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Arrival Information

Ferry to Bainbridge

The ferry to Bainbridge Island departs from Seattle Pier 52 (Colman Dock), located at 801 Alaskan Way. There is construction in the area but the signage to the Pier is relatively clear. Ferries depart at 8:45am, 9:35am, 10:40am, 11:25am, 12:20pm & 1:10pm and 2:05pm. It is not unusual for ferries to be a few minutes late but don't plan on it. Walk on passengers board the ferry approximately 15 minutes before the departure time so allow ample time. You will need to buy a passenger ticket for $8.00. The ride is about 35 minutes and you will likely have great views of Mt. Rainier. We encourage you to use the Ferry ride as a chance to relax and to disengage from your regular daily work schedule. Ferry Info here

What to do in Bainbridge

There are a number of art galleries, gift stores, coffee shops and wine tasting within walking distance of the ferry terminal. If you want to wander around town before catching the shuttle to IslandWood, walk to the first intersection from the ferry terminal and turn left (west) on Winslow Way E. The Art Museum is located at 550 Winslow Way E (about 1/2 of a mile from terminal), and is open from 10 am- 6:00 pm. Bainbridge Island map here.

Shuttle to IslandWood

Let's Talk shuttle, driven by UW graduate student Greg Brandell, will be available to take you to IslandWood from either the Ferry terminal or the Art Museum parking lot, starting around noon. The Symposium begins at 3:00 but you are encouraged to come anytime after noon to settle in and explore. Please reserve your shuttle ride before Weds, July 22. If you miss your ferry or shuttle or have last minute questions, call the operations number. Reservation for Shuttle Pickup- due Weds July 22.

At IslandWood

IslandWood is a 255-acre outdoor learning center that promotes the concept: “Disengage to engage. Disconnect to connect. Retreat to advance.” If you're interested in their sustainable design, see this YouTube video. The setting is deliberately informal and casual. As you pack, think about hiking or picnic clothing, not conference dress. The lodge is not air-conditioned but is shaded and has a wonderful breeze. We don't expect rain but a light rain jacket is always good insurance. The Lodge does not provide toiletries but we will have small number available including sunscreen. Phone service is spotty and sometimes erratic. WiFi is free and everywhere. You are welcome to bring computers or smart devices, but we ask you not to use them during the general meetings. Meetings and lodging will be in the Ichthyology Inn, which is home base for Let's Talk for the duration of the Symposium. Meals will be in the Dining Hall. The Dining Hall does not provide alcohol, but we will have an open bar each night.

Depatures

Check-out will be Weds morning and we will conclude meetings by noon and transport you to the ferry. Please let us know if you need help with any arrangements after your departure.

Questions: Kris Morrissey (morriss8@uw.edu) or Lisa Hayes (206-616-1437). During Symposium: Let's Talk Operations: 206-437-5234 (This number not operational until Sunday)
Let’s Talk: A Meta-Conversation about Dialogue
Symposium Synthesis Paper

Prepared by Kris Morrissey & Molly Mandeltort with support from Cat Sharon, Kacey Lewis and Julian Miller

Background for the Symposium

As a relatively recent phenomenon within museums, there is a growing sense of excitement, enthusiasm and experimentation around dialogue, particularly for addressing complex, contested or sensitive topics and for engaging a more representative audience in the stories and the objects that our museums collect, curate, interpret and share. However, there is a troubling gap between the excitement around dialogue and the reality of a research-based practice of dialogue in museums. While terms such as dialogue, civic discourse, cafés, forums, and deliberative conversations are increasingly popular in the verbiage of museum practice, there is no consensus around what each term means or the differences between them and the implications of those differences.

There is also limited information or discussion about the infrastructure or the institutional and field-wide investment needed to create and sustain dialogue-based programming. Davis, Gurian, and Koster (2003) observe that words such as forum and town hall have been added to museums’ missions, but without a widespread understanding of their weighty operational implications. Bell (2009) asks, “What skills and practices does it take to conduct this kind of programming, and are museums able and willing to develop them?” The range of projects initiated around dialogue in the past decade suggests that the field wants to know how to do this work and wants to know how to do it well. However, doing dialogue well is not easy and doing it poorly is dangerous. The museum profession has identified and institutionalized basic principles around traditional museum practices such as preserving a basket or writing a good label, but we are just beginning to learn how to “do dialogue.”

The Let’s Talk symposium is an attempt to identify emerging areas of generalizable knowledge and shared areas of consensus (what we know) and to identify and describe gaps in that knowledge (what we don’t know). We hope to end the Symposium with some shared frameworks, definitions and concepts around dialogue-based programming and ideas for moving this work forward. This paper introduces the concepts and ideas we want to explore before and during the symposium. See the last page for a summary of the goals of the Symposium that are discussed throughout this paper.
Finding a Starting Point

To get a sense of what has been tried and learned about dialogue, we initiated a literature survey, conducted by Molly Mandeltort, a Museology graduate student at University of Washington and later expanded with support from three other graduate students (Kacey Lewis, Cat Sharon, and Julian Miller). We used conference programs, peer-reviewed and professional publications, funding sources and word of mouth. We tried to identify enough examples that the list would be representative of the types of programs taking place but not exhaustive in the catalog of programs.

On the national level, we found a number of resources and organizations focused on dialogue such as the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation, World Wide Views, Public Agenda, National Issues Forum, Art of Hosting Conversations that Matter and Animating Democracy. In general (but with some exceptions), they focus on local and national policy issues and on civic engagement of adults, most often moving towards either consensus and/or action around an identified problem or policy. For example, World Wide Views was developed in Copenhagen in 2009 to include people at different sites in what they call global citizen deliberations related to public policy and other issues. (See Appendix for overviews of a sampling of programs.) Some of these national organizations inspired, trained or collaborated with museum based programs. For example, the Museum of Science, Boston participated in the international World Wide Views program on Global Warming in 2009.

Within the field of informal learning, dialogue-based projects exist across geography and disciplines, but the majority are clustered in historic or cultural institutions, often associated with the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (operating since 1999) or science museums, often associated with the NISE Network (operating since 2005) or taking the shape of a Science Cafe. Significant funding has supported both NISE Network activities (largely from NSF) and International Coalition of Sites of Conscience (largely from IMLS). The high levels of funding for these efforts suggest both an interest in dialogue at the national level and the importance of collaborative efforts. Science Cafés seem to be funded from a range of sources including IMLS, NSF, foundations and local funds. While we found a significant range of ways art museums are experimenting with engaging visitors in conversations around art, we found few programs that approximated our definition of dialogue-based programming. One intriguing example may be the new Center for Learning and Creativity at the Baltimore Museum of Art that plans to promote dialogue and understanding around issues relevant to the human experience.
We reviewed the public materials around these programs (i.e. evaluation plans, website descriptions) and used that information to prepare a starting point for the Symposium to address these questions:

1. **Why** are we engaging in dialogue-based programs? What types of rationale and intentions are museums using to support the use of dialogue? (*Value*)
2. **What** is dialogue? What are the characteristics and dimensions of programs that describe themselves as dialogue or used terms related to dialogue? (*Definition*)
3. What is the **impact** of dialogue on individuals, museums, and communities? What are the intended goals? What type of impact is being measured? What type of impact is being achieved? (*Impact*)
4. **How** is dialogue framed, organized and facilitated? (*Facilitation*)
5. What type of infrastructure or professional support exists for advancing the work around dialogue-based programming? (*Practice*)

The activities of the Symposium are structured to apply the expertise and the patience of the participants to address these questions and to prioritize and develop plans and products that will continue the field-wide efforts to move this work from “best-guess” practices to “theory-based” practices. We hope you use this paper as a starting point to ponder, question, consider and play with these questions.

**Question One: Why Dialogue?**

Why has the field become interested in dialogue? What problem or opportunity is dialogue addressing that can't be met through exhibits, collections, programs and other traditional formats of museum engagement? The architect Louis Sullivan observed that “Where function does not change, form does not change” or in the more common vernacular– ‘form follows function’. We suggest that dialogue is a new *form* of museum practice and it is emerging in response to a change in the *function* and expectation of museums; dialogue is not just a new way of doing what we have always done, it is a way of doing something we haven't (typically) done and the value of dialogue resides in its capacity to meet this new function.

While some professionals might argue that this role has always fell within the domain of museum practice, only recently has there been a national mandate for museums to be fully engaged in negotiating the tensions and uncertainties around the complex issues and critical questions of a global society. Dialogue-based programs are developing in response to this focus. Exhibitions and programs
are generally developed around content that is stable, uncontested and research-based, and that content is presented in the context of other knowledge rather than in the context of critical social issues. In contrast, dialogue programs are likely to address complex, sensitive and potentially divisive or contested topics such as immigration reform, LGBTQ rights, gun control, climate change and race relations—topics that reside in the intersections between the diverse values, knowledge, experiences and opportunities of individuals, groups and communities.

