Colleges of Education? Simpson explores this idea in detail and offers some promising suggestions for further consideration.

The process of integration is, however, taking place in many other areas of education as well. One of the most notable

initiatives in integrated design is to be found at the Loughborough Engineering Design Centre. Here the work is clearly focused on "the creation of an outlook and training of the mind conducive to a successful design engineer "and not only" in the further acquisition of advance scientific or technical knowledge." The work of the Centre is described in detail by Rodwell in a paper that is not only interesting in its own right but also in its relevance to teachers in a wide range of institutions. But Loughborough is not the only university in which there is an active interest in design education. Marshall, of the Open University, extends an invitation to design educators to avail themselves of the extensive opportunities now provided by the Open University which are already being used by a surprisingly large number of teachers of the design subjects.

What of the consequences of our new initiatives in design education? Many are too new to allow any kind of appraisal of their effects on the lives of our students. But some important clues are to be obtained by the ongoing work being conducted by Weir in the Scottish Council for Research in Education. In a second important contribution to *Studies in Design Education and Craft* he presents further evidence of his study of craftsmen in Scotland and considers how we may account for success or failure in Further Education. He appraises the implications of his findings for the selection of craft and technician apprentices. His conclusion, advocating careful monitoring of student progress, is one of considerable importance, not only for the craft tutor in Further Education, but also for the teacher in every design department.

The concluding article by Baynes consists of a progress report on a major project in design education now taking place at the Royal College of Art. Baynes' outline of this skilful search for information and understanding makes it clear that the results will be of the greatest importance and interest to

design educators and will illuminate still more clearly the practice and policy of integrated approaches in design education.

The issue concludes with the usual extensive review and news sections which, on this occasion, include an account of the recently published findings of the Goldsmiths' project *Art and Craft Education 8 - 13*.

John Eggleston