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While much has changed since the Design Intersections event in May of 2018, our professions continue to wrestle with the implications of bias and diversity in the work we do. These topics show no sign of going away, and the work of creating new mental models to shape the future of design + data + behavior clearly demands an ongoing conversation.

What follows is a synthesis of the thematic strands that wove through our panels and breakout sessions to help inch that conversation forward. It is intended more as a reflection than a narration, and less to dictate answers as much as point directionally to how we might frame some of the issues that our collective minds — and hearts — must address.

Behavioral science alerts us to the variety of ways in which we struggle to reconcile the hazy past with the abstract future, in contrast to the vivid present. So while none of us know for certain where we'll be next May, work has already begun on next year's Design Intersections event, to be held here in Chicago May 22-23, 2019. We'd love to have you join us.

— Ruth Schmidt

*Visiting Industry Professor at IIT Institute of Design, Chair of Design Intersections 2018, and Editor in Chief of Reflections on Intersections*
HORSE + CARRIAGE

HORSELESS CARRIAGE BECAME THE CAR

DRIVERLESS CAR BECOMES...?
Mental models: Old language vs new concepts

We are surrounded by constantly evolving interactions, products, and experiences that are informed by data and data systems, yet we remain constrained by existing metaphors and mental models to describe them. We also laugh when recalling that cars used to be referred to as “horseless carriages,” but tend to describe autonomous vehicles as “driverless cars.” Language informs not just how we describe what we know and how we communicate, but also how we think. Falling back on old language and conceptual models may fundamentally be limiting how we talk about these massive shifts and their potential consequences.

Our struggle with new mental models is not just about appropriate definitions, but also about our expectations of social and behavioral norms. This requires questioning our own deeply embedded assumptions about what feeds our perceptions in the first place. How have our own behaviors and perceptions shifted to accommodate our “companion machines” more than our fellow humans? Why do digital assistants have female voices? How has our reliance on “free” services impacted what we’re willing to surrender in exchange for convenient search or an email account?
“It’s going to take a lot for me as a human being to trust a car at this stage of my life... in that scenario, I don’t really need to know all the algorithms. I need to know what you can do, how reliable you are, and how should I relate to you as an entity.”

— Mark Burrell
Design Director, IBM Watson Health
Our relationship with technology is in flux

We’re constantly negotiating our relationship with technology. Is it a tool? A companion? We’ve agreed, across multiple conversations, that despite data’s abstract nature, it radically reshapes how we engage with people, entertainment, and content. This isn’t a matter of semantics so much as a way to understand the rules of play. It’s essential to remember that data is at the heart of these relationships.

At the same time, our old “real life” mental models still inform how we think about technology. When so many of our most basic interactions are mediated through tech, we must also ask what is “real life” versus digital life? This tension is more likely a signal that the rules are getting reset than failure of imagination. Does barking commands at a digital assistant create a slippery slope in our interactions with humans? Likewise, does saying “please” and “thank you” to Siri raise concerns about inappropriately anthropomorphizing technology?
Limited capacity to describe new models

“We kind of have a very prescribed idea of what automotive manufacturing must look like in terms of a space. And then you realize: with autonomous vehicles, it starts to look a lot more like a clean room than it does a neighborhood car mechanic...”

— Meghan Webster, Education, Civic, and Culture Leader, Senior Associate, Gensler

The realization that we rely on legacy metaphors to express data relationships is starting to make us collectively uncomfortable, especially when faced with the need to bridge the gap between what we can say and what we can envision. These limitations of language lead to limitations of communication and also force us to reconsider how to describe our experiences. You might say, for example, that Facebook’s ideological echo chamber is a new kind of digital gated community, which prevents rather than encourages serendipitous encounters. What does it mean to think of the internet as a set of communities rather than a superhighway? What can we learn from urban studies to address this?
Bias is in systems, cultures, and individuals

It’s a natural state of being human: bias is inherent in individuals. But we must also consider systemic and cultural bias and the blind spots they create. For decades, clinical trials used Caucasian males as the standard for health care treatment, resulting in protocols and treatment being applied to women and minorities without true vetting. Even when systems or algorithms are not intentionally biased, they tend to create an uneven playing field, unless the latent issues are surfaced and addressed. Diversity can help counter these issues, but only if it is encouraged and included at every stage.

Gender is not the only differentiating factor, but it surfaces yet again in our social biases about digital assistants. Is it by design or accident that Siri and Alexa have female voices? Yes, historically, women have more often been cast in a supporting role, but the decision to assign gender to a digital entity is ours to make. We should be troubled that these roles are assigned without questioning them.
Rethinking expectations and relationships

The new mental models will also impact our relationship with any entity with whom we share our data. We can all probably recall that initial pleasant sensation of using Gmail, Facebook, or Instagram “for free.” Over time, the creeping realization that we were paying with our data all along has changed the dynamic. We’ve gone from “You have my data?” to “What data are you collecting?”, and from “What are you doing with it?” to “What makes you think it’s yours to use?” What initially seemed like a straightforward demand—an exchange of services for data—is not necessarily so simple.

But is it really data that we want, or its ability to offer curated insights? This question has implications on how we value data, but also on the level of control we seek. Consider terms and conditions: too often this legalese is a barrier to building trust rather than a confidence builder. Might we feel differently if we grounded our sense of trust in a company more on their overall ethical stance and actions than a long agreement that virtually no one reads?
“

...look at the values and culture of an organization, as opposed to the text in their policy ... a company that has a broad set of values and culture, that at least has a frame of protecting your interest, that’s probably better.”

— Ram Prasad
Co-founder, FinalMile Consulting
Mental Models

Knowing ≠ trusting

“We don’t really understand the physics of the things we use, but at the same time we know how to interact with them. I don’t understand how my car works. It sometime does unpredictable things, but I’m reasonably confident that if I turn the wheel that way, these specific things are going to happen.”

— Florent Buisson
Behavioral Scientist, Allstate

We may hear things like “I just want to understand” when people talk about craving more confidence in decision-making based on data. But how important is deep comprehension, really? We operate cars on a daily basis without really knowing what’s going on under the hood (both literally or figuratively) but we still have trust that they will function in a certain way when we perform certain actions.

This is, perhaps, part of our hesitation to trust autonomous vehicles. We may not be quite ready to trust a car that acts independently, and possibly unpredictably, even if our current human-driven vehicles are already jam-packed with sensors and predicative features. Due to the increasing complexity of algorithms, even experts may lack true insight into how they work. If this is the case, can we really expect laypeople to comprehend the mechanisms at work?
JUST ADD CONTEXT
Role of design: What role should we play?

As we continue to design for the evolution of data and its impact on behavior, the role of designers will also continue to evolve. Designers have long served as user advocates, but this role will increasingly demand leadership and advocacy to ensure the ethical construction of algorithms and collection of data, and the creation of non-paternalistic behavioral interventions. Our responsibility to advocate for users will only grow in importance, as we vigorously challenge assumptions by de-biasing incoming assumptions, building diverse teams and incorporating the lessons gained from feedback.

Algorithms have historically been considered a technical achievement, but soft skills in design, data science, and behavioral professions seem likely to gain in importance rather than fading away. It turns out people are actually pretty decent at managing ambiguity and complexity, compared with machines, and our ability to measure the hard-to-measure and get excited about gaps, or what’s not in the data, is delightfully human.
“Bringing back that perspective of biases, of human context, rehydrates [data] in a way.”

– Julia Haines
User Experience Researcher, Google
Context is deeply human

The importance of adding context to data surfaced repeatedly throughout our conversations. This context provides a missing frame and lens for interpretation that the biggest mountains of data can't supply. Despite the common perception that data is objective (i.e., “good”) and judgment is subjective (i.e., inherently suspect), data without context isn’t really even information. The act of interpretation requires adding human perspective to help contextualize data and position it in a more insightful way, getting rid of noise and providing a sense of agency that puts individual choices or actions into perspective.

Context also adds a kind of connective tissue to data. We can never have perfect information, but we can support peoples’ ability to make the best decisions they can given the information they have — “satisficing” — if we know enough about real life needs, tradeoffs, and consequences.
Ways to counter bias

Data collection is biased when we over-collect here and under-collect there. Solution development is biased when we ignore (or more likely, don’t even realize) that the basis for our designs left out whole swaths of people. Data interpretation is biased when we go looking for what we want to see and dismiss the rest. As a result, bias will be embedded in virtually every algorithm, assumption, and conclusion. Even machine learning algorithms are biased, because somewhere down the line a human made choices about what to include or leave out.

If we’re going to recognize that there’s bias at every level of the process — from collection, to selection, to interpretation, to prioritization, to production — it also means embracing the fact that a critical part of our jobs as designers, data scientists, and behavioral specialists is to be a front line of defense against these biases. This can partly be accomplished by intentionally building diversity into teams, including more voices and perspective in the mix, and by questioning our own assumptions at every step.
A constellation of skills and perspectives

For too long, artificial distinctions between qualitative and quantitative, subjective and objective, “soft” and “hard” attributes have created a false binary opposition between some professional disciplines and attributes. Evidence-based metrics grounded in randomized control trials and generative contextual insights are both important, supplying different, but critically important, lenses for problem framing and solution development. They are more powerful when they join forces as equals, rather than as hierarchically charged competitors.

Teams benefit similarly from a variety of perspectives. Despite the ongoing need for deep skills to tackle the work, we also recognize that it’s sometimes not so much about being a designer or a developer or a data scientist, but more about stitching together the qualities of multiple skillsets and mindsets to increase our effectiveness. A fluidity of perspectives within individuals and across teams helps to mitigate bias by making us aware of our own limitations, and encouraging us to perceive multiple approaches as valid.
Role of Design

The need for new ways of working

Professionals in fields that think about these issues daily are not immune to bias. This puts them even more on the hook to uproot old habits about problem framing and what “good” solutions look like. Data science has historically been perceived as a tech exercise, but it also benefits from the science of psychology and the art of design to address its blind spots. Quantitative data is sometimes perceived as more “true”, yet it is also at the mercy of those who choose which data points to study, which impact analytical conclusions. Recent skepticism over the famous “Marshmallow Test,” investigating delayed gratification in children, demonstrates that we are hardly immune from bias in drawing conclusions from data.

But many of the challenges we face are not entirely new. We may need to humbly look to other disciplines that have already developed approaches to important challenges, such as sampling frame problems, that we now see as front-line issues.
…with some of the organizations out there in the world who are doing real work, there's a lot less patience. People are looking for new methods to measure things on a much shorter timeframe and timescale, but still have some rigor.”

— Jessica Leifer
Vice President, ideas42
As we live and work in a world increasingly informed by data, each of us is grappling with the same questions in our respective fields and working to do our part in solving for them:

**Defining the problem is still the first step.** As designers, we don’t necessarily have the answers, but we understand how to define the problem. In many ways, we are translators, shaping a lens through which we can help others see problems in a new way, one that makes them definable and solvable.

**We look for what’s measurable and meaningful.** Regardless of the problem at hand, finding the right level of evidence needed to inform a decision starts with measurable metrics that matter.

**We are moving from “Expert” to “Integrator”.** Although the need for specialists remains, the pragmatic methods for solving complex challenges require that people connect the dots.
MEASURING THE VALUE OF DATA
One of the pillars of behavioral economics — and a foundational principle behind “nudges” — is the recognition that people often don’t act in their own best interest. But the concept of “best interest” gets increasingly complex when it comes to what we give versus what we get, especially when it comes to surrendering our personal data. Too often it’s an imbalanced one-way street. Companies benefit from data collection and aggregation while users struggle to achieve comprehension, with no bargaining leverage.

These “negotiations,” like many systems that benefit from keeping the status quo, are currently set up to reward entities that have already established a strategic approach for knowing what data to capture, what its value might be, and how it’s used. The question of who owns the data we create is a big part of this puzzle, but it’s insufficient. It also depends on what end users ultimately want: they may not desire raw data as much as they want insights that come from it, or a way to derive value from their actions that other entities are using for profit.
“...it also seems a little disingenuous to present somebody with fourteen pages of [terms and conditions] as if that’s a kind of conversation.”

— Ted Booth
Senior Director User Experience Design, Honeywell Home
What does “informed consent” mean?

The idea of informed consent is fundamentally flawed when it comes to terms and conditions. Chances are none of us have managed to make it through all that fine print, and very few even want to try. Yet we feel uncomfortable about being uninformed. Composed for the legal protection of the companies that craft them, these agreements are hardly a negotiation, let alone a conversation. It’s simply not a true choice when one side has no leverage to push back.

To make this more complicated, even if we did read and agree to the terms themselves, the second troubling issue is a series of conceptual gaps between the use of a service, the data that is collected, and the use (and value) of that data. Consumers may mostly interpret the act of giving up a little data for the use of a service as a reasonable exchange, but the aggregation of data across thousands, or even millions, of people amplifies its value at an astounding scale. Letting a company know my shoe size is one thing. Knowing that my data contributed to building behavioral profiles with the intent of manipulating elections is another altogether. But it’s difficult for the average person to even conceive of this, when really all they wanted to do is tell their Facebook friends about their new size ten Hush Puppies.
Stakeholders in conflict

The philosophically inclined among us recognize that defining what’s in our own best interest is no easy task. While we might generally agree that things like health, happiness, and free will are desirable, we’re not in a position to gauge what those terms mean for other people. Something in my best interest may not be in yours, and what’s in both of ours may not align with that of the greater good.

In our current socio-techno-economic context, it’s almost a given that there will be conflicts in defining “best interest”. Organizational goals tend to revolve around things like growth, revenue, and competitive advantage, and it’s not a coincidence that deriving value from customers’ data can contribute to all three. This leaves customers out of the loop. They often don’t have the choice to not trade their data for desirable services, products, and experiences, yet they are also a lot less likely to benefit from the value of the data that they themselves generated.
Knowledge + Ability to say no = Power

An influential contributing factor to the tensions in our data-driven society is the imbalance of power. Who collects data, who gets to use it, and who gets to deny access when data is not handed over? The ownership of data has obvious power, but the wealth generated by that data also tends to be concentrated in commercial entities rather than the individuals who generated it. Assuming that handing over data is the cost of doing business in today’s society assumes a little too quickly that we don’t have a choice — and a voice — in that exchange. But it’s a daunting endeavor to shift the tide. Power structures are great at maintaining the status quo that benefits them, and our current system is unlikely to acquiesce to a new, more balanced model.

The flip side is data security. How do I keep others from accessing my data without my permission? For the most part, the burden is entirely on the user to maintain smart digital hygiene and create good passwords. But what if that responsibility were to shift to the makers of offerings, rather than the recipients of them?
The burden of control

We’re all familiar with the hesitation — “I should read this…” — before accepting terms and conditions. But why can’t this be more of a conversation? What if it were less a matter of a company’s need to protect itself than a bill of rights for both parties? In other words, why must the customer have to make all the concessions? “Give up your data or you can’t participate” is typically the only option we have when engaging in services we want and, increasingly, need.

But being informed enough to make these choices with confidence is its own kind of burden. The degree to which we need to understand what’s at stake, or how to protect ourselves from intrusion, or weigh the actual value of the data we supply, is not clear. To what degree do we even want control over making these decisions, when we can sometimes barely conceive of what data can do? Having all that responsibility could be far more stressful than freeing. If professional designers and data analysts hesitate to take this burden on, woe befalls the layperson for whom this may genuinely feel like a foreign language.
“You have to understand the problem and you also have to respond to assistance, and automatic operations... so we have all these complex issues of control and trust.”

— Josh Lucas-Falk
CEO, Grand Studio
WHO Is doing your bidding?
Diversity: Inviting new perspectives to the table

When humans are involved, bias is a given. Even when we have no malicious intent, and actively want to be fair-minded, we all have blind spots. And, as human creations, algorithms are likely to be at their most flawed when they are narrowly conceived. The exclusion of varying perspectives leads to oversights and exclusions, from racist soap dispensers that don’t recognize darker skin tones to the troublesome premise that men “just sound more like leaders”. An increased diversity of opinions, of perspectives, and of inputs to algorithm design and problem solving can help mitigate bias, not just in how we build solutions, but also how we approach deciding which problems should be solved.
Cambridge Analytica literally harvested our data without our consent and then used algorithms to get into our deepest, darkest fears about each other. They divided us. Here, the horrible side of our nature, which is the desire to be exclusive and different and better than somebody else is being pandered to and exploited.”

— Shrupti Shah
Managing Director, Deloitte
Two sides of exposing bias

Increased data transparency and thoughtful analytics are likely to yield faster, more comprehensive ways to analyze large data sets. This in turn can reveal hidden biases operating at a systematic scale. When the analysis of acceptance data at prestigious schools, such as Harvard and Oxford, reveals consistent patterns in selection bias against certain groups, we may almost heave a sigh of relief that our perceptions and reality — however disappointing it may be — are aligned.

Even when the intent is good, the selection and analysis of data can reflect the imperfections, norms, societal values, and biases of their human creators. Ignoring this fundamental truth risks simply replicating the problem, rather than revealing entrenched power dynamics, unchallenged assumptions, and dangerous biases. But more frighteningly, we've seen that the tools of data interpretation can amplify biases and fragment human connection and community when used maliciously. In this dark scenario, diversity and difference become weaponized as tools of division on a societal scale.
A more just, more diverse model

Human biases in algorithms and data are essentially a given. Accepting this is one thing; taking proactive steps to eliminate it requires a diversity of opinions, voices, disciplines, and advocacies in teams, but also in the selection of users and participants whose perspectives flavor the direction of what gets designed.

When working with data and interpretive tools, it’s also essential to think reflectively about what — and whose — data are included. This provides a foundation for what’s considered important, what data is left out, and how it will be interpreted. The good news is that we need not reinvent the wheel. The social sciences have a deep history of thinking about gathering and interpreting data off of which we can build, while applied behavioral design provides proven approaches to identify and tease out bias in real-world settings. But above all else, we should be aware of who is doing the designing, modeling, and interpretation. Who gets to choose what’s important? Who gets to design in the first place?
Data + Design + Diversity

Considering diversity in how we plan, measure, interpret, and implement solutions is no single person’s or profession’s responsibility. It requires an effort from everyone to call out instances where diversity is lacking, and equip ourselves to actively amp up diversity in multiple forms by employing key practices:

...using diverse data sets that reflect a full picture of the people who will be affected by the design and interpretation, and questioning what data to include, looking for gaps, inequalities, and unintended consequences that will be replicated through these choices.

...composing diverse teams that reflect the people who will be affected by the outcomes, and taking the ethical stance demanded by advocates of inclusive design: “Nothing about us without us.”

...bringing different disciplinary perspectives to bear on the same problems, in order to combat bias and the replication of mental models. Behavioral scientists, data scientists, designers, and other disciplines are all required, as each contributes different skills and perspectives to solve the problems we collectively face.
Changing the conversation

Sarah Reid

The Design Intersections conference felt and sounded different than other conferences I’ve attended. By harnessing three lenses and languages — design, data, and social/behavioral science — in a single space, we started to have a conversation. Too often, a homogeneous group of individuals can often talk over each other, or a collision of two camps will reinforce an “us versus them” dynamic, which only heightens boundaries. The triangulation of design + data + behavior created positive friction and a collaborative dynamic that facilitated reflection and opened up a wider range of options about what problems are, who gets to decide, and how we might go about solving them, together. We’re beginning to change the conversation because of, not in spite of, our diversity.
NAVIGATING COMPLEX WATERS
Looking around the corner: Emerging perspectives and definitions

The one thing we absolutely know about the future is that we’re going to get it wrong, but the increasing pace of change and advances in algorithmic design suggest we’d best start to look forward now. Fundamental questions are still in flux: Should I keep my data private, loan it out, or give it away? How do I evaluate what my data is worth to me, let alone to anyone else? Meanwhile, the business case for data transparency is still hazy. New businesses are positioned to leapfrog our desire to access our data straight to gleaning useful insight from it, and they are starting to emerge on the horizon to help us navigate these complex waters.

If there is one thing we know about the future, it’s that some of our fellow humans will manipulate data and algorithms to stimulate and play off our own worst impulses — we’ve already seen the effects of this. Data literacy will only get us so far; the ethics of our entire system will be tested, with responsibility shared across designers and data scientists, professionals and citizenry alike.
“[I] became an actuary out of grad school because I wanted to be what we now call ‘data scientists,’ but that term didn’t exist back then.”

— Jim Guszcza
US Chief Data Scientist, Deloitte
The evolving nature of jobs

It’s difficult to know what kinds of roles and skills the future will require. Anecdotally speaking, sixty-five percent of kids today will end up in jobs that have yet to be invented. How can we possibly know how to train for the jobs of the future if we don’t even know what they are yet?

However, some attributes are likely to remain core skills, even if they are harder to measure. A sense of intellectual curiosity, a natural inclination to learn, and the ability to manage ambiguity and complexity are fundamentally critical skills that will continue to be important for data scientists, behavioral experts, and designers alike. It’s similarly valuable to look beyond narrow, diploma-friendly definitions, and to identify roles that sit across professional disciplines, such as translator, integrator, communicator, and advocate. Solving problems on paper is really only half the work toward helping smart ideas take root and scale.
Looking around the corner

Imagining the future

When considering the future, we have to expect that new business models and industries will evolve to address some of the emergent issues we’ve been identifying. This means, for instance, looking beyond creating better terms and conditions. Chances are, terms and conditions will evolve into something entirely new, and whole new industries will arise that convert data into value in ways that we can hardly imagine.

There will also be entirely new situations where the trinity of design, data, and behavior collide. The connectedness we already experience in our homes, workplaces, and shared spaces will also continue to expand, and public policy will continue to shape behavior through the creation of solutions that leverage vast amounts of aggregated data. This will create new opportunities and challenges for us to tackle in our respective fields. These shifts will not all be rosy. We’ve already seen many ways in which regulatory constraints, put in place to promote the common good or level out the playing field, are caught in a web of continually playing catch-up. The growth of the gig economy and the concept of individuals as lone agents are already introducing new issues rooted in fundamental shifts in how we work, play, and interact.
New roles and definitions

“It’s not just jobs that will continue to evolve. We’re already seeing new hybrids for problem solving: “human-centered data science”, “equitable computing”, “behavioral design.” In the same way, our language will also change to reflect our new reality (anyone remember when “multimedia” was a thing?). New frameworks that help us make sense of the interrelationships between design, data, and behavior are also likely to emerge. This also means we will increasingly be responsible for helping clients and colleagues get their heads around change.

There’s no one answer to any of this. It’s up to us all to keep our eyes wide open, to harness and promote best practices, to err toward inclusiveness, and stay ethically centered.”

— Josh Lucas-Falk
CEO, Grand Studio
Looking around the corner

Reframing the narrative

Our behaviors with regard to data are informed by the stories we tell ourselves, and the outside forces that shape the environment in which we function. But it’s too simple to make this a David and Goliath tale, of puny individuals railing against behemoth organizations. As professionals, we wrestle with the fact that we’re all doubly implicated in these conversations, both as experts and as laypeople. No one is immune, and it’s more than an interesting theoretical problem to solve when we use Gmail and purchase from Amazon on a daily basis without thinking twice.

Reshaping how we assign value to data, and what we’re willing to exchange for it, will require rethinking the very concept of daily living as a constant state of exchange. Individuals need to feel more confident about what they are giving up, and, potentially, even have some negotiating power. Once again, shared definitions are essential. Saying that the use of data can help us achieve a higher quality of life sounds uncontroversial, but who gets to decide what’s the appropriate “quality of life”? 
We think data is really interesting... but found out that athletes really just wanted to know what time to go to bed at night to have optimal performance.”

— Francois Millard
Senior Vice President, The Vitality Group
What does “doing good” look like?

As a group, we’re not particularly inclined to hand-wringing, but it never hurts to recall successes and effective ways of cutting in. Public policy, for example, has made great strides in embedding an ethical ethos in its core goals, corralling data to encourage positive behavioral change across the world, and increasing the transparency of aggregated data sets. Being open with data may help reset the current imbalance we see elsewhere. When data is scarce, it’s valuable; when it is easily accessed, its currency shifts, as value is created by smart ways of getting insights.

The urge to collect everything and sort it out later creates churn and noise, but we also recognize that it’s a questionable ethical stance. Just because we can collect all sorts of data doesn’t mean we should. Ethics shouldn’t only come up after things go south, but should be foundational to the conversation from the very beginning, throughout our engagement with data and the ways we design to support behavior.
Principles + Values

**Integrity**
Adhere to facts; mitigate bias as much as possible

**Simplicity**
Eliminate unnecessary complexity

**Transparency**
Provide insight into machinations and processes

**User Proprietary**
Ensure the ability to decide what to with my data
Throughout the course of Design Intersections, we discussed the need for new ways of thinking and acting when designing with data and behavior in mind. We also began to surface a loose collection of principles, relevant across our disciplines, that suggest the faintest outlines of an informal code of ethics.

Which feel "right"? What's missing? Most importantly: how might we collectively find ways to build ethical practice into the work, structures, and processes of each of our individual fields?

**DIGESTIBILITY**  
Make information easy to read and understand

**INCISION**  
Be open and available to all

**EVALUABILITY**  
Make comparing options and weighing tradeoffs easy

**DIVERSITY**  
Intentionally include and integrate new viewpoints
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About IIT Institute of Design

Founded 80 years ago in Chicago as the New Bauhaus by László Moholy-Nagy, with a purpose of “ensuring ... society has access to the maximum use of constructive abilities for its benefit,” IIT Institute of Design (ID) is the sole graduate-only professional design school in North America. Grounded in design strategy as well as in human-centered design and systems thinking, ID offers leading Master’s and PhD programs in design and design-driven innovation. By educating the next generation of designers in relevant, emerging practice, ID develops pioneering thinkers and interdisciplinary problem solvers who navigate and facilitate change across complex systems.
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Design Intersections
Design + Networks + Activation

May 22-23, 2019, IIT Institute of Design at Kaplan Institute

Save the date for the next design intersections event chaired by IIT Institute of Design Associate Professor Carlos Teixeira with PhD students Jessica Jacobs, Irem Tekogul, and André Nogueira in collaboration with former chair Ruth Schmidt.
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