From the national level, there is a clear and consistent (although not consistently supported) message that museums should be fully engaged in negotiating the tensions and uncertainties around the complex issues of a global society. The strategic goals of the Institute of Museum and Library Services advocate for museums to “prepare people to be full participants in their local communities and our global society” and to be “strong community anchors that enhance civic engagement.” The Association of Science and Technology Centers “supports science centers and museums in proactively addressing critical societal issues, locally and globally” and the National Art Education Association suggests that visual arts education should “fulfill human potential and promote global understanding”. However, there are many within and outside the museum that view this direction as potentially counter to the core values and purpose of museums in society. The often cited 2013 report *Public Perceptions of-and Attitudes to-the Purposes of Museums in society*, prepared by Britain Thinks, interpreted their findings to suggest that the public challenged the idea of the museums as a place for “providing a forum for debate” or “promoting social justice and human rights.”

To be successful in dialogue-based programming and to be able to recognize what success is, we need a clear sense of why we are developing dialogue-based programming. Articulating the value of dialogue is particularly important in this era of accountability and decreased public funds.

---

**Symposium Goals:** Articulate and disseminate a shared understanding of the unique value of dialogue-based programming. (What does this practice bring to museum’s role in society?)

**Assumptions:** Dialogue-based programming affords museums the opportunity to provide a type or level of engagement with societal questions in a way that is distinct from other informal learning formats such as exhibits, tours, lectures or media.

**Potential Outputs:** Video segment that could be used for training or education, White Paper, Commentary to submit to a journal
Question Two: What is Dialogue-Based Programming?

We drew from a number of sources for our working definition. The Centre for Contemplative Dialogue describes dialogue as “the practice of building shared meaning.” The National Coalition of Deliberation and Dialogue characterizes dialogue as “participants exchanging information face-to-face, sharing personal stories and experiences, honestly expressing perspectives, clarifying viewpoints, and developing solutions.” Our starting point for a working definition of dialogue-based is: programming that engages a group of individuals in face-to-face structured, facilitated, and deliberate conversation around a specific problem or concern. Dialogue-based programming draws on the experiences, knowledge and ideas of the participants to move the group towards a shared goal such as understanding, empathy, consensus, or action. We are starting with an inclusive definition that includes but distinguishes between what is often called dialogue and what is often called deliberation. We are not including what might be commonly understood as debate.

While dialogue resides within the realm of the educational purpose of museums, it pushes on those boundaries in the nature of the topics addressed, the types of individual and community outcomes intended, and the positioning of museums within social change or advocacy. We hypothesize that although some program elements may occasionally look similar, there are fundamental and critical differences between programs that are dialogue-based and those that are not. Important educational efforts that are not dialogue-based may focus on advancing knowledge or sharing knowledge within a broad(er) audience; dialogue-based programs instead attempt to more clearly position knowledge within a societal context. Knowledge and content play a role in dialogue but content is viewed within the complex web of lived experiences, societal attitudes, values, beliefs, and power structures. Dialogue seeks an understanding of how content interacts with and informs societal and individual values, beliefs, and behaviors.

We drew a wide and somewhat wobbly circle around what we are initially considering dialogue-based programs (See Appendix A for list of programs we reviewed). They include examples such as Border Immigration Dialogues at Museo Urbano, forums sponsored by the NISE Network, Tenement Talks at Lower East Side Tenement Museum and Dialogues at the Levine Museum of the New South. We are not certain if programs such as Science Cafe’s fall within the circle or perhaps fall along a continuum but we have included them in the Symposium as being more similar than different. We aren’t including
(but may learn from) programming efforts such as gallery tours, object-theater, workshops, public lectures or visitor conversations in galleries.

---

**Symposium Goal:** Develop and disseminate a description of the characteristics and dimensions of dialogue-based programming. Identify areas where there is not consensus or are varied ideas around the terminology.

**Assumptions:** We believe that a clearer definition of dialogue and dialogue based programming will help museums make more effective and consistent decisions about the nature and level of their engagement in this type of work.

**Potential Outputs:** Paper, Entry in the Evidence Wiki on InformalScience.org (http://informalscience.org/research/wiki), Information on our individual institutional websites

---

**Question Three: What is the impact of dialogue-based programming?**

Does Dialogue-Based Programming (DBP) work? What does it look like when it works? How can we measure or document success? The long and short term impact of existing programs on individuals or communities is difficult to identify, in part because intended impacts are not always identified in project descriptions, but more challenging is the lack of published summative evaluation reports. It is not clear if evaluation isn’t happening or if it’s proprietary and not publicly available. The intended impacts that were identified were rarely measured; evaluation was more typically front-end and/or focused on participant satisfaction and logistics of the event. A notable exception is the Sites of Conscience’ in-depth evaluation of facilitation which came closest of what we saw to aligning the measurement with the intention of the dialogue.

Compounding the problem of a lack of studies was the lack of a shared vernacular around impact and program goals. Each program and evaluation report used somewhat different language, rarely even using the term ‘impact’ or ‘goal’. We turned to the *Generic Learning Outcomes* (GLO’s) to provide a framework for organizing and understanding the stated and implied impacts that we did identify. The *GLO Framework* (See Appendix) was developed by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council in the UK to help museums and libraries better understand how to support and document learning, defined broadly and inclusively as what people do when they want to make sense of the
world. (See also Generic Social Outcomes.) The research around the GLO's as well as specific guidelines for how to code common language (e.g. “I had fun” would be coded as *Enjoyment, Inspiration and Creativity*) made the GLO's a robust framing tool.

The GLO categories are:

1. *Knowledge & Understanding*- knowing about something, facts or information, deepening understanding of something
2. *Skills*- knowing how to do something (physical, intellectual, social, communication)
3. *Attitudes & Values*- attitudes, viewpoints, opinions, empathy, capacity for tolerance
4. *Activity, Behavior, Progression*- a change in behavior or actions (what people do)
5. *Enjoyment, Inspiration and Creativity*- having fun, being inspired, innovative thoughts

Impact goals related to knowledge were present in all the dialogue programs we looked at, sometimes around understanding a phenomenon (e.g. nano-technology) and sometimes around the history of a social issue or problem. Science-based programs tended to focus primarily on these knowledge outcomes (with the notable exception of *Race Are We So Different?*) while cultural institutions were more likely to use knowledge as a base for outcomes related to attitudes and values. Interestingly, goals that could be defined as *activity, behavior and progression* were rarely identified and there is a suggestion that museums shied away from encouraging participants to become active in the issues discussed. (See “The Evaluation Landscape of Dialogue-Based Programs” in Appendix.) This reluctance may be related to the pedagogy of the type of dialogue or the presumed role of museums in society. The presence of goals in the category of *enjoyment, inspiration and creativity* was difficult to determine as there was always a stated or implied goal of making the participants comfortable which could fall within this category but we saw comfort as an indicator of the implementation of the dialogue program rather than impact on participants. DBP might benefit from exploring if impact goals around *enjoyment, inspiration and creativity* are relevant to this work.

---

**Symposium Goals:** Develop a research agenda to move the field forward in its ability to articulate, measure and achieve impacts that dialogue-based programming affords.

**Assumptions:** Museums should be able (but probably aren't) to articulate and measure short and long-term impacts if they want to make informed decisions about if, when and how do engage in dialogue programs.

**Potential Outputs:** Research Agenda, paper, research proposals
Question Four: How is Dialogue Facilitated?

Of the questions we looked at, we found the most material and agreement around facilitation guides and training. We chose to use the term ‘facilitation’ to include the structure of the event, the selection and inclusion of the audience, the framing of the topic, ground rules, assumptions, and the movement of the group from the starting point to the completion of the event through the direction and negotiation of the contributions of the participants. However, we may have unintentionally conflated disparate variables within this broad category and we suggest more discussion around our understanding of facilitation.

Areas of agreement in the literature include common ground rules (using “I” statements, not interrupting), role of the facilitator (staying neutral, involving everyone, standing up to bias, clarifying goals) and organization of event (face-to-face, real time, small groups). Most dialogue sessions follow a similar structure with an introduction where the rules and goals are clarified and some type of brief community building activity, followed by the core of the interaction between participants, ending with a clear concluding process that generally summarized the perspectives, ideas and (if appropriate) conclusions. The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience has a very clearly defined structure called the “ARC of Dialogue” (See Appendix). There was also an implied assumption about the importance of the role and behavior of the facilitator and indeed, most of the professional development and evaluation materials around dialogue, focused on the training and performance of the facilitator. Materials were generally domain specific and focused on facilitating dialogue about the particular topic rather than generalizable skills of facilitation.

There is probably an important relationship between the composition of the participants and the nature of topic. Audiences may be selected for a particular dialogue-based program to be deliberately homogeneous in their experience and attitude or deliberately diverse to bring together different attitudes and experiences; this decision is likely to be related both to the intended goal of the program and the nature of the range of societal attitudes towards the topic.

While the structure and ground rules are relatively similar across dialogue programs, there are distinct differences in the ways the facilitator directs, shapes and concludes a dialogue session. The most salient and provocative differences in facilitation styles appear to be related to the goals of the dialogue. Program goals fell into three broad categories:
1. Using dialogue to increase understanding of a scientific or cultural phenomenon. Many of the programs described as cafés fall in this category. (We'll use the term Café Model for sake of brevity.)

2. Using dialogue to identify and build consensus or convergence of opinions, often towards a policy decision and sometimes concluding with recommendations for action. Many of the programs described as forums fall in this category. (We'll use the term Forum Model for sake of brevity.)

3. Using dialogue to understand differences in experiences, attitudes, and values around a topic or social issue. Many of the programs described as circles or dialogue groups fall in this category. (We'll use the term Circle Model for sake of brevity.)

We hypothesize that these three broad goals define three distinct models of dialogue-based programs. Understanding the characteristics of each model may be useful in promoting best practices in the ways museums design, facilitate and evaluate dialogue-based programs. One model might be more appropriate for a program where the intended impact related to the attitudes of the participants while another type might be more appropriate if the intended impact was about knowledge. Similarly, one might be more efficacious when the topic is sensitive or contested and another might work best if the topic was of emerging interest but not divisive within the population. Each model is described in more detail below.

A. Café Model

In programs such as Science Cafés, the setting is typically a public gathering place such as a bar or coffee shop, rather than a museum or cultural setting, with participants (as many as 100) sitting with friends or family and facing a stage or speaker. Although café’s are most commonly associated with science museums, the model holds for other disciplines with history museums in particular, increasingly offering cafés. A café is generally structured with a presentation by an expert (typically recruited and introduced and sometimes trained in public engagement by the museum), followed by a break to promote (but not facilitate) table conversations and then reconvening for questions of the expert. This type of facilitation differs from what we are calling ‘forums’ or ‘circles’ in that it is primarily focused on facilitating interactions between the speaker and the audience rather than between the members of the audience.
Cafés are generally focused around what the GLO’s would categorize as a knowledge goal of increasing individuals' understanding of a scientific (or cultural) phenomenon. The topics are usually current and discussed within the context of science and research rather than within the context of lived experiences or personal values. The topics are typically not contested or controversial and the dialogue doesn't attempt to lead to consensus. However there are instances of Café’s focused on topics that are controversial and that situate science knowledge within the ways we think and act upon those issues. The Hot Topics Café, sponsored by the Museum of Northern Arizona and Northern Arizona University’s Philosophy in the Public Interest offered perhaps the most interesting and brave range of topics—gun control, reproductive rights, gay right, the US/Mexico border. (See Appendix for Program Overview.)

B. Forum Model

This category includes dialogue-based programs where the goal is to move individuals towards a shared consensus around a policy, decision or issue. Topics are typically current issues related to community or national policy and the group consensus or decision may be shared with policy makers. Examples of national models include World Wide Views and National Issues Forum. The NISE Network forums are the most visible and robust examples of museum-based forums.

Forums take place in a variety of settings including museums and libraries with the setting typically selected for convenience of desired audience rather than the cultural significance of the location. Dialogue is typically grounded in content information that is provided prior to, or at the beginning of, the program. Some forums privilege the role of expertise in the forum while other variations deliberately avoid experts, preferring to emphasize the participants’ perception of how the topic affects them.

The role of the facilitator is generally to move the group through a process of exploring the topic, the choices around the topic, the implications of those choices and then, towards a consensus on a choice or decision.

C. Circle Model

This category includes dialogue-based programs where the goal is to explore participants’ perspectives and experiences around a topic or issue, to develop empathy for others and to better understand an issue or problem that is typically a sensitive, complex or divisive topic. Programs typically include a small number of participants (under 20), often sitting in a circle or somehow facing each other, with the facilitator within the group. Participants may be drop-in or may be part of a group that scheduled the event to be a shared experience. The dialogue often follows a shared experience
that serves as the prompt and context for the dialogue. This might be a tour such as the Tenement Talks that take place at the end of a tour of the Tenement House, a performance or enactment such Follow the North Star, or an exhibit such as the Talking Circles after participants experienced the RACE Are We So Different exhibit.

The authenticity and history of the setting and the value of the shared experience are part of what distinguishes this model from the forum or café. This initial shared experience is often the prompt or context for discussing the issue or topic. The facilitator uses questions, prompts and observations to move the group from discussing reactions to the experience, to broadening and deepening knowledge and tolerance for participants’ personal experiences, ideas and values as well as those of others. Consensus is not a goal and in fact could be counter to the intentions of the dialogue. By emphasizing personal experience over professional expertise, these programs depend on open dialogue and careful listening. The facilitator is typically an expert in facilitation and generally has a depth of knowledge and often experience around the topic.

Significant resources exist around organizing and facilitating this type of dialogue with a range of variations in the name, logistics and particular format. Sites of Conscience has developed a model of facilitation called the Arc of Dialogue (See Appendix) and the organization provides significant training and opportunities and resource materials to member organizations.

**Symposium Goals:** Discuss emerging ideas about primary types or models of Dialogue-Based Programs.

**Assumptions:** All dialogue facilitation is not and should not be the same. The nature of the facilitation is related to the goal of the dialogue, the nature of the topic and participants.

**Potential Outputs:** Models, frameworks, research agenda

**Question Five: What Support Exists for Dialogue-Based Programming?**

There are a number of resources through national initiatives and programs such as National Issues Forum, which develops guides for community dialogues or the National Center for Dialogues and Deliberations, which has an encyclopedic list of resources, definitions and other resources (See Appendix). In the museum field, we found significant resources around specific models or approaches,
most often developed by networks. For example, Sites of Conscience has a range of training materials available to members and NISE-network has a vast range of resources publicly available from training materials to sample worksheets. Most of these resources are specific to the topic and specific goal of the network or institution. There are also a number of training opportunities provided by these disparate programs, each with a specific focus and approach.

We didn’t find evidence of Dialogue-Based Programming integrated in core resources and conversations of museums. For example, InformalScience.org lists a number of program formats including emerging formats such as citizen science and maker programs’ but does not include forums, café’s or dialogue, and the search terms “dialog”, “dialogue” and “forum” bring up different projects, suggesting that anyone looking for research or examples of dialogue programs would need to be creative with search terms. A search through AAM’s bookstore found one book—on clearance—with the term dialog or dialogue. The lack of a common vernacular and the lack of field-wide recognition of dialogue as an emerging format limit the growth and the generalizability of a knowledge base that is possible when knowledge is aggregated.

__________________________________________________________

**Symposium Goals:** Identify mechanisms to support the visibility and accessibility of the work around dialogue.

**Assumptions:** Some level of standardization in language as well as increased visibility of dialogue-based work will assist those engaged in this work and will advance the work towards a theory-based activity.

**Potential Outputs:** Practice agenda, terminologies, recommendations for field-wide resources
Summary of Symposium Goals

The Dialogue-Based Programming Symposium uses this paper as a starting point and a catalyst for what we hope will be a very productive, intense and fun two days of working, thinking, pondering and deliberating. We encourage you to ponder, challenge, and discuss these ideas and questions before, during and after the Symposium. We hope that the Symposium models best practices in dialogue with the aspiration of creating a richer shared understanding of dialogue through the contributions of all of us. The bios of the participants are included in the packet sent to you. Participants were drawn from a larger, rich group of applicants and were carefully selected to provide as wide a range of expertise as possible including researchers, evaluators, exhibit developers, educators, administrators and many who wear a range of hats and bring a range of experiences.

Symposium Working Goals:
1. Articulate and disseminate a shared understanding of the unique value of dialogue-based programming. (What does this practice bring to museum's role in society?)
2. Develop and disseminate a description of the characteristics and dimensions of dialogue-based programming. Identify areas where there is not consensus or are varied ideas around the terminology.
3. Develop and disseminate an agenda to move the field forward in its ability to articulate, measure and achieve impacts that dialogue-based programming affords.
4. Discuss emerging ideas about primary types or models of Dialogue-Based Programs.
5. Identify mechanisms to support the visibility and accessibility of the work around dialogue.

Potential Products to be created during the Symposium (with subsequent editing support available):
- Video segments- we will have one or two videographers available to create short interviews or video segments that could be used in classes, training or YouTube.
- Blog posts
- Papers
- Models & Frameworks
Appendices

Appendix A: Bios of Participants

Appendix B: List of Programs Reviewed by Molly Mandeltort

Appendix C: Selected Program Overviews by Julian Miller

Appendix D: Dialogue Programming with the RACE exhibit by Kacey Lewis

Appendix E: The Evaluation Landscape of Dialogue-Based Programs by Cat Sharon

Appendix E: Arc of Dialogue from International Sites of Conscience
Let’s Talk Participant Bios

Tammy Bormann designs and facilitates dialogic learning processes that disseminate knowledge, create lenses of awareness, and equip individuals and organizations to dismantle systems of privilege and disadvantage. She partners with the ICSC to prepare museum professionals to design and lead public dialogue programs using site content as a catalyst. Tammy was a member of the design team for the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio. She earned a BA from Muhlenberg College and an Ed.M from Harvard University.

Cassie Chinn, Deputy Executive Director at the Wing Luke Museum, oversees exhibition, collection, programming and education initiatives in collaboration with community members. In her 20+ years with the museum, she has worked with numerous community advisory committees and community members to create exhibitions, gather oral histories and produce projects, including a recent exhibition on Bruce Lee. During the Museum's capital project, she led community-based planning and served on the Design Team. She is the author of The Wing’s Community-based Exhibition handbook.

Donna Francis left the research lab to join the science museum world over a decade ago. She has the fun job of developing ways to engage the public in science through programs, events, and exhibits. Her key dialogue-based activities are Café Scientifique, - a popular discussion series for adults in pubs, and Sci Fri - a Friday night youth program mixing science, socializing, and global issues. In addition, Donna has moderated and designed many other opportunities to engage the public and scientists in meaningful, conversations about science and society.

Robert Garfinkle is the Project Leader of the Science and Social Change Initiative at the Science Museum of Minnesota. Robert leads exhibit projects and spearheads the Science Museum’s commitment to exploring the intersection of science and social issues. Robert has led two projects that have won the AAM’s Excellence in Exhibition Award: Invention at Play (2002 with the Lemelson Center for Invention and Innovation) and Race: Are We So Different? (2008 with American Anthropological Association). His most recent project is a collaboration with the San Diego Natural History Museum on their new Coast to Cactus in Southern California exhibit.
Conny Graft is a consultant in interpretive planning, research, and evaluation for museums. Conny began consulting with nonprofits in 2000. In 2010, she retired from The Colonial Williamsburg where she worked for 27 years and served as Director of Interpretive Planning, Director of Interpretive Education and Director of Research and Evaluation. Conny has been the evaluator for The Sites of Conscience Dialogues on Immigration from 2010 – 2015.

Tim Grove has over twenty years experience in public history working at some of America’s most popular history museums. He is Chief of Museum Learning at the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. He manages a staff that produces programming and works on exhibition and Web development. Tim writes the column History Bytes in History News, which encourages history organizations to think critically about technology. He’s a founding member of the History Relevance Campaign.

Joanne Jones-Rizzi is the Director of Community Engagement at the Science Museum of Minnesota. She leads a group committed to being thoughtful and intentional about defining community and creating approaches that advocate equitable access, reciprocity, meaningful participation, and cultural relevance. She is co-author of the book Opening the Museum, author of numerous articles, and developer of exhibitions and programs, exploring ideas related to museums and identity, race, community and dialogue.

Liz Kollmann is a Senior Project Manager, Research & Evaluation at the Museum of Science. At the Museum, she has researched and evaluated many public engagement with science (PES) projects including over 30 forum dialogue and deliberation programs and the exhibition Provocative Questions. She was a co-PI for Dimensions of PES which explored the state of PES programming in informal science institutions and Multi-Site Public Engagement with Science which encourages discussions between scientists and publics about synthetic biology.

Jacque Larrinzar is a Human Rights Artivist who believes in the role of Museums to create a sense of belonging and foster the growth of community members as human beings regardless of their wealth or access to power. Museums are no longer places where to store our past but dynamic places where we can discover all the different aspects of identity and place. Interactive, fun and with a heart, museums of today, reflect the world of tomorrow.
Randi Korn works with cultural organizations to plan their work to achieve impact and evaluate their effectiveness. Randi has held a variety of positions in museums, including executive director, exhibition designer, interpretive planner, and evaluator. Korn was as a board member for VSA, on the editorial board for Museums & Social Issues, and on the NAEA research commission. She will lead a reflection session on the last day and work with the Let's Talk advisory committee to ensure final products achieve their intentions.

Jen Kretser As Director of Programs for The Wild Center, I manage all creative education and community-based program development, implementation, and evaluation. This includes developing professional and effective partnerships at many scales. I'm working on engaging and connecting youth (high school and college) in dialogue about place - particularly focusing on climate change through a 2-day youth climate summit. The Wild Center is exploring how we can use dialogue to broaden our work in the community.

Anne Manning has served as the Deputy Director for Education and Interpretation at The Baltimore Museum of Art since 2007. In September, she will join the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art as the Director, Education and Interpretive Programs. Her twenty-two-year museum career includes experience at the Blanton Museum of Art at the University of Texas at Austin, the Hood Museum of Art at Dartmouth College, the Allen Memorial Museum at Oberlin College, and the Carnegie Museum of Art in Pittsburgh.

Peter Miele: I am the Education Coordinator for the Seminary Ridge Museum, overseeing educational and interpretive programming and museum operations. I am particularly interested in shared authority and encouraging audience participation in the museum experience through techniques such as Facilitated Dialogue. I serve as project director for an IMLS grant to develop an interactive museum theater experience, Citizens at a Crossroads. I hold a M.A. in Applied History from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania and taught high school in Demarest, New Jersey.
Kris Morrissey: I am the Director of the Museology Graduate Program at University of Washington where I teach a course on Social Change and Advocacy and oversee a number of theses related to social change. I was the founding Editor of the journal Museums & Social Issues and one of our publications focused on dialogue. I have become increasingly aware of the relationship between dialogue and social change and am excited to serve as PI on the Let’s Talk project.

Molly Mandeltort: is a second-year in the University of Washington’s Museology program. She completed her Bachelor’s degree in English and Art History at Boston University, and is interested in narrative environments and public engagement models in the museum field. As the Research Assistant on the Let’s Talk project, she explored the literature around and materials on facilitated dialogue-based programs, identifying patterns and trends for the comprehensive review section of synthesis paper. She will not be able to join us at the Symposium but will help continue the work in the fall.

Linda Norris: is an independent professional focusing on community engagement, shaping compelling narratives, and creativity. She is the co-author with Rainey Tisdale, of Creativity in Museum Practice, Linda blogs at The Uncataloged Museum. She was a Fulbright Scholar to Ukraine in 2009 and continues work with Ukrainian museums. Her clients include historic sites, history and natural history museums many with a strong focus on the development of dialogue-based practice. She teaches community engagement online for Johns Hopkins Museum Studies Program.

Todd Palmer: I’m Associate Director and Curator, National Public Housing Museum in Chicago. For 20 years I've worked in and with museums as a content developer, exhibit designer, public artist and planner. My projects aim to invite dialogue and raise social conscience ranging from diversity, indigenous sovereignty, civil rights, sustainability. I stumbled into this work in 1994 having taught public school design history with a BA in architecture history from Princeton and a Masters in architecture design degree from Columbia in NYC.
**Sarah Pharaon** is Senior Director, Methodology and Practice with the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. She oversees the National Dialogues on Immigration project, linking sites across the country hosting dialogues on contemporary immigration issues affecting their communities. Previously, she worked as Director of Education at the Lower East Side Tenement Museum and was the founding curator of the Arab American National Museum. She is a consulting trainer on dialogue and engagement for the National Park Service.

**David Sittenfeld** manages the Forum program at the Museum of Science, Boston, which engages citizens, policymakers, and scientists in deliberative conversations around emerging scientific and technological issues. In addition to overseeing the Forum program, David regularly gives talks and presentations on current science and technology topics and manages special programs and exhibit projects. David is currently pursuing his Ph.D. at Northeastern University, focusing upon participatory community-based methods for environmental health assessment and public engagement.

**Keni Sturgeon** is the Director of Science & Education at Pacific Science Center. As a museum professional with both private and public museum experience in institutions of varied types - academic and public; history, anthropology/cultural, aquarium, botanical garden, science center and maritime - and sizes, She has seen the growth of the value of dialogue in museums. In addition, she has been an instructor for several museum studies and anthropology courses for graduate and undergraduate students, which focus on building community.

**Will Walker** is associate professor of history at the Cooperstown Graduate Program (CGP) in museum studies. He is the author of A Living Exhibition: The Smithsonian and the Transformation of the Universal Museum and a lead editor of the National Council on Public History’s blog History@Work. Over the past several years, he has incorporated dialogue methods into CGP’s curriculum, involving his students in a number of facilitated dialogue programs on civil rights and environmental issues. He is particularly interested in ways oral histories can be incorporated into dialogues.

**Emily Zimmern** has served as executive director of Levine Museum of the New South since 1995. Under her leadership, the Museum has received numerous accolades, including IMLS’s National Award for Museum Service, AAM’s Excellence in Exhibition Award and AASLH’s Award of Merit. A native of Louisiana, Emily earned her B.A. and M.A. in American history from Vanderbilt University and a M.B.A. from Queens College. Active in civic affairs, she currently serves as Vice Chair of Charlotte’s Immigrant Integration Task Force.
University Of Washington Museology Program Support

**Christie Aesquivel** has a BA in Women’s Studies. After graduation, her interests grew to include botanical gardens and horticulture, which led her to continue her education. In 2013, she interned at Royal Horticultural Society Harlow Carr in Harrogate, England. Presently, Christie is a board member with Friends of the Conservatory Volunteer Park, Seattle Washington.

**Greg Brandell** holds an undergraduate degree in education and is interested in educational curricula for facilities with living collections. Greg’s experience with dialog includes facilitating youth dialogs in low-income neighborhoods as part of a community initiative funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. He is focusing on non-profit management, education, and visitor evaluation. Greg will be driving the shuttle that will transport you from Ferry to IslandWood.

**Kacey Lewis** is a second year Museology student at the University of Washington. Over the past several months she has worked closely with Kris Morrissey on the Let’s Talk Project, and analyzed the “RACE: Are We So Different?” dialogue groups. Her research interests include social practice within art museums and how dialogue can play a pivotal role.

**Xiqian Li (Doris)** is a merging museum professional studying Museology at University of Washington and artist with training, skills and passion for fine art, art history, social issues, and curating exhibits. She has experience in marketing and public relations in a publishing company and is developing an international perspective through living in China, the UK, and the USA.

**Brendan McCauley** is a Master’s student in Museology at the University of Washington. He received his Bachelor’s in Film Studies from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He has worked for Vision Maker Media, the Missouri History Museum, the Saint Louis Art Museum, the Henry Art Gallery, and UW Library’s Special Collections. He will be helping with any video documentation or production at the Symposium.

**Grace Rotwein** is a museology graduate student at University of Washington. She recently moved to Seattle from northern California. Her prior experience includes an internship in the Humboldt State University Library's Special Collections Department and volunteering at the Trinidad Museum where she had the opportunity to co-curate a photograph collection.
Appendix B: Programs Reviewed for Synthesis Paper
Prepared by Molly Mandeltort

National Initiatives Reviewed
These were selected broadly to represent projects that appeared to have an element of dialogue in their mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Coalition for Dialogue &amp; Deliberation <a href="http://ncdd.org/">http://ncdd.org/</a></td>
<td>The NCCD is a network of more than 2,200 innovators who bring people together across divides to discuss, decide, and take action together effectively on today's toughest issues. NCDD serves as a gathering place, a resource center, a news source, and a facilitative leader for this vital community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FrameWorks Institute <a href="http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/">http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/</a></td>
<td>The mission of the FrameWorks Institute is to advance the nonprofit sector's communications capacity by identifying, translating and modeling relevant scholarly research for framing the public discourse about social problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwood Institute for Public Innovation <a href="http://www.theharwoodinstitute.org/">http://www.theharwoodinstitute.org/</a></td>
<td>The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation is a nonpartisan, independent nonprofit that teaches and coaches people and organizations to solve pressing problems and change how communities work together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Agenda <a href="http://www.publicagenda.org/">http://www.publicagenda.org/</a></td>
<td>Public Agenda is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that helps diverse leaders and citizens navigate divisive, complex issues and work together to find solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Café <a href="http://www.theworldcafe.com/">http://www.theworldcafe.com/</a></td>
<td>Using seven design principles and a simple method, the World Café is a powerful social technology for engaging people in conversations that matter, offering an effective antidote to the fast-paced fragmentation and lack of connection in today’s world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Institute of the Southwest (fka the Institute of Interfaith Dialog) <a href="http://www.interfaithdialog.org/">http://www.interfaithdialog.org/</a></td>
<td>Mission: to promote mutual understanding, respect and cooperation among people of diverse faiths and cultures by creating opportunities for direct communication and meaningful shared experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAST (Expert &amp; Citizen Assessment of Science &amp; Technology) <a href="http://ecastnetwork.org">http://ecastnetwork.org</a></td>
<td>ECAST is a national nonpartisan network of policy research institutions, universities, and science museums working together to foster the development of balanced, nonpartisan technology assessments and related public engagement activities. The goal is to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Views</td>
<td>encourages citizens around the world to discuss policy-making and raise awareness of topics, and then provides decision-makers with a unique insight into the global public opinion on complex governance issues that are debated and negotiated at global venues, such as the UN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Coalition of Sites of Conscience</td>
<td>Sites, individuals, and initiatives activating the power of places of memory to engage the public in connecting past and present in order to envision and shape a more just and humane future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISE (Nanoscale Informal Science Education) Network</td>
<td>A national community of researchers and informal science educators dedicated to fostering public awareness, engagement, and understanding of Nano-scale science, engineering, and technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTC (Association of Science-Technology Centers)</td>
<td>A global organization providing collective voice, professional support, and programming opportunities for science centers, museums, and related institutions, whose innovative approaches to science learning inspire people of all ages about the wonders and the meaning of science in their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAISE (Center for the Advancement of Informal Science Education)</td>
<td>CAISE works in collaboration with the National Science Foundation (NSF) Advancing Informal STEM Learning (AISL) Program to strengthen and advance the field of professional informal science education. CAISE also facilitates discussion, connection and collaboration across the ISE field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD (Days of Dialogue)</td>
<td>Days of Dialogue (DOD) are day-long forums that provide neighborhood leaders and community members a space to identify the needs of an identified community, and to develop strategies to address them. The DOD model focuses on bridging the gap between diverse groups to engage in meaningful interaction across typical sociopolitical boundaries (e.g., race/ethnicity, social class, educational level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Issues Forum</td>
<td>Offers citizens the opportunity to join together to deliberate, to make choices with others about ways to approach difficult issues and to work toward creating reasoned public judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art of Hosting</td>
<td>Based on the assumption that people give their energy and their resources to what matters most to them – in work as in life – the Art of Hosting blends a suite of powerful conversational processes, drawing on collective wisdom and self-organizing capacity of groups of any size to take charge of the challenges facing them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Museum Programs

These are programs we looked at initially in preparing our synthesis, based on some aspect of their programming that related to dialogue. Not all fit our current working definition of dialogue-based programming. (The source document for this list includes more information about each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Presenting Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hot Topics Café</td>
<td>Museum of Northern Arizona + NAU's Philosophy In the Public Interest office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking About... (1)</td>
<td>Center for Civic Reflection + Chicago Cultural Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking About Heritage Matters</td>
<td>Sites of Conscience + Chicago Cultural Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen. Talk. Learn</td>
<td>Diversity Awareness Partnership + multiple St. Louis museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Views</td>
<td>World Wide Views + various sites (see Notes column for pertinent locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Im)migration Dialogues on the Porch</td>
<td>Jane Addams Hull-House Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scientist Is In</td>
<td>The Smithsonian Natural Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOT (Human Origins Today) Topics</td>
<td>The Smithsonian Natural Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe Scientifique</td>
<td>The Wellcome Trust (funding) + various sites (see Notes column for pertinent locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogues</td>
<td>Levine Museum of the New South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Station Barracks exhibit</td>
<td>Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming to America exhibit</td>
<td>Arab American National Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Platt-Torres exhibit</td>
<td>Arizona State Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sabor exhibit</td>
<td>Atlanta History Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Identity Program exhibit</td>
<td>Bob Bullock Texas State History Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Alliance of the South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Tour: Lowell</td>
<td>Lowell National Historic Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Immigration Dialogues</td>
<td>Museo Urbano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagining Home</td>
<td>Museum of International Folk Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Our Families Finding Ourselves exhibit</td>
<td>Museum of Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ex)change</td>
<td>National Hispanic Cultural Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routes and Roots</td>
<td>New Mexico History Museum/Palace of the Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking of Immigration</td>
<td>Statue of Liberty National Monument and Ellis Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gallery of Conscience</td>
<td>Museum of International Folk Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums</td>
<td>NISEnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Action Lab: Global Dialogues</td>
<td>New School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Techniques for Challenging Topics</td>
<td>National Network on Ocean and Climate Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Babylift: Perspectives and Legacies</td>
<td>Adoption Museum Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTA21 initiative</td>
<td>CALTA21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science cafés</td>
<td>Ontario Science Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sharing Science&quot; workshops</td>
<td>CNSE Children's Museum of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Questions Project: Students Ask and We Learn</td>
<td>J. Paul Getty Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various workshops</td>
<td>Museum of Folk Architecture and Rural Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Learning and Creativity</td>
<td>Baltimore Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation Through Dialogue</td>
<td>Seminary Ridge Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Program Overviews

These brief overviews are not meant to be a comprehensive description of all programs discussed but a concise look at a representative sample of programs to show the range of ways dialogue-based programs are constructed. Descriptions were excerpted from publicly available materials including websites and grant proposal announcements.

Programs Described

• World Wide Views
• Tenement Talks
• Hot Topics Café
• Border Immigration Dialogues
• Let’s Talk About This: Folk Artists Respond to HIV/AIDS
• Heritage Matters
• (IM)migration Dialogues on the Porch

Descriptions prepared by Julian Miller, Museology Graduate student, University of Washington.
World Wide Views was developed in 2009 in Copenhagen to include people at different sites in a global debate related to public policy and other issues. The programs present people with the pros and cons of a variety of issues. According to their website, meetings are divided into 4-5 thematic sessions (30-90 minutes), each with 3-5 questions with "pre-prepared answering options." There are 5-8 people per group and people vote individually for each question and then compare to the votes cast online. The results are collected and presented to policy makers. These include public councils, think tanks, parliamentary technology assessment institutions, non-governmental civil society organizations and universities.

Each project is very extensive. The first World Wide Views consultation (and the first-known global citizen consultation) was held in 2009 on the topic of Global Warming with 4000 participating citizens in 38 countries. The Museum of Science, Boston was one of the participating organizations. In 2012 the topic was Biodiversity and included 3000 participating citizens in 25 countries. The 2015 topic is Climate & Energy and is expected to be the "largest ever public consultation on climate change and energy." It is estimated that the current project will include people from 100 countries to influence the decisions made at COP 21, which is the Climate Change Conference happening in Paris December 7-8, 2015. In 2016 they are scheduled to discuss Biodiversity again featuring participation of 40 countries with a projected budget of 3.5 million Euros.

Partnership:
Coordinated by the Danish Board of Technology and organizations from around the world. Participants from the United States include: CSPO at Arizona State University, Pomona College, Loka Institute, Colorado School of Mines, Georgia Institute of Technology, Boston University, Brookfield Institute, Museum of Science, Boston, Virginia Tech, CSPO in DC, Museum of Science Boston, and University of Massachusetts.
Program Overview

**Tenement Talks**

Tenement Museum

Founded in 1988, in the Lower East Side of New York, the Tenement Museum catalogues and gives voice to the memories and stories of the over 7000 immigrants from over 20 countries who lived in this historic building between 1863 and 1935. Tenement Talks (2014-Current) is a combined tour and dialog event that runs for two hours and is now in its third iteration. The museum provides a safe space to discuss difficult and controversial issues through participation and exchanges between visitors about past migrations, personal stories and fresh perspectives on the topic. Topics are curated in a way to allow for dialogue, not debate. The goal is not to produce a nostalgic feeling, but rather, allow for self-reflection and collaborative learning on historic and contemporary immigration.

**Past Iterations**

Kitchen Conversations (2004-2010): Through a number of years of experimenting with visitor engagement, the program used trained staff facilitating the conversation, and created direct bridges between the exhibits, tours and personal experiences and stories. These conversations became the model for other museums designing dialogue experiences. Program shifted from a separate one-hour tour and one hour conversation to a combined two-hour event.

Getting By: Past and Present (2010-2013): Building on the success of Kitchen Conversations, this event focused on taking visitors to new un-restored spaces, new objects and exhibits, and using open ended questions and more flexible programing to allow additional time in the museum. Visitors were encouraged to share their own perspectives and opinions on what it meant to be ‘Americanized.’

**Affiliations**
Con Edison, New York City Department of Cultural Affairs, The City Council of New York City, and Beer by Brooklyn Brewery
Program Overview

**Hot Topics Café**

Hot Topic Café is a joint project between Northern Arizona University's Compassion Project and Philosophy in the Public Interest (a nonpartisan group that hosts dialogue events). Beginning in October 2011 with Occupy Wall Street, this program provides a forum for civil discourse about issues of community concern. Members of the community are invited to voice their views, and are encouraged to listen to others with respect and compassion. Discussions are facilitated by philosophers who encourage diverse views, but also point out fallacious reasoning or other logical problems that may arise. Each Session is 90 minutes and some topics are held in two consecutive sessions. Sessions may also have a social psychologist present to talk about the role of and to intervene if there is a lack of civility.

Partners:

- **Compassion Project**: "Established to . . . help raise awareness about the importance of compassions, as well as learn about the relevance of compassion to everyday issues".
- **The Philosophy in the Public Interest** "creates opportunities for guided community conversations about topics as timeless as friendship and as pressing as U.S. immigration policy."
- **The AZ Daily Sun** hosted pre and post conversations with early topics by running a background story on the topic to give background information and then starting an online discussion moderated by NAU faculty.
- **Others**: Arizona Humanities and the McKenzie Endowment for Democracy

This is a condensed list of topics that have been covered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment &amp; energy</th>
<th>Gov. secrecy</th>
<th>Native American Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Free Speech</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#BlackLivesMatter</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper or Plastic</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust with Police</td>
<td>Water issues</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Overview

**Border Immigration Dialogues**

*Museo Urbano*

Border Immigration Dialogues was started by Yolanda Leyva at University of Texas El Paso to open dialogue with students and community members to reflect on issues of immigration. The event is centered on the 2000-mile border between U.S. and Mexico "a place that reflects a long history of conquest, labor exploitation, denial of basic human rights and other tragedies." According to Leyva "we shouldn’t know history just for the sake of knowing history, but we should connect it to contemporary issues and how we can better society.” The program includes activities like a self-guided walking tour through El Segundo Barrio and Downtown El Paso, which focuses on the city of El Paso and the Mexican Revolution. The program invites visitors to reflect on their own place in history and to think critically about history and to act on that knowledge.

*Mueuo Urbano* is a traveling museum that is currently looking for a permanent location. Its exhibits feature the history of El Segundo Barrio and the borderlands in and around El Paso. This program will roll out nationally and Leyva is training graduate students in dialogue facilitation.

Sites: The program has been hosted at [Centennial Museum of UTEP](https://www.utep.edu/museums/cenm) and the [El Paso History museum](https://www.epm.org/

Partnerships:

- Funding through a grant from IMLS and the Nathan Cummings Foundation.
- The International Coalition of Sites of Conscience
- Department of History at University of Texas, El Paso.
- UTEP Institute of Oral History
- UTEP Philosophy Department for the “Philosophy for Children in the Borderlands” project promoting dialogues on immigration for ages 4 and up. Children within the program will be taught that it is possible to express opinions and think philosophically while their parents learn a greater appreciation for their child's capacity for thought.
Program Overview

Let’s Talk About This: Folk Artists Respond to HIV/AIDS
The Gallery of Conscience

July 7, 2013 - January 5, 2014

The Museum of International Folk Art (MOIFA) partnered with N'MPower, a support group for gay, bi, questioning, and transgendered persons, to develop a digital storytelling project to address the changing needs of the contemporary populations of at-risk youth. Let's Talk About This: Folk Artists Respond to HIV/AIDS was unveiled on World AIDS Day in December 2012 as an exhibition in progress. Museum visitors were invited to engage with the issues raised by the first set of artwork by talking, writing about, stitching or drawing. The works by visitors stayed in the gallery for more visitors to see, “creating a kind of asynchronous conversation.”

In this multi-faceted community engagement project, the Gallery of Conscience at MOIFA will develop dialogues around folk artists’ depiction of the history of the AIDS pandemic and the myths that traditional communities in New Mexico tell about AIDS that lead to its stigmatization and resultant secrecy and shame. Trained Youth Media Project mentors will lead youth in creating their own digital oral histories to be aired on the Audio Revolution! By using folk art as a starting point and shared experience, MOIFA aims to ease the taboo of talking about sex to help local LGBT youth establish and maintain healthy and respectful relationships.

Partners:
- Museum of International Folk Art (MOIFA)
- N'MPower, a non-traditional support group for gay, bi, questioning, and transgendered persons
- International Coalition of Sites of Conscience
- International Folk Art Foundation
- New Mexico Arts
Program Overview

**Heritage Matters**
Chicago Cultural Alliance

In 2014, the Chicago Cultural alliance partnered with the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience and 20 other organizations to host four dialogue events on the immigrant experience.

- Journey & Lifestyle: Haitian American Museum of Chicago
- Politics & People: Balzekas Museum of Lithuanian Culture
- Language & Identity: Chinese-American Museum of Chicago
- Community & Diversity: Segundo Ruiz Belvis Cultural Center

According to their website, "Chicago Cultural Alliance Heritage Matters program explores current issues through the lens of heritage" and is based on the concept of the 'American Dream.'

Other Host Sites

- American Indian Center
- Balzekas Museum of Lithuanian Culture
- Chinese-American Museum of Chicago
- Haitian American Museum of Chicago
- Latinos Progresando
- Latvian Folk Art Museum
- National Public Housing Museum
- Korean American Resource and Cultural Center
- Segundo Ruiz Belvis Cultural Center

Collaboration with: International Coalition of Sites of Conscience and IMLS (funding)
Program Overview

(IM)migration Dialogues on the Porch

Jane Addams Hull-House Museum

For the last three years, the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum has been facilitating dialogues, which connect histories of migrant and immigrant experiences at the turn of the twentieth century to contemporary narratives shared by our visitors. The process begins with a 50-minute tour of the Hull-House, through which visitors explore the histories of Eastern and Central European immigrants as well as Mexican and African American migrants who came to Chicago from 1889 to 1963. The tour is followed with a 50 minute facilitated dialogue where participants reflect on their own experiences of movement, cultural identity, and the values that shape their perspectives on immigration policy in the United States today. This hands-on experience will emphasize storytelling, inquiry, and opportunities to listen deeply and question our own assumptions and values.

Partnerships: UIC College of Architecture & the Arts, Institute of Museum and Library Services, National Endowment for the Humanities, Boeing, Institute of Museum and Library Services
Appendix D: Dialogue Programming with RACE: Why Are We So Different?

Prepared by Kacey Lewis, Museology Graduate Student at the University of Washington

Titles used for programs: Talking Circle, Group Workshops, Discussion Circles, Circles of Dialogue, Group Program Packages, Talking Circles, RACE Exchanges, Eliminating Racism, Facilitation Discussion

The exhibit, RACE Are We So Different has been traveling since 2007 with over three-dozen sites hosting it. Many of the sites followed the lead of the Minnesota Science Museum in holding some type of dialogue programming in conjunction with the exhibit. This document summarizes the publicly available information about these programs. The goal of this summary is to explore how one exhibit or shared experience can be adapted to a range of institutions and interests.

The targeted audience for the facilitated discussions ranged from the general public to local businesses, government agencies, faith-based organizations, and other non-profit organizations. The maximum group size for the groups ranged from 20-40 individuals. One institution—the Phillip and Patricia Frost Museum of Science—had an age requirement of 15 in order to participate in the dialogue groups. Most facilitation groups discussed the exhibit and the visitor’s experience before/after viewing the exhibit. Some institutions offered private rooms for groups to debrief before/after viewing the exhibit. The dialogue groups did not seem to have a set framework, but we might assume that each museum took the basic structure of the dialogue groups at the Science Museum of Minnesota and adjusted it to their needs. We did not find any information on evaluation conducted on the facilitation groups.

Fees

Some of the museums included the cost for the dialogue groups as part of general admission. However, some institutions did charge extra fees for participation in their dialogue groups. The Science Museum of Minnesota charged $450 for for-profit organizations and $300 for non-profits, civic, and public organizations. The museum charged $50 per student groups, but offered half off
for schools with 75% of students eligible for free and reduced lunch. The History Colorado Center had two prices based on discussion group. The facilitated discussion group was priced at $600 and the un-facilitated discussion group was priced at $250. The Phillip and Patricia Frost Museum of Science discussion group was $200 per group.

ECHO Lake Aquarium and Science Center had group packages for K-12, University Classes, Businesses, Government, Non-Profit, and University Staff. They were the Basic Package and the Preferred Packaged. The Basic Package included admission to the ECHO Lake Aquarium and Science Center and a two-hour facilitated session. Each session included two experienced professional trainers with the option for onsite catering and customized topics that met the needs of a group. The Preferred Package included all of the components of the Basic Package, but included a facilitated “Introduction to Diversity and Cultural Competency in Vermont” session. This presentation was given at the organization’s site and lasted about 3.5 hours. The packages also offered a one-hour debrief session for K-12 and university students. The university students also had the option to rent the ‘Break-Out’ room for an additional fee. Additionally, ECHO Lake Aquarium and Science Center featured a ‘Break-Out Room’ with a maximum capacity of 230 people. The prices for each package at ECHO Lake were listed as followed:

- Business, Government, Non-Profit, University Staff:
  - Nonprofit/Educational: Basic Package: $2,000/ Preferred Package: $3,500
  - Government: Basic Package: $2,500/ Preferred Package: $4,250
  - Corporate/For-Profit: Basic Package: $3,000/ Preferred Package: $5,000

- K-12 Students:
  - $6 per student admission, free adult admission per five students; $8.50 admission each additional adult; $60 per 1 hour guided debrief

- University Students:
  - $6 per student and free for 5 faculty/ Break-out rooms $50/hr

Local Influences
Some museums added an art exhibition or a community-focused exhibition that focused on a topic that was an important part of the community's identity. For example, The University of Northern Iowa Museum explored three themes: the
everyday experience of race, the contemporary science that is challenging common ideas about race, and the history of this idea in the United States. The museum picked random visitors and asked them for their photograph and then to describe their racial heritage. The museum also asked visitors to write their thoughts down about the use of Native Americans as sports mascots. (Pacific Science Center also added a component.)

The Carnegie Museum of Natural History added two small, local exhibits titled Community Voices Gallery and Finding the Words: Pittsburgh and the Early Civil Rights Movement. The Boston Museum of Science had Voices without Faces, Voices without Races, which was a three-minute audio collage of voices by over 200 Boston community members.

Facilitation Training
The type of facilitators varied by program. Most facilitators were trained volunteers but some sites did have one or two professionals as the facilitator. For example, at the History Colorado Center in Denver, Dr. Carolyn Love of Kebaya Coaching & Consulting facilitated the discussion groups. ECHO Lake Aquarium and Science Center in Burlington, Vermont brought in the training collective, CQ Strategies, to facilitate their discussion groups. Dr. Emily Drew, Associate Professor of Sociology and Ethnic Studies at Willamette University, led the discussion groups at Oregon Museum of Science and Industry. YWCA program coordinator Maria Drawhorn led the Kalamazoo Valley Museum’s discussion groups. The Discovery Place in Charlotte, North Carolina used trained facilitators from a non-profit organization called Crossroads Charlotte. They formed their facilitation groups around three main questions:

1. How did you feel about race before the exhibit?
2. What did you learn about race in the exhibit?
3. How do you feel about race now?

The Missouri History Museum had trained facilitators from the local chapter of the National Conference for Community and Justice. The Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania hosted Anti-Defamation League Workshops where facilitators from the League hosted workshops on discrimination at the museum.
The Riverside Metropolitan Museum in Riverton California built dialogue within the exhibit space by having group conversations in the center of the exhibit and in a room nearby the exhibit. The Science Museum of Minnesota offered training sessions for their facilitators that ranged from 2-3 hours and 6-8 hours depending on their previous experience. The Center of Science and Industry in Columbus, Ohio used the PBS series “Race: The Power of an Illusion” as the pivotal tool for their staff training.

Recommendations from reports
- more time to plan out the dialogue groups more efficiently
- shared vocabulary be used and to avoid certain terms like “learn tolerance” and “appreciate ethnic heritage”
- really think carefully about the facilitators that will be interacting with the public, and to make sure the facilitators realize that they do not need to be experts
- identify what diversity museums have and try to incorporate those issues into the discussion.
- more on community problem solving
Appendix E: The Evaluation Landscape of Dialogue-Based Programs

Prepared by Cat Sharon, graduate student in the Museology Graduate Program, University of Washington

“Assessing dialogue depends on whether the framework is that of a social scientist or a program manager. The social scientist asks: ‘How and why does the dialogue function in particular circumstances?’ The practitioner asks: ‘Is dialogue successful in meeting program goals? How can we increase its success?’” (Blaney, 2013, p. 23)

Though Carol L. Blaney's thesis on dialogue-based programming astutely identifies the two different modes for evaluating the success of these initiatives, in practice they are frequently intertwined. Even when they ostensibly focus on ‘big picture’ outcomes like introducing new attitudes and behaviors, evaluations are often just as concerned with logistics and attendance outcomes. This is not an inherent criticism; blending these perspectives makes evaluation useful for a variety of stakeholders—program facilitators, leadership, marketing staff. Rather, these reports demonstrate a gaps in our current work as the field strives to identify best practices.

This paper describes a brief, informal study of fifteen evaluation reports, scholarly articles, and other write-ups to explore the landscape of current evaluation on dialogue programs. Due to the proprietary nature of these documents, the scope of this examination is limited to reports publicly available online, which skews heavily towards informal science programs (due in part to NSF and other agency reporting requirements). Additional reports—like the formative evaluation of the International Sites of Conscience’s National Dialogues on Immigration initiative—were generously provided to us directly. We used the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLO's) to provide a framework for organizing and understanding the stated and implied impacts. The GLO Framework was developed and adopted by the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council in the UK.

In short, there are few generalizable trends to be found in the evaluation of dialogue-based programs. The intended program goals and the evaluation questions central to these studies do not always match, making it difficult to assess
the degree to which the learning outcomes are being fulfilled. What follows is an overview of the known evaluations and gaps in our knowledge that represent potential avenues for further research.

**Relevance**

The broader Let’s Talk project—led by principal investigators Kris Morrissey (University of Washington) and Robert Garfinkle (Science Museum of Minnesota)—includes research that will help describe the current landscape of dialogue programs under an award from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). Other researchers and funders have also recognized the need for a more complete understanding of these programs. Science Live, funded in 2015 by Science Learning+ with support from the Wellcome Trust and NSF, will look at science events including dialogue programming. Let’s Talk and Science Live both highlight evaluation as necessary to understanding the degree to which these programs are being intentionally designed and refined.

Within academia, Blaney (2013) investigates the experiences associated with facilitated dialogue programs from the perspectives of both participants and facilitators. Evaluation is one piece of this puzzle, and Blaney includes theoretical and observed outcomes for dialogue programs and applying them to three case studies. Notably, she considers these outcomes in both short- and long-term categories, a distinction which is rarely seen in the institutional evaluations in this paper. Other studies like Abram’s (2007) look at the Lower East Side Tenement Museum’s Kitchen Conversations also inquire about the short- and long-term effects of program, but without the evaluation supports to fully investigate these outcomes.

**Key Questions:**

1) What programs are producing available evaluations, and what do they tell us?
2) How can we characterize the current state of evaluation of dialogue-based programs?
3) What learning outcomes do these evaluations identify in their program goals? Are these same outcomes measured, and are they achieved?
A number of the evaluation reports included in this overview (6) are from the Nanoscale Informal Science Education Network (NISE Net), which leads forum-based programming about the implications of emerging nanotechnologies. Most of these are formative surveys that focus on the structure and logistics. They share common program goals across all initiatives, including increased participant understanding of nanoscale science, increased acceptance of and familiarity with nanoscale technology, consideration of potential positive and negative impacts of new technologies, and increased confidence in being part of public discourse, as well as the broad aim to increase adult engagement at the participating science centers.

Outcomes in the summative evaluation generally mirrored these program goals, with the notable addition of the behavioral “likelihood of communicating risks” about nanotechnology after participating in the Nanotechnology and Health Care forum. This evaluation is one of the few that includes a delayed follow-up survey with participants to fully measure behavioral changes.

In the formative evaluations, however, the measured outcomes tended to be more about recruiting participants and program sustainability. Operating under the same program goals, these evaluation questions asked about effective marketing strategies, program stakeholders, and cost-effectiveness of programs. Instruments focused on collecting demographic information about participants, analyzing their awareness and interest within the topic area, and a few very broad findings about learning new information or gaining comfort in discussing the topic.

The formative evaluation provided by the International Sites of Conscience is one of series of evaluations considering outcomes for both program facilitators and participating guests. The formative piece about participant outcomes is unique in its methodology: instead of relying solely on surveys and interviews like most of the other programs in this paper, a focused observation instrument provides quantitative data about guest actions. Among the behaviors listed are asking questions of the facilitators, asking questions of other guests, sharing stories, sharing opinions, or becoming visibly emotional. This strategy presents a way to
look at the mechanisms of dialogue programs across sites, rather than focusing solely on the short-term success of the program implementation. (Feedback about the degree to which participants feel they have gained new knowledge and attitudes are also included in a more standard surveys and facilitator reflections.)

The evaluation also highlights an interesting reticence by some participating sites to include a question about guests “inspiring others to become more involved in immigration issues” in their survey. Although interpreted in this report as part of the way museums do or do not see themselves as players in social issues, other reports in this overview have also shied away from making and evaluating claims about changes in behavior, action, or progression. Without the means to follow-up with participants at a later date, there are naturally few ways to gather evidence to suggest that these outcomes are occurring; however, the value of these more challenging longitudinal studies is increasingly recognized throughout the field of museum evaluation.

Overview of Findings

Who is conducting the reports?
Most of the available reports come from projects with agency funding requiring external evaluators. In the case of NISE Net evaluations, internal and external evaluations are effectively mixed due to its collaborative nature; staff evaluators collected data at their respective museums but findings across sites tended to be synthesized by one team.

What phases of evaluation do they represent?
Formative evaluations (6) are more prevalent than summative (4), though even these methodologies are sometimes mixed. Flood Forum, presented by the Nuture Nature Foundation, is both a summative look at two completed forums and a front-end look at participant interests for future programming. Because of the limited evaluation material available, case studies from academic works and journals have also been included where appropriate (3).

What time frames do they cover?
Very few have a delayed follow-up survey or interview component; as a result, most evaluations are concerned only with immediately measurable outcomes and do not broach the subject of behavior or progression GLOs. Among those that do include a follow-up component are NISE Net's
summative evaluation on Nanotechnology in Health Care and case studies by Blaney (2013) and Abram (2007).

Which GLOs do program goals address? Which GLOs have evidence of being achieved? The charts below represent the most common generic learning outcomes to appear in these evaluations according to the definitions of the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council of the UK (MLA, 2008). Not all reports included easily identifiable program goals, focusing only on the evaluation questions and outcomes; others were primarily focused on facilitator training or participant recruitment and did not reflect any GLOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge &amp; Understanding and Attitudes &amp; Values were the most common outcomes, in both program goals and actual evaluation measures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Goals, n=11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes &amp; Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, Creativity, Inspiration, Activity, Behavior, Progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measured Outcomes, n=14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes &amp; Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, Creativity, Inspiration, Activity, Behavior, Progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tractors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Generic Learning Outcomes

Knowledge and Understanding
- Knowing what or about something
- Learning facts or information
- Making sense of something
- Deepening understanding
- How museums, libraries and archives operate
- Making links and relationships between things

Skills
- Knowing how to do something
- Being able to do new things
- Intellectual skills
- Information management skills
- Social skills
- Communication skills
- Physical skills

Attitudes and Values
- Feelings
- Perceptions
- Opinions about ourselves (e.g. self esteem)
- Opinions or attitudes towards other people
- Increased capacity for tolerance
- Empathy
- Increased motivation
- Attitudes towards an organization (e.g. a museum, archive or library)
- Positive and negative attitudes in relation to an experience

Enjoyment, Inspiration, creativity
- Having fun
- Being surprised
- Innovative thoughts
- Creativity
- Exploration, experimentation and making
- Being inspired

Activity, behaviour, progression
- What people do
- What people intend to do
- What people have done
- Reported or observed actions
- A change in the way that people manage their lives

Adapted from: http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk/toolstemplates/genericlearning/
DESIGNING THE ARC OF DIALOGUE

Phase One: Community-Building

- **Purpose**
  Why are *we*, specifically, coming together to engage in this dialogue process? Why is this important to us?

- **Intended Outcome(s)**
  What do we hope to learn by engaging in this dialogue?

- **Ground Rules/Principles for Engagement**
  What are the “norms,” rules, principles or guidelines we want to establish to guide our dialogue and help us establish the “container” that the dialogue occurs within?

- **Ice-Breaker**
  Ice-breakers serve the purpose of helping to build the “learning community” and break down artificial barriers between people by providing participants with non-threatening opportunities to teach about themselves and learn about others.

Phase Two: Sharing the Diversity of Experiences

These questions invite participants to think about their own experiences with the dialogue topic and to bring examples of these experiences into the conversation. These questions help participants begin to make personal connections and find personal meaning in the dialogue topic. This process also allows participants to begin to establish a “common ground” of understanding and personal connection to the dialogue topic.

Phase Three: Exploring the Diversity of Experiences Beyond Our Personal Experiences

These are questions specifically designed to explore the dialogue topic beyond participants’ personal experiences with it. These questions help participants to engage in inquiry and exploration about the dialogue topic in an effort to learn with and from one another.

Phase Four: Synthesizing and Closing the Learning Experience

- **Synthesis**
  The facilitator helps participants to identify and make meaning from the “threads” that connect the ideas, perspectives and insights generated through the dialogue.

- **Next Steps**
  The facilitator works with the group to reflect on its learning and to decide what, if any, are the next steps the group wants to take.

- **Closure**
  In the process of closure, the facilitator works with the group to reflect on its learning, offer final observations, make comments to one another about the learning process.
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