



Report on the First National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation

October 2002
Alexandria, Virginia

By Sandy Heierbacher, Conference Director

Contents

Letter from the Conference Director

Why We Held the First-Ever National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation

How the Conference and the Coalition Came to Be

The People Who Made It Happen

Conference Overview

- Break-Out Sessions

- The Large Group (Plenary) Sessions

- The Twelve Next Steps Groups

- Additional Outcomes of the Conference

Evaluating Our Work

The Conference Coalition

Note: The contents of this report were written in 2002 and 2003. There have been many new developments since, and much progress has been made in the action areas generated at the conference.

A Letter from the Conference Director

Written by Sandy Heierbacher in early 2003.

We are very proud of what we were able to accomplish in the past year. We showed that the dialogue and deliberation community is ready to begin coming together to make a greater impact on the world.

The conference itself was a very special gathering. Many participants commented that the atmosphere was one of excitement, positive energy, and intense hope and expectation for the future. There was also a spirit of appreciation for the many people who had worked together to make the conference happen.



Many things could have been improved. In our desire to expose participants to as many models, methods and tools as possible, we overscheduled. People wanted quality *and* quantity, and that was difficult to deliver during a 3-day conference with numerous goals. Participants also wanted more opportunities for skill-building than they received, and many would have liked more youth-oriented and K-12-related sessions. Participants also would have enjoyed more time and space for networking and just getting to know their colleagues. Although we chose to not have lengthy keynote speeches or panel discussions during plenary sessions, some participants wanted to see and hear more of the top leaders in the field.

At times, goal-driven tasks and time management overshadowed the need to resolve diversity and insensitivity issues that came up. We failed to set up a system, policy or committee to address difficult moments and assess participants' safety during the plenary sessions, break-out sessions and other times during the conference.

We are fairly pleased with the level of diversity at the conference. Approximately 35% of our registrants were non-white, as were many of our session leaders. Our participants represented all of the streams of practice we identified as existing in the field. 62% identified with the Community Building and Social Action community, 53% with the Conflict Transformation and Peace-Building community. 41% identified as part of the Deliberative Democracy community, while 31% identified with Collective Inquiry. 28% identified with the stream of practice called Critical-Dialogic Education Models for K-12 and Higher Education, and 14% identified with Online Dialogue & Deliberation. 17% of our participants identified another stream of practice that we hadn't specified, Arts and Civic Dialogue being the most popular write-in.

Participants had a total of 1,925 years of experience, an average of 10 years' experience (for the 190 people who provided this information). The most experience recorded was Nguyen Minh Chan with 40+ years. Of course, many improvements could have been made in our level of diversity. More People of Color would have added to the quality of the event, as would have more people from some of the underrepresented streams of practice (such as Online Dialogue & Deliberation). Youth were underrepresented at the conference - only two participants were under 20 years old and only 19 participants were in their 20s. And public officials were also underrepresented. Although this was a national conference, participants also felt that the international community was underrepresented.

Also evident was the lack of conservative viewpoints represented at the conference. When participants at Saturday's plenary session used their key pads to indicate who they had voted for in 2000, we learned that only 4% of our participants had voted for George W. Bush. This became an important issue during the rest of the conference, with many people asking questions such as "How can we be a politically neutral field when the people attracted most to the field are overwhelmingly liberal?", "How can we involve and welcome conservatives into our field?" and "Is there something inherently liberal about dialogue and deliberation?" These continue to be vital questions for the D&D community which NCDD hopes to explore further.

We feel that our efforts to bring D&D practitioners and scholars together for networking, information-sharing and planning succeeded in making D&D leaders more willing to share their successes and strategies with others in the field, more able to share them, and more informed about where to go to access such information.

The initial Coalition was developed in order to define, strengthen and shape the future of the dialogue and deliberation community by finding ways to help D&D leaders communicate with one another, share resources and strategies, and increase their effectiveness. More than anything, we wanted to address and begin to remedy the disconnect that exists throughout the D&D community. We did this by holding a national conference, and we continue to do this through our activities and collaborative projects, and through the resources and opportunities we provide our members and others involved in dialogue and deliberation work.

- Sandy Heierbacher, 2002 Conference Director

Why We Held the First-Ever National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation

Dialogue is a process which enables people from all walks of life to talk deeply and personally about some of the major issues and realities that divide them. Dialogues are powerful, transformational experiences that often lead to both personal and collaborative action.

Why dialogue AND deliberation? Dialogue is often deliberative, involving the weighing of various options and the consideration of different viewpoints for the purpose of reaching agreement on action steps or policy decisions. But deliberation is not nearly as effective if it occurs without dialogue. Engaging in dialogue before moving to deliberation helps ensure that members of a group will be open to others' opinions and perspectives, even when they conflict with their own. This leads to a more open and thorough examination of all possible outcomes, which means better decision-making.

People are leading dialogues (deliberative and otherwise) across the country in schools, in churches, in workplaces, and in virtually every other venue imaginable. They are encouraging people to engage in dialogue about issues ranging from race relations in their communities and violence in their schools to how to handle the buildup of nuclear waste or the rapid rate of development in their region. People are organizing dialogues in order to resolve conflicts, to increase citizen participation in governmental decisions, to educate about important issues and realities, to help people build self-awareness, to improve communication skills, to strengthen teams or build coalitions, to stimulate innovation and to foster effective community change.



Deliberative approaches to dialogue are being applied with increasing frequency in communities, across regions and at the national level. Some of these approaches are designed to bring citizens and government decision-makers together as joint problem solvers. Techniques range from intimate, small-group dialogues to large, town meeting-like forums involving hundreds or even thousands of participants. Evolving communication technologies are sometimes integrated into these experiments to overcome traditional barriers of scale, geography and time.

Problems & Challenges

If you know where to look, you can find references to dialogue and deliberation everywhere in our society today. The problem is that most people do not know where to look. Policymakers, who are increasingly interested in helping their constituents share viewpoints, develop clarity and make recommendations about important policies, don't know where to find out more about dialogue and deliberation. Educators who want their students to understand and transform conflicts aren't sure where to look for the resources they need. Even dialogue and deliberation practitioners themselves aren't clear on where they can find needed information, resources and advice within our evolving field.

Dialogue organizers and facilitators are generally unaware of the many high-quality, low-cost resources that could help them become more effective in their work. They don't know who they can contact for help with specific problems they are facing, or where they can go for training or events that can help them build their skills.

There is a bewildering array of overlapping terms and concepts being used by practitioners and scholars in our field. Even leaders in the dialogue field tend to be unaware of all of the various aliases that the dialogue process adopts in different venues, in different parts of the country and across the globe. It is difficult for dialogue practitioners to understand how their work relates to the practices of public participation, civic engagement, alternative dispute resolution, conflict resolution, organizational development, deliberative democracy, organizational development, consensus building, community building, and so many other practices.



The opportunities for U.S. dialogue leaders to get together with other leaders in the field are rare, and the opportunities that do exist always leave out significant portions of the dialogue and deliberation community. As a result, the group who is organizing community-wide Study Circles in Ohio does not benefit from the years of experience of the Jewish-Palestinian living room dialogue leaders in San Francisco. The success of one-time dialogues in bookstores and coffee shops in Seattle does not give older dialogue programs in Boston needed ideas of how to engage more of the public in their process. An excellent dialogue training program in Akron is run without even the dialogue practitioners in that state finding out about it in time to register. And the success and impact of a range of new deliberative online dialogues remain unknown to the vast majority of organizers of community discussions across the country.

This kind of disconnect is understandable given the tremendous grassroots growth of dialogic and deliberative processes in the past decade alone. But for the processes to be refined and the practice to continue to be developed, D&D practitioners and theorists need to establish ways to stay connected with one another. Means of sharing strategies, asking questions and getting the right people to answer them, getting the word out about events and training opportunities, evaluating programs, developing professional standards and reaching agreement on basic terms and definitions in the field – the development of all of these things is essential to the growth of the field and the future of the dialogue process.

A Possible Solution

A group of leaders in the dialogue community began working together in the summer of 2001 to organize a national event which would bring practitioners together across the myriad methods, applications and venues in which dialogue is practiced. We were awarded funding for the event by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation in May 2002, for a National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation to be held October 4-6, 2002.

It is our hope that the conference will help define, strengthen and shape the future of the dialogue process by giving leaders and future leaders in the field a venue in which to develop sustainable ways to communicate with one another, share resources and strategies, and increase the visibility and effectiveness of the practice.

The Conference was a highly participatory, high-energy event which brought dialogue practitioners together for the first time across models, topics, regions, applications and philosophies for a unique learning, networking and planning experience. The Conference was designed to provide the opportunity for new task forces, networks and committees to form for purposes designated by the participants. The Conference included experiential workshops, opportunities to experience and observe a variety of dialogue models, an exhibition of resources and materials, networking opportunities, a high-tech, large-group town meeting and a community dialogue-style action forum.

Participants were given the opportunity to learn about what's new in the field (new strategies, methods, research, etc.), to increase their skills in organizing dialogues and in helping their dialogue groups take effective community action, to find out how to handle specific problems and challenges they routinely face, and to share their own knowledge and experience with their colleagues.

A report will be produced which will focus on the issues, resources and innovations gleaned from the conference (key questions and challenges for the field; new approaches, strategies, resources and projects of interest to practitioners; information on various dialogue models and tools), new collaborations, projects and networks created at the conference, an evaluation of the event, and plans and ideas for future events.

The Future

The Coalition of organizations that helped make the conference happen decided to become the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation, and we have opened our doors to practitioners, theorists, students and organizations across the field who are interested in working with us to continue strengthening and uniting our field.

The National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation has the potential, in the long run, to make the D&D community vastly more effective. Depending on what we, as a Coalition, decide to do, D&D practitioners can be made more knowledgeable and more skilled, and can be given more and better access to the resources and individuals who can help them in their work. The dialogue and deliberation community can become much more cohesive, with less confusion and isolation.

An accurate understanding and knowledge of dialogue and deliberation can be made more widespread, with more people having an understanding of what D&D are and why they are so effective, how to organize a dialogue (deliberative or not), and how to obtain or train a facilitator. If our efforts are successful, communities, schools, government agencies and others will be better able to foster collaborative solutions to difficult problems – not only because information about D&D processes will have been made more accessible, but because the practice will have been strengthened and improved.

But the long-term impact of NCDD depends upon the dedication, commitment and vision of members of the dialogue and deliberation community – not only those who attended the conference and pinpointed some of the actions that need to be taken to strengthen and unite the field and to meet practitioners' needs, but also the hundreds of dialogue and deliberation leaders who were not able to attend the conference. We need to work together to ensure that our burgeoning field and our talented practitioners are able to reach their full potential!

How the Conference and the Coalition Came to Be

The momentum that led up to the event began at MRA's Connecting Communities conference in June 2001 (MRA is now called Initiatives of Change), when Jim Snow of George Mason University's ICAR program and Tamra d'Estree of Denver University began talking about the need for a conference that would allow dialogue and deliberation practitioners to experience each other's models, share strategies and get to know their colleagues in the field. Cricket White of Hope in the Cities joined the conversation and quickly began drawing in other conference participants who were involved in leading dialogue and deliberation efforts. Cricket's enthusiasm was contagious, and the following people began seriously talking about how we could make this idea a reality:

Sandy Heierbacher of the Dialogue to Action Initiative

Randy Ross of the New Jersey Office of Bias Crime and Community Relations



Jim Snow of George Mason University's Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution

Melissa Wade of the Study Circles Resource Center

Mike Wenger of NABRE (the Network of Alliances Bridging Race & Ethnicity)

Cricket White of Hope in the Cities (of course!)

Upon returning home, Sandy Heierbacher created a listserv (email discussion list) so that the group could communicate with one another readily, and we wrote to each other excitedly about planning an event which would bring dialogue practitioners together to learn about each other's dialogue models and strategies and to address the disconnect and lack of infrastructure that exists in the dialogue community.

We also reached out to others in our networks, and were joined by the following people who became actively involved in our planning efforts:

Reena Bernards of The Dialogue Project

Chip Hauss of Search for Common Ground - USA

Maggie Herzig of the Public Conversations Project

Jennifer Murphy of George Mason University's Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution

Maggie Potapchuk of NABRE (the Network of Alliances Bridging Race & Ethnicity)

Polly Riddims of Fusion Partnerships, Inc.

David Schoem of the University of Michigan

Toni Tucker of Dayton Dialogues on Race

Michele Woods Jones of the Citizens' Unity Commission

It soon became evident that although everyone on the listserv was committed to organizing a gathering of dialogue leaders, each person had different ideas, needs and a unique vision for the event. In order to create some clarity about what ways dialogue practitioners could really benefit from such an event - and whether or not there was demand for an event like this - the group decided to design a needs assessment, and invited dialogue facilitators, organizers, researchers, students and participants to complete an online survey.

115 people from throughout the dialogue community completed the survey. The results, which were posted on the Dialogue to Action Initiative's website and publicized throughout the dialogue community, are both interesting and informative, and confirmed that dialogue practitioners have a strong need - and many great ideas! - for a dialogue conference.

Making the Conference Happen

A grant proposal was then written and presented to the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (thanks to David Schoem mentioning our efforts to Terry Amsler of Hewlett!). After some rewriting and waiting, we received the good news on Thursday, May 23!

As soon as we heard the news, we moved into high gear. We had already found a great location and had agreed on October 4-6 as the dates for the event, but that left us with little over four months to organize a national conference! Sandy Heierbacher immediately sent out an announcement to about 2500 contacts throughout the dialogue community, hoping to not only encourage people to plan to attend, but also to join our Organizing Team and our Coalition.

We wanted this conference to be welcoming, relevant, informative and inspiring to practitioners and theorists representing the entire spectrum of dialogic practice, and assembling a broad-based Organizing Team was an important step in achieving this goal.

Within a couple of days, we had received over 400 email messages from dialogue leaders who wanted to express their excitement about the event. Many of these leaders accepted our invitation to join the conference Organizing Team or have their organization become a part of the Coalition for a National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation.

With a large organizing team of 60 incredible people who had faith that we could pull this off in four months - not to mention six absolutely phenomenal committee chairs - we were able to put together an event that includes 56 top-notch breakout sessions that exposed dialogue practitioners to a plethora of dialogue methods, models and tools, and three large-group sessions that took conference participants through a dialogic process to help them determine what actions we should take as a group to move our field forward. [Click here for more details about the event itself](#) (info about the break-out sessions and descriptions of the methods used during the plenary sessions and their results).

For those of you who weren't able to attend the conference, it was a really wonderful event. The atmosphere was extremely positive and just charged with energy, and the overwhelming attitude of participants was one of gratitude for the opportunity to be together with fellow D&D practitioners and excitement about what they could learn at the conference and share with



others, and what we could begin doing together to strengthen our field.

The large-group sessions were high-energy and were effective in getting the group to think about what the field needs and how we might begin working together to meet those needs. And the break-out sessions were highly varied and very well-facilitated. Overall, the conference was too short and the schedule was too tight, but the spirit was one of learning about new methods and tools, meeting new colleagues and fostering new collaborative efforts.

Next Steps

After the conference, the 50 organizations which made up the Coalition for a National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation decided to continue working together to strengthen and unite the dialogue and deliberation community. The conference was over, but the work was just beginning, so the Coalition decided to become the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation (NCDD).

Since the 2002 conference, we have been inviting organizations and practitioners from across the dialogue & deliberation community to join our efforts. As of January 2006, over 500 organizations and individuals have joined the Coalition.



The People Who Made It Happen

NCDD 2002 Steering Committee

Eric F. Boyd, Executive Director, Los Angeles Days of Dialogue

Paul Gorski, Assistant Director, Office of Human Relations Programs, University of Maryland

Sandy Heierbacher (Conference Director), Director, Dialogue to Action Initiative

David Isaacs, Co-Founder, The World Café

Martha McCoy, Executive Director, Study Circles Resource Center

Maggie Potapchuk, Senior Program Associate, NABRE and the Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies

Polly Riddims, Partner, Fusion Partnerships

Randy Ross, Program Development Specialist, New Jersey Office of Bias Crime and Community Relations

Doug Sarno, Co-Director, Perspectives Group

David Schoem, Faculty Director of Michigan Community Scholars Program, University of Michigan

Attica Scott, Executive Director, Knoxville National Conference for Community & Justice (NCCJ)

Elaine Shen, Director of Partnerships & Training, Television Race Initiative/Active Voice

Jesús Treviño, Ph.D., Associate Provost for Multicultural Affairs, University of Denver

Melissa Wade, Program Assistant, Study Circles Resource Center

Stacie Walton, M.D., Adjunct Professor, Saint Louis University School of Public Health

Cricket White, Training and Communication Director, Hope in the Cities

Special Consultants:

Tom Atlee, Co-Intelligence Institute

Glenna Gerard, The Dialogue Group

Joe Goldman, AmericaSpeaks

Michael McCormick, Study Circles Resource Center

Lilith Ren, Federal Aviation Administration

Pat Scully, Study Circles Resource Center

NCDD 2002 Planning Team

Craig Alimo

Reena Bernards

David Campt

Millicent Carvalho

Wally Clausen

Pat Eastwood

Nabil M. El-Khodari

Omowale T. Elson, Ph.D.

Beth Fisher-Yoshida

Chip Hauss

Katie Howard

Leslie Inman

Mary Jacksteit

Janetta Kearney

James Knauer

Susan Koscis

Amy Ladd

Matt Leighninger

Theo. R. Leverenz, Ph.D.

Aliah Majon

Susanna McIlwaine

Ernesto Mejia

Jen Murphy

Susan Myers

Nancy Polk

Kent Roberts

Laurie Shiparski

Jim Snow

Bob Stains

StrongHeart

Lars Hasselblad Torres

Aaron Traxler-Ballew

Jesús Treviño, Ph.D.

Paul Wahrhaftig

Michael Weiksner

Saadia Williams

Lawrence Wofford

Michele Woods Jones

Rosa Zubizarreta

Conference Overview

Here we will describe the bulk of what was accomplished at and directly because of the 2002 conference. We will list the 56 break-out sessions, describe the three plenary sessions, outline the 12 "next steps" groups that formed at the conference, and describe additional conference outcomes.

Break-Out Sessions

Are We Hearing What They're Saying? Transforming Education Through Teacher/Student Dialogues

Paul Gorski, University of Maryland, Office of Human Relations Programs

Art & Civic Dialogue: An Exchange Among Arts and Dialogue Practitioners

Andrea Assaf, Barbara Schaeffer Bacon and Pam Korza, The Animating Democracy Initiative of Americans for the Arts

Beginning, Maturing & Growing a Sustained Dialogue

Len and Libby Traubman, Jewish-Palestinian Living Room Dialogue

Bridges Across Racial Polarization®: A Model Program of Interracial Dialogue

Barbara Levin, Bridges Across Racial Polarization (FOCUS St. Louis)

Building a Movement for Dialogue, Deliberation & Democracy: Where Do We Go From Here?

Tom Atlee and Adin Rogovin, The Co-Intelligence Institute

Can Dialogue be used as a Reconciliation Tool? Avoiding One-Sided Blame and Sharing Responsibility for Community Change

David Campt, RaceDoctor.org
Yvonne Haynes, Hope in the Cities
Cricket White, Hope in the Cities

Community Dialogue: Power & Pitfalls

Mary Jane Hollis, Aurora Community Study Circles

Community Dialogue Post-9/11: Sharing Our Learnings & Experiences

Laura Chasin and Maggie Herzig, The Public Conversations Project

Convening & Facilitating Dialogues to Maximize Participation of "Lesser-Heard" Voices

Susan Clark and Enrique Ramirez, Target Knowledge

Creating Conversation Cafés Where Strangers Can Talk: Promoting & Marketing a Culture of Conversation

Michael Kerman and Susan Partnow, Conversation Café

Creating Safe Space for Victim-Offender Dialogue: A Restorative Justice Perspective

Phyllis Turner Lawrence, Restorative Justice Consultant

Cultural Considerations and Dialogue Facilitator Preparation: Contributions from the Diversity Field

Evelyn Boyer and Cole McGee, National MultiCultural Institute

Dance Exchange on Dialogue & Making Dance

John Borstel and Liz Lerman, Liz Lerman Dance Exchange

Developing a Dialogue-Centered Agenda for Social Change: Where Can and Should the Dialogue Movement Go?

Sandy Heierbacher, Dialogue to Action Initiative
Martha McCoy, Study Circles Resource Center
David Schoem, University of Michigan
Ximena Zúñiga, University of Massachusetts

Dialogue and Deliberation in Canada: Dispatches from the Frontiers of Citizen Participation

Miriam Wyman, Practicum Limited
Sandra Zagon, Canadian Policy Research Networks

Dialogue for Action and Change: Case Studies on the Achievement Gap in Education

Nguyen Minh Chau, Maryland Vietnamese Mutual Association, Inc.
John Landesman, Study Circles Resource Center
Gwen Whiting, G. Whiting & Associates

A Dialogue on the Role of History in Inter-Ethnic Conflicts

Millicent Carvahlo, Pennsylvania Conflict Resolution & Mediation Services, Inc.
Najeeba Syeed-Miller, Asian-Pacific American Dispute Resource Center

The Difference Deliberative Dialogue Makes: The Diversity and Community Project at Franklin Pierce College

Doug Challenger, Joni Doherty and Jed Donelan, New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce College

Distinguishing Deliberation From Other Kinds of Discourse

David Ryfe, Middle Tennessee State University

Dynamic Facilitation: A New Model for Dialogue & Deliberation

DeAnna Martin, Center for Wise Democratic Processes
Rosa Zubizarreta, Co-Intelligence Institute

(En)Circling Understandings: Story Circles as Social Justice Education

Gloria Bouis and Sivagami Subbaraman, University of Maryland, Office of Human Relations Programs

Evaluating Intergroup Dialogue: What We Did and What We Learned

Christian Dorsey, Operation Understanding DC
Ellen Wayne, University of Baltimore, Center for Negotiation & Conflict Management

Evaluation of The Environmental Justice Collaborative Model

Eric Marsh, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Exploring Conflicts & Common Ground: A Critical-Dialogic Approach to Intergroup Dialogue

Craig Alimo, University of Maryland Office of Human Relations Programs
Ratnesh Nagda, University of Washington
Monita Thompson, University of Michigan
Carolyn Vasques-Scalera, George Washington University
Ximena Zúñiga, University of Massachusetts

Faith-Based and Secular Approaches to Dialogue and Conflict Resolution

Chip Hauss, Search for Common Ground
Ambassador Robert Seiple, Institute for Global Engagement

From Talk to Action in Large-scale Dialogue Programs: Lessons from Community Experiences

Matt Leighninger, Democracy Workshop/Study Circles Resource Center

The Heart of Bohm's Dialogue: A 6-hour Exploration

Richard Burg, Simple Idea
Lee Nichol, Center for Creative Inquiry

How to Host a Successful Online Dialogue

Sheila Collins, NABRE and the Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies
Barry Joseph, Global Kids
Amy Ladd, Group Jazz
Jed Miller, Web Lab
Pat Scully, Study Circles Resource Center
Mike Weiksner, E The People

How Socrates Café Can Create a More Participatory Society

Chris Phillips, Society for Philosophical Inquiry

INTRAGroup Dialogue: Models for Single Identity Structured Interaction

Kelly Maxwell, Monita Thompson and Aaron Traxler-Ballew, University of Michigan IGRCC

The Life-Cycle of a Dialogue Group: From Birth to Action

Reena Bernards and Najat Arafat Khelil, The Dialogue Project

Linking People and Communities with Public Policy-Makers: Innovative, Community-Driven Strategies Of "Civic Engagement" In Public Policy-Making On Behalf Of Children & Families

Ken Colling, San Diego Children's & Family Commission
Katie Howard & Michelle Vilchez, Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center
Cristina Rodriguez de la Mar, Civic Engagement Project for Children & Families

Local, National and International Projects based on the National Issues Forum Model

Jim Knauer, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
Harris Sokoloff, University of Pennsylvania Center for School Study Councils

Managing the Being-Doing Dilemma: Is Dialogue a Tool For Action or a Way of Being Together?

Megan Buchanan Schopf, Artful Work
Laurie Shiparski, CPM Resource Center

New York City Community Building Model & International Peacemaking Model

Carlos Garcia and Grace Yun, InterRelations Collaborative
Ana Ofelia Rodriguez, Broadway Housing Communities, Committee of the Heights Inwood Homeless

Nonviolent Communication: Practical Tools to Realize the Full Potential of Dialogue

Duke Duchscherer, Center for Nonviolent Communication

Preparing for Participation: Inquiry that Supports Reflection

Sallyann Roth and Bob Stains, the Public Conversations Project

Reaching Out: Taking Conflict Resolution to the Wider Public

Eileen Dzik and Carole Frampton, Search for Common Ground

Remarketing Dialogue: The New D&D!

Amitai Etzioni, The Communitarian Network
Jed Miller, Web Lab
Elaine Shen, Television Race Initiative/Active Voice
Lars Torres, AmericaSpeaks
Miriam Wyman, Practicum Limited

Scaling Up From Small Group Dialogues: Using "Symbolic Dialogue" to Achieve Large-System Collaboration

John Spady, Forum Foundation

Society's Breakthrough! - Facilitating a Dialogue-based Society

DeAnna Martin and Jim Rough, Center for Wise Democratic Processes

Strategies & Skills for Effective Facilitator Training

John Fenner, The Center for Dialogue
Gwen Whiting, G. Whiting & Associates

Tipping the Culture: Fostering Habits of Dialogue and Collaborative Action on College Campuses

Nancy Thomas, Democracy Project, Society for Values in Higher Education

Transformative Dialogue and the Power of Appreciative Inquiry

Kenneth Gergen, Taos Institute
Mary Gergen, Penn State University

The United States: A People's Dialogue - An arts-based civic dialogue on the nature of citizenship since 9/11

Marty Pottenger, Animating Democracy
Patricia Romney Ph.D., Romney Associates, Inc.

Using Citizen Deliberative Councils to Generate Citizen Wisdom to Guide our Democracy

Tom Atlee, The Co-Intelligence Institute

Using Film to Build Dialogue to Action: How to bring in and sustain effective stakeholders and build new collaborations.

Elaine Shen, Television Race Initiative/Active Voice

Using Informal Writing to Foster Democratic Dialogue: From Small-Group Gatherings to Online Forums

Irene Papoulis, Intercollegiate E-Democracy Project
Beverly Wall, Trinity College

Walk That Talk: Beyond Our Stories About Race

Cynthia Jones and Kathleen Kane, CUNY Hostos Community College

Where Do We Go From Here? Growing the Nascent Deliberative Democracy Movement

Carolyn Lukensmeyer, AmericaSpeaks
Martha McCoy, Study Circles Resource Center
Michael Weiksner, E The People

White Privilege and Critical Pedagogy: Dialogue in the Classroom

Lauren Parker Kucera, M.A., coAction

Working with Top Management Teams and Dialogue in Britain

Rich Field, Field Enterprise Ltd.

The World Café: Building Collaborative Learning Communities in the Service of a Global Wisdom Society

Nancy Young, Institute of Noetic Sciences

The Large Group (Plenary) Sessions

The three plenary sessions – one each day – put participants through a deliberative dialogue process to help them decide how we should move forward together to strengthen and unite the field and the practice. Below is a synopsis of the three sessions and their findings.

Friday's Large-Group Dialogue Process

Designed and administered by members of the Conference Organizing Team.

Lead Facilitators:

Eric Boyd, Executive Director of Los Angeles Days of Dialogue

Randy Ross, Program Development Specialist, New Jersey Office of Bias Crime and Community Relations

In facilitated small-group dialogues, conference participants introduced themselves and shared their reasons for coming to the conference. They shared what dialogue and deliberation mean to them – both literally (what do those words mean?) and figuratively (what meaning do they have for you personally?). They moved on to talk about what their individual needs are as dialogue and deliberation professionals. And they concluded by discussing what their hopes are for the practices of dialogue and deliberation, and for the dialogue and deliberation community.

A group of volunteers compiled the handwritten notes taken during this session. They found that the greatest hope that participants expressed is that the practices of dialogue and deliberation (D&D) will improve our world through a) personal transformation, b) stronger communities, and c) reinvigorated democracy.

Participants also hope that D&D will become embedded in our processes of governance, mediating institutions, and the consciousness of the public.

Additional shared hopes included:

- The practice of D&D will gain greater recognition ("same status as opinion polling"). This will bring more funding to the practice.
- D&D will be accessible to everyone and truly inclusive. D&D skills will be taught throughout the educational system.
- We will build a community of practice that supports sharing, working and learning together. We will be more intentional about considering who has been left out of gatherings like this and increase our own diversity (including ideologically).
- We will develop shared models, assumptions and terms within the D&D community. We will avoid jargon, clichés and terms that are too narrow.
- We will develop better measures and practices to evaluate our work.



The group also developed this important statement:

Dialogue and deliberation have a diversity of purposes, ranging from personal growth and learning to collective action and impacting governance. As a group, we have disagreements about the nature or role of action and change in our work. This group needs to be clearer about the hopes that inform our different ideas about the role of action and change.

Saturday's 21st Century Town Meeting

Designed and administered by AmericaSpeaks.

Lead Facilitator:

Joe Goldman, Associate of AmericaSpeaks

In facilitated small groups, and equipped with electronic, wireless keypads for each individual and wireless laptops for each table, participants were asked to identify opportunities and challenges that have the potential to effect our ability to move our field of practice forward. Throughout this session, participants were polled (via the keypads) on various questions and issues, and notes that were typed into the laptops were compiled by a volunteer Theme Team.

The opportunities that were identified are:

1. We are at a national moment that demands dialogue and deliberation on issues such as the economy, 9/11, trust in institutions.
2. Engage the nation in a dialogue on war with Iraq. "It's not about the war, it's about using the democratic way to discuss the issue."
3. We have identified issues and intentions within the field. "It is a great time to build on them," define the field, increase connections and "move forward together."
4. Educate everyone about D&D and "reinvent the way we are with each other in groups, in society, nationally."
5. Create a shared toolbox for D&D practices, combining methods from all corners of the field.

The challenges that were identified are:

1. Representation: Including typically underrepresented groups and a range of political perspectives.
2. Funding: Making the case for the value of the dialogue process; demonstrating outcomes; competing among ourselves.
3. Decision-makers: Openness to sharing power; the view of dialogue as a means for input and changing mindsets.
4. Barriers to Participation: Resistance due to time; question of value; apathy; need to create incentives for participation.
5. Building on Connections Here: Remaining open as a field to other disciplines that can deepen and enrich our practice and thinking; maintaining values as we build.
6. Outcomes: Developing better tools for evaluation of both process and outcomes.

Participants were then asked to develop a set of specific action items that the field should pursue. These ideas were compiled and given to the facilitators of Sunday's plenary session.

Sunday's Next Steps Forum

Designed and administered by the Study Circles Resource Center.

Lead Facilitators:

Michael McCormick, Program Director at SCRC

Gwen Whiting, Associate of SCRC

At this session, conference participants were asked to choose a "Next Steps group" to join based on their interests. The groups, which are listed below, were gleaned from Saturday's plenary. After meeting in these newly-formed groups and discussing their different and shared perspectives regarding their particular Next Step, participants reported out creatively (there was some singing involved, and lots of energy) about the main themes of their discussion.

At this point, everyone was given the (optional) opportunity to change groups based on what they heard and which group they feel best meets their needs, interests and abilities. The new groups then discussed how to proceed with the next steps (What action needs to be taken? What obstacles might we face? What resources do we need? Who will take responsibility for what?), and reported out again.



The twelve "*Next Steps Groups*" that developed focused on:

- Connecting dialogue and deliberation to the arts
- Creating a shared dialogue and deliberation toolbox
- Integrating dialogue and deliberation into educational environments
- Advancing diversity and expanding connections
- International networking
- Marketing dialogue to the media and the public
- Meeting practitioners' funding needs
- Developing our mission and vision
- Convening national dialogues (starting with Iraq)
- Networking and communications within D&D
- Networking and collaboration among online D&D practitioners
- Research & development

The Twelve Next Steps Groups

These groups formed on the last day of the National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation to address various needs and issues and/or make recommendations that are vital to the dialogue and deliberation community. Below are summaries of the groups' plans or recommendations.

The Connecting to the Arts Group

The Connecting to the Arts group is interested in exploring parallels and intersections between the arts and civic dialogue; examining how the arts can contribute to various dialogue goals, including action; expanding the reach and value of dialogue through the arts; and developing better understanding about artistic forms that embody dialogue or are dialogic in nature and that may enhance dialogue work.



Dialogue & Deliberation Toolbox Group

This group is interested in the collection, classification, description, and utilization of tools and methods, for the training, practices, self-reflection, troubleshooting and development of the international dialogue community.

Education & Dialogue Group

This group emphasized the importance of learning about what each other is doing in their respective locations in education. They expressed interest in sharing resources, tools and curricula that are already in place and displaying these on the NCDD website as well as the TeachingDemocracy.org website run out of the Pennsylvania Center for Civic Life.

They discussed coordinating future networking efforts at related conferences, and even talked about institutionalizing such meetings as an official part of the national conferences of such organizations as the American Association for Higher Education or the Association of American Colleges & Universities.



The group also emphasized the importance of more long-term goals including the development of programs or programming which would prepare educators and both formal and informal educational organizations to incorporate dialogue into their pedagogy, curricula and governance structures.

Advancing Diversity Group

The Advancing Diversity group is focusing on improving the climate for the coalition and future conferences with regard to diversity and racism. The group's vision statement is: Assuring that the Coalition in its organization and programming provides models for thinking about and exploring diversity as well as models that honor diversity. The group hopes to develop a process continuum that legitimizes the importance of differences as a valued quality in the work of the NCDD and that moves in continuous circle of growth: Consciousness, Contact, Awareness, Tolerance, Acceptance, Respect, Appreciate, Honor.

International Networking Group

This group recommended that NCDD find "sister organizations" in other countries with which to interact and connect,

and look for other ways to network in order to find individuals and organizations that do D&D work internationally. They suggested we contact some of the North America-based organizations not represented at the conference that do international dialogue and deliberation work in order to have more of an international presence in NCDD membership and at future conferences. Another recommendation was to provide a separate fund to create up to 10 scholarships for people from the international community to attend the next conference.

The International Networking group felt that the D&D community should find and follow through on funding opportunities to support D&D work with other countries. They also suggested that members of the D&D community collaborate to develop an International Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation. They offered the Office of Citizens Exchange as a possible source of funding for such efforts.

Marketing & Media Group

The Marketing and Media group seeks to build relationships with the media and decision-makers and to increase their understanding of dialogue and deliberation. The group is also interested in finding ways to define our message (articulating what dialogue and deliberation offer in a compelling way), “work” the message (writing articles about dialogue, getting ideas into the mainstream), and build understanding through engagement (engaging media in a “day of dialogue” to raise awareness).

Funding Group The Funding group recommended that D&D organizations and programs begin to share information about and connections with foundations that support our work, and find ways to foster collaborative grant writing. They suggested that we try to map our collective resources and needs in order to approach foundations in a more strategic, cohesive way. The Funding group also recommended that representatives from foundations interested in dialogue and deliberation be brought together for a collaborative Day of Dialogue.

Mission and Vision Group

The Mission and Vision group recommended that NCDD consider the exploration of who we are (as both a network and as a field or community) and what we are doing to be an ongoing conversation producing occasional insights and decisions, but never firmly nailed down. The group recommended that explore who else should be involved in this conversation about our mission and vision before any firm statements are made.

The National Dialogue Project

The National Dialogue Project was created to connect dialogue and deliberation organizations, practitioners and networks to support citizen engagement. Fostering a National Dialogue on Iraq was to be this group’s first major project.

Networking and Communications Group

The Networking and Communications group emphasized the need for local and regional gatherings as well as additional national conferences. They recommended that NCDD develop ways for conference participants to stay in touch with each other – and with other practitioners and scholars who were not in attendance at the conference – via the website, online newsletters, listservs, and perhaps a directory of people and organizations.

Online Working Group

Although this group did not form at the Next Steps forum, the group did form at the conference. This group considers itself to be the “Online Working Group of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium.” The group is comprised of researchers and practitioners who seek to advance the development and use of internet technologies to enhance deliberative democracy. The working group was formed immediately after a group of online D&D practitioners ran a break-out session at the conference. The group is formally linked to the Deliberative Democracy Consortium because the concept for the working group came from an earlier meeting of the consortium. The group communicates through a monthly conference call and a listserv, and runs the Blog at www.deliberative-democracy.net.

Research & Development Group

The Research & Development group provided NCDD with the following recommendations: Both theory-based and evaluative research pertaining to dialogue and deliberation should be collected and advanced. Information on current research and support for research should be collected and shared throughout the field. There is a need for research to be applied more often and more effectively to practice, and for practice to be applied more to research efforts. To do this, resources such as tools and instruments, case studies, research papers and evaluations need to be made much more accessible and available. We need to find ways to learn across methods, advance cross-cultural and international research, collect and create tools for community self-assessment, create a clearinghouse of lessons learned and find ways to be collaborative in our research.



Additional Outcomes of the Conference

The conference inspired a number of additional meetings, events and projects that the Organizing Team did not originally plan for. We were thrilled about each of these developments.

Partner Activities Before and After the Conference

Three very exciting opportunities for dialogue and deliberation practitioners and scholars were held in conjunction with the 2002 conference. All of these programs were held at the Radisson Hotel in Alexandria, Virginia, where the conference was held.

IAP2 Certificate Program in Public Participation (October 1-3)

During the three days prior to the conference (Tuesday through Thursday, October 1-3), the *Perspectives Group* offered Modules 1-3 of the IAP2 (International Association for Public Participation) Certificate Program in Public Participation.

This training provides beginner through advanced intermediate practitioners with a broad-based learning experience covering all of the foundations of public participation. Each course is designed to provide the fundamentals of public participation that practitioners from around the world can use to implement customized and effective programs. Upon completion of all five modules, students will receive a certificate from IAP2.

Animating Democracy Initiative Meeting (October 3)

On Thursday, October 3, the Animating Democracy Initiative (ADI), a program of Americans for the Arts, brought together 20 artists, artistic directors and dialogue specialists involved in arts-based civic dialogue projects supported by the Animating Democracy Lab. Eight dialogue professionals who were unaffiliated with Animating Democracy, but who are interested in or are applying the arts or humanities in their civic dialogue work, also attended the meeting. This was a focused opportunity for participants to explore ADI's work, and other self-identified topics and issues, before attending the conference.

The Animating Democracy Initiative, launched in the fall of 1999, is a four-year initiative of Americans for the Arts, supported by The Ford Foundation. ADI's purpose is to foster artistic activity that encourages civic dialogue on important contemporary issues and to promote the concept of arts-based civic dialogue. The core of the Initiative is the Animating Democracy Lab. In the Lab, ADI supports 32 artistic and cultural projects that experiment with different approaches to arts-based civic dialogue. The projects reflect a range of cultural organizations, from theatre companies to orchestras, which clearly see a role for civic dialogue within their institutional goals. For more info about ADI, go to www.AmericansForTheArts.org/AnimatingDemocracy.

All-Day Jewish-Palestinian Dialogue Meeting (October 7)

On Monday, October 7, Len and Libby Traubman of the highly-respected San Mateo (California) Jewish-Palestinian Living Room Dialogue brought together over 25 leaders in Jewish-Palestinian dialogue. Practitioners in this important realm of dialogic practice had the rare opportunity to meet face-to-face with people doing similar work in other communities. Participants reviewed principles of dialogue and outreach, considered shared challenges to sustained dialogue and spent time thinking together about deepening and widening the dialogue circle, both in the U.S. and overseas. To learn more about the Traubmans' work, go to <http://traubman.igc.org/global.htm>.



A Strong, Unforgettable Art Component

Due in large part to our collaboration with the Animating Democracy Initiative, NCDD 2002 ended up having a very strong art component which left a strong impression on most participants. Animating Democracy's day-long meeting held the day before the conference brought a sizable number of talented artists whose work inspires dialogue and deliberation. Some of these artists had applied to present at the conference. In addition, we were approached by two young, talented artists who provide graphic notation services at conferences and who were especially interested in this conference. And we wisely decided to have artist William Cochran present a slideshow about his unforgettable Community Bridge project during our opening night reception.

Art-Based Break-Out Sessions

Five of our most popular break-out sessions were related to the arts. This was the first time many of the dialogue and deliberation practitioners and scholars present had been exposed to some of the possibilities for combining art with D&D, and these sessions were extremely popular and highly praised by those who attended.

The sessions were titled:

Art & Civic Dialogue: An Exchange Among Arts and Dialogue Practitioners (Presenters: Andrea Assaf, Barbara Schaeffer Bacon and Pam Korza, the Animating Democracy Initiative of Americans for the Arts)

Dance Exchange on Dialogue & Making Dance (Presenters: John Borstel and Liz Lerman, Liz Lerman Dance Exchange)

The United States: A People's Dialogue - An arts-based civic dialogue on the nature of citizenship since 9/11 (Presenters: Marty Pottenger, Animating Democracy and Patricia Romney Ph.D., Romney Associates, Inc.)

Using Informal Writing to Foster Democratic Dialogue: From Small-Group Gatherings to Online Forums (Presenters: Irene Papoulis, Intercollegiate E-Democracy Project and Beverly Wall, Trinity College)

Using Film to Build Dialogue to Action: How to bring in and sustain effective stakeholders and build new collaborations. (Presenter: Elaine Shen, Television Race Initiative/Active Voice)

One participant made this comment about the Liz Lerman Dance Exchange session: "I was brain dead with exhaustion from the adrenalin put out at my own workshop and the listening focus of the prior workshop. This woke me up and got my attention.... You didn't realize until the very end how far you had gone both in deepening your connection with yourself and working in interesting ways with others."

Because of these sessions, more D&D practitioners now know that combining the imaginative power of art with the transformative power of dialogue creates dramatic possibilities for communication and connection. Integrating the arts into our work also obtains and holds the interest of some people who might otherwise be uninterested in dialogue and deliberation. The D&D community now knows the importance of examining this question posed by the Animating Democracy Initiative: How can the arts and humanities contribute most potently to civic dialogue and broader civic discourse?

A Special Presentation on The Community Bridge

During our Friday evening reception, artist William Cochran shared with us the inspiring story of the Community Bridge and the divided community that came together to build a lasting bridge.

The Community Bridge is an extraordinary public artwork in Frederick, Maryland, whose meaning and content was created through a two-year artistic interaction with thousands of people of all ages and backgrounds. This large-scale collaboration charged the bridge with such meaning that those who see it and hear its stories often report that it changes the way they look at the world – it certainly seemed to impact many people's thoughts and ideas throughout the next two days of the conference!



Today, the bridge is a strong engine for economic and cultural development in the city of Frederick, Maryland. It is living proof of the immense power of focused collaboration and dialogue. More about the Community Bridge and William and Teresa Cochran's organization Shared Vision, can be found at www.sharedvision.org. Shared Vision creates monumental public artworks of exceptional quality that engage the public directly in their making. They harness the combined imaginative power of thousands of people to build a potent force for the revitalization of cities and communities.

Graphic Recording by Megan Schopf

Megan Schopf, Founder of Artful Work, is an artist and facilitator who provided the conference with her experience working with groups and individuals creating visuals that support personal/professional development and deepen conversation. Throughout the conference, in both plenary and break-out sessions, Megan created visual learning tools which artistically captured what was being said. Megan has extensive experience in using graphics with people on an individual level, in large groups at conferences and small intimate dialogue groups.



Schopf feels that our stories, thoughts, and questions all reveal to others what is deepest in our hearts and have the potential to change the hearts of others. Capturing those elements visually allows the individual and the community to see; to feel their heart; their humanness. She believes the experience of an expressive form of communication opens perception and expands awareness of not only words, but of needs, emotions and intentions. It captures the undercurrent and communicates with the unconscious, creating memory.

Artistic Notation of Elena Stanger

Elena Stanger, an innovative artist from the Bronx and owner of Diversity Designs (www.diversityarts.com), provided us with graphic notation and diversity art services at the conference. Stanger – or St. Anger – created artwork while observing sessions at the conference. Her artwork, which revolves around cartoons in which innocent-looking characters talk to one another about sensitive subjects, is designed to raise questions or awareness in the viewer, leading to greater individual clarity and insight, and intergroup understanding.

Stanger has been doing artwork since 1995, amplifying her background in cultural diversity awareness and understanding on the canvas. Her Masters' Degree is in Conflict Analysis and Resolution from George Mason University, where she first began to explore the impact of art on social change and conflict transformation.



Stanger's paintings captured important conference themes and key questions, such as "what is the relationship between dialogue/deliberation and action?" They also represented real conference interactions, allowing people to learn and talk about what happened in sessions they did not even attend. Most importantly, the paintings provided another opportunity for

dialogue and reflection.

A dialogue leader and facilitator of intercultural communication herself, Stanger's artistic style particularly lent itself to a conference on dialogue and deliberation, as her paintings generally focus on dialogue and include diverse characters interacting with one another about sensitive issues.

A Canadian Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation

At the conclusion of the 2002 conference, Canadian Policy Research Networks (CPRN) and other Canadian participants set their minds to undertaking a similar initiative in Canada.

A coalition has since been formed to obtain funding for and organize this event, which will be modeled after the National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation. This three-day, interactive learning conference designed to begin building a D&D community in Canada will be a highly participatory event, bringing together dialogue practitioners, academics and researchers in Canada and beyond for a unique learning, networking and planning experience. The Conference will include experiential workshops, opportunities to experience and observe a variety of dialogue models, an exhibition of resources and materials, networking opportunities and a community dialogue-style forum. There will be plenary and small group sessions, daily concurrent sessions, and a variety of presentation and demonstration styles.

A Book Project Led by Scott Hammond

Scott Hammond, Ph.D., from Utah Valley State College has developed a book project as a result of the 2002 Conference. The book will feature chapters contributed by 25 dialogue scholars and practitioners. The book, entitled "The Metaphors of Dialogue," examines the spectrum of practices and theories regarding dialogue. Its principle focus is to account for the wide range of dialogic practices and bridge the gap between theory and practice. Dr. Hammond and his coauthors examine dialogue as bridge building, identity construction, peace making, visioning, and other popular conceptions and uses of dialogue.

The First DC-Based Dynamic Facilitation Training

Since he is based in Washington state, Jim Rough's highly-touted Dynamic Facilitation trainings have always been held on the West Coast. NCDD members Reena Bernards and Jim Houck were so impressed with the Dynamic Facilitation session led by DeAnna Martin and Rosa Zubizarreta at the 2002 conference, however, that they decided to work with Jim to bring one of his trainings to the D.C. area for the first time. NCDD served as a collaborative partner to help make the dialogue and deliberation community aware of this June training.

Evaluating Our Work

Our Reports & Evaluation Committee, ably chaired by Eric Boyd, former Executive Director of Los Angeles Days of Dialogue, compiled and analyzed all of the data from our surveys and workshop evaluations.

Summary of Survey Results

Participants indicated that they attended the conference to build their skills (38%), to learn about dialogue methods and tools (38%), to help strengthen and unite our field (26%), and to meet their colleagues in the field (25%).

Other reasons mentioned by 8% or fewer were to improve their job prospects, to discern similarities and differences between models, to make culture more essential to understanding dialogue, to improve personal relationships, to stay in touch with others throughout the field, and to share resources.

When asked what their primary expectations were for the event, participants stated their hopes to contribute to the conference from their own experience (20%), to network with their colleagues (19%), to obtain and share resources (14%), and to learn about new methods and models (13%).

Other expectations mentioned by 8% or fewer of the participants (in order of frequency mentioned) were: to advance knowledge and understanding in the field, to reenergize my commitment to this work, to participate in dialogues, to learn about evaluation techniques and tools, to broaden my studies and experience, to get new ideas, to initiate collaborative projects and relationships with others in the field, to examine and rethink my own personal viewpoints, to learn about "what's next" in the field, to hone my skills, to learn about the U.S. dialogue and deliberation community, to share concerns about the field, to discuss a stronger democracy, to explore new ways to engage, and to have fun!

Participants were asked whether there were any topics or activities not listed on the conference schedule that they would have liked to see. Only 16 comments were offered, half of which suggested that more youth-oriented sessions should be offered. Two comments stated that more K-12 and college-based sessions should be offered.

Other comments stated that more sessions should be offered that focused on dance and theatre, the use of dialogue in business, non-verbal dialogue techniques, additional open forums, dialogue and deliberation as tools for social justice, and



identifying and recruiting elected officials for participation in dialogue and deliberation programs.

A space was provided for additional comments. Comments ranged from questions such as "How does the D&D field see itself in relation to efforts such as the critical thinking movement in education that emphasize dialogue between teachers & students?" to suggestions such as "Ensure that facilitators model good practices." And from compliments such as "Well planned conference! The handbook is awesome!" to critiques such as "Some of the workshops need longer time slots."

Next Steps for Field

For the most part, participants felt that if in fact the dialogue & deliberation community views itself as a "field" or "movement," then that body should work assiduously to "show its wares" and/or "showcase its stars."

Relative to the individuals who comprise our "field," a significant number of members view the question of neutrality as one of vital importance to the field. In addition to the conference Organizing Committee's recognition of this emerging issue – as evidenced by verbally addressing the issue at the final plenary session – a number of individuals attending workshop sessions also indicated concern in this regard. One participant who attended the "Creating Space/Restorative Justice" session stated the following: "Sentiments for Offenders were troubling (almost pro offender). Need more work on what it means to 'create safe space' vs. advocacy."

Whatever the next steps are for the field, feedback from participant evaluations make it very evident that practitioners believe that addressing "The Neutrality Question" should be included in our list of priorities.

Progress Made on our Goals

Our five basic goals for the conference were:

- Defining and clarifying our work and our field.
- Building knowledge and sharing information.
- Building skills.
- Meeting and getting to know our colleagues in the field.
- Initiating collaborative projects.

The two intermediate outcomes we pledged to work towards with use of the Hewlett funds were:

1. Participants (and the organizations and colleagues they report to and influence) will be more effective and efficient in their work as dialogue and deliberation practitioners.

Specifically, attending the National Conference on Dialogue and Deliberation will help them to:

- increase their skills in facilitating and organizing D&D programs
- more readily access existing dialogue and deliberation resources (online, offline and human) that can help them in their work
- more easily share their future accomplishments, ideas, strategies, activities and solutions with other leaders and practitioners in the D&D community
- more readily assess and evaluate their work
- more easily initiate collaborative efforts with other D&D practitioners or organizations

2. The processes of dialogue and deliberation will be strengthened and streamlined.

- Best practices, strategies, tools and techniques will be more readily shared throughout the field.
- Participants (and the organizations and colleagues they report to and influence) will be better equipped to increase others' knowledge and understanding of D&D and to promote D&D in their communities.
- Participants will be more likely to work together on conducting D&D-related research and creating D&D resources.
- Participants will be more informed about their place in the dialogue and deliberation community, and dialogue and deliberation's place in the fields of conflict resolution, public participation, social change, community building and others.

And the long-term outcome we pledged to work towards was:

The practice will be improved due to the infrastructure for the dialogue and deliberation community that will be generated at the conference, whether that infrastructure takes the form of a new organization, an annual meeting or conference, an active listserv or online bulletin board, or any other form.

Specifically, dialogue and deliberation practitioners (not only participants in the conference) will be more likely and able to:

- effectively evaluate their programs
- continuously improve their programs' strategies and plans
- constantly increase their own knowledge of work in the field
- share success stories, strategies, tools and techniques with others in the field
- learn about best practices and successful tools and techniques
- promote the dialogue and deliberation processes and educate the public about dialogue and deliberation.

The activities we conducted in order to reach these outcomes were:

- Administering a needs assessment to determine D&D leaders' and practitioners' needs and hopes for a national gathering.
- Creating and publicizing a website for the conference which provided information for about why, where and when the conference was going to be held, who was organizing the event and what activities and sessions would take place.
- Holding a pre-conference meeting with sub-committee chairs, steering committee members, the conference director and Organizing Team members in order to make decisions about the content, structure and logistics of the event.
- Visiting the conference site to prepare for and optimize the event.
- Publicizing the event to leaders and practitioners across the D&D community.
- Collaborating with prominent dialogue and deliberation organizations (Study Circles Resource Center and AmericaSpeaks) to prepare strategic large-group sessions held at the conference.
- Preparing handbooks for participants which included contact information and bios of all conference participants and presenters; lists of key resources, tools and programs useful to D&D practitioners and scholars; definitions of key terms used throughout the spectrum of practice; and an agenda and other logistical information.
- Holding the Conference itself, included participatory workshops, opportunities to experience and observe a variety of dialogue models, an exhibition of resources and materials and a community dialogue-style action forum.
- Gathering information during the Conference via session evaluation forms, notes during plenary sessions, and first and last day surveys designed to gauge participants' views about various possibilities for the future of the D&D community.
- Revamping the NCDD website so that the focus was not on the conference, but on the initiatives and recommendations that came out of the conference, on how others can join NCDD and on ways we can network and communicate via the website and other means. The resources gathered for the conference handbook were also displayed prominently so that others could benefit from this work, and we collaborated with EdGateway to create our new "Online Community."
- Opening our doors and inviting organizations and individuals who were not at the conference to join the newly-formed National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation. We now have 135 members compared to the original 50. It is important to note that people who attended the conference are not automatically considered a part of the Coalition. Every new member needs to explicitly express their interest in joining NCDD, and is expected to carefully consider and convey what it is that they or their organization will be able to contribute to the Coalition.
- Helping some of the 12 action groups that formed on the last day of the conference to continue their conversations and begin taking action.
- Continuing the work of the Dialogue to Action Initiative by keeping the D&D community informed about news, resources, opportunities and events.
- Collaborating with other organizations and groups in order to strengthen and unite the growing D&D community. Ten important collaborative projects have been initiated with such organizations as the Society for Values in Higher Education, the Deliberative Democracy Consortium and the Co-Intelligence Institute.
- Following up on some of the Next Steps groups' recommendations and initiating a number of other projects, networks and inquiries.
- Applying for and obtaining funding to continue NCDD's work for the next two years.



Did Our Activities Lead to the Outcomes We Intended?

We will address our intended outcomes separately for clarity.

Intermediate Outcome Number 1:

Participants (and the organizations and colleagues they report to and influence) will be more effective and efficient in their work as dialogue and deliberation practitioners.

Did participants increase their skills in facilitating and organizing D&D programs?

Of the 56 break-out sessions, 20 provided opportunities for conference participants to build their skills in facilitating or organizing D&D programs. On average, participants who completed the session evaluation forms felt that the sessions would help in their D&D work (4.16 score out of 5).

The results of our Final Day Survey tell us that people felt that their own skills and knowledge were improved somewhat at the conference. On average, more conference participants agreed with than felt neutral about the statement "Overall, my own skills and knowledge were enhanced (3.83 score out of 5 maximum)."

It was clear, however, that people would have appreciated more opportunities to improve their skills in organizing and facilitating D&D programs. The statement "Throughout the conference, there was sufficient opportunity to improve skills in organizing D&D programs" only received a score of 3.34. And the statement "Throughout the conference, there was sufficient opportunity to improve facilitation skills" scored 3.16. This means that slightly more people were satisfied with the skill-building opportunities at the conference than were dissatisfied with them.

Obviously, more of an emphasis should be placed on skill-building sessions at the next conference – perhaps there should even be a pre-conference training for intensive skill building. Overall, though, participants were very pleased with the conference. 92% felt that the conference met their personal expectations, and people rated their overall conference experience a 4.21.

Can participants more readily access existing dialogue and deliberation resources (online, offline and human) that can help them in their work?

The participant handbooks and the NCDD website both list resources that can help practitioners in their work. Training opportunities, books and manuals on facilitation techniques, and selected D&D guides can all clearly be utilized for skill-building. Because of our efforts, practitioners can more readily access existing D&D resources that can help them in their work. Incidentally, the handbooks given to each participant were a huge hit, receiving a rating of 4.25 out of 5.

Many of the NCDD projects that are currently in the works will enable D&D practitioners to more readily access existing resources. All of the resources currently housed under the Dialogue to Action Initiative (including the calendar and main community page) will be integrated into the NCDD website, so navigating thataway.org and finding what you need will be much easier. The feature we are adding that will allow practitioners and scholars to post and examine best practices, lessons learned, reports and other such resources will also help improve access.

Is it now easier for participants to share their future accomplishments, ideas, strategies, activities and solutions with other leaders and practitioners in the D&D community?

The new connections and relationships people made at the conference should make it easier for participants to share their accomplishments, ideas, strategies, activities and solutions with their colleagues. Providing all participants' contact information and bios in the conference handbook should also help make this easier.

The online community we created on the NCDD website also makes sharing this kind of information easier. All conference participants were registered for the main NCDD Discussion list, which allows them to send emails to each other quickly and easily.

The NCDD website and online community have already made it easier for people to share their accomplishments, strategies, solutions and activities. As stated above, many of the new sections and features we are adding to the next version of the website will also make information-sharing even easier.

Can participants more readily assess and evaluate their work?

Only one break-out session directly addressed evaluation (Evaluating Intergroup Dialogue: What We Did and What We Learned, presented by Christian Dorsey of Operation Understanding D.C. and Ellen Wayne of the University of Baltimore, Center for Negotiation & Conflict Management). More opportunities to learn and share evaluation tools at the conference would have been useful.

Our collaborative project with the Deliberative Democracy Consortium will lead to the development of a new tool or series of tools that can be used for a variety of different D&D models, venues and circumstances. Because of this project, we hope that practitioners will be able to more readily assess and evaluate their work. Our first step in this project is to collect evaluation tools that are currently being used throughout the dialogue and deliberation community. NCDD plans to provide some of these tools on its website as a resource for practitioners.

Is it easier for participants to initiate collaborative efforts with other D&D practitioners or organizations?

Our Final Day Survey results tell us that most participants planned to contact some of the people they met at the conference and possibly start collaborative projects with them (3.76 out of possible 5 rating).

The evaluation forms for the break-out sessions tell us that many people were inspired by those sessions to pursue collaborations with either the presenter or similar organizations or individuals. (That was the second most common response to the question "What next steps does this session prompt you to pursue?")

Even more promising, 57 of the 108 people who completed that survey indicated that they had begun exploring the possibility of partnering or working collaboratively with other conference participants. Here are some exciting examples of what conference participants were considering on the last day of the conference:

"A group of us plan to get together to develop some integrated dialogic models, combining the models we experienced at the Conference."

"I intend to collaborate with several area colleagues to organize a statewide (Connecticut) dialogue summit on child care."

"Several of us plan to form a consortium to promote/use dialogue on college campuses."

"I met representatives from several agencies with whom I intend to develop dialogues on race relations on both the East and West coasts."

"A group of us are going to help each other with some local work, and then collaborate on some national research."

"A few of us are forming a 'Deliberation on the ground' group, which will develop some experimental programs."

"I plan to collaborate with new colleagues to write an article on Deliberative Democracy in a leading Green Party publication."

NCDD has already made it somewhat easier for conference participants and NCDD members to initiate collaborative efforts through its online community – especially through the main NCDD Discussion list that all conference participants were subscribed to. And our 10 collaborative projects (listed on page 30), are providing NCDD members and other D&D leaders with opportunities to become actively involved with some of the most exciting, promising projects going on in the field today.

Through the practitioner advice forum, regional networks, internal NCDD "sections," commentaries on the main NCDD page, and other new NCDD projects and features, we will continue to make it easier for people to initiate collaborative efforts, and to share their accomplishments, ideas, strategies, activities and solutions.

Intermediate Outcome Number 2:

The processes of dialogue and deliberation will be strengthened and streamlined.

Are participants better equipped to increase others' knowledge and understanding of D&D and to promote D&D in their communities?

The conference brought D&D practitioners and scholars together from across the entire spectrum of practice. We would be surprised if even one person failed to leave the conference with a greater awareness of the plethora of models, tools, applications, venues and outcomes used and emphasized by different communities of practice.

The resources compiled by members of the Organizing Team and provided to participants in the conference handbook and on the website, in and of themselves, have equipped participants with the information they need to more effectively promote D&D in their communities. The list of 65 terms and definitions that participants left the conference with (86 are now listed on the website) provided people not only with a quick reference tool for looking up unknown terms in titles and descriptions of break-out sessions. This list remains the most comprehensive list of terms that can be found that covers the entire spectrum of practice.

The sample ground rules were compiled not only to provide practitioners with ideas, but also to provide people who train others in D&D principles or methods with a short handout that represents ground rules used across the spectrum of practice.

Several of the other resources we provided were designed to be used as handouts, such as the "Why Foster Dialogue & Deliberation" sheet which quotes leaders from various communities of practice, and the "Selected Guides to Dialogue & Deliberation" list.

Are participants more likely to work together on conducting D&D-related research and creating D&D resources?

NCDD certainly has been and will continue to make it easier for scholars and practitioners to find ways to work together to conduct research and create resources. One of the projects we recently initiated involves collecting information about who is currently conducting or soon to be conducting research in the field, and what the focus of their research will be. NCDD's Convener, Sandy Heierbacher, often receives emails from Ph.D. candidates and other researchers who are interested in finding out if there are others who are exploring questions similar to the ones they are thinking about. We hope to be able to keep an ongoing list of D&D research that is being accomplished and planned in order to foster collaboration and prevent

duplication. We are hoping to share this information on the website.

As explained previously, many collaborative projects were initiated at the conference, and we have since developed ongoing structures that allow conference participants and NCDD members to connect with one another more easily, making it easier for them to initiate collaborative projects.

NCDD has also begun to partner with some key organizations in the field on important research and resource projects. We are working with the Deliberative Democracy Consortium to research existing evaluation tools used throughout the field in order to create a new tool or series of tools which can be adapted for different models and programs. We also plan to assist the Consortium with a relationship mapping project which will help answer questions about which D&D groups work together, which organizations serve as bridges between clusters of groups, where there is a need for more interaction, etc.

We are also collaborating with The Democracy Design Workshop at Yale University and the New York Law School to help develop, populate and promote an exciting new web-based resource called the Interactive Democracy Inventory. And we are working closely with the Society for Values in Higher Education to ensure that D&D resources and networking opportunities for faculty, staff, administrators and students at colleges and universities are made available on the web – whether on the NCDD website, the SVHE site or the Teaching for Democracy site.

From the number of emails we receive from researchers looking to collaborate and from the spirit of collaboration and co-creation that currently exists throughout the D&D community, it appears that people are more likely to work together on conducting D&D-related research and creating D&D resources. We just need to be sure they have the resources, information and opportunities to make it happen.

Are participants more informed about their place in the D&D community, and dialogue and deliberation's place in the fields of conflict resolution, public participation, social change, community building and others?

If the conference accomplished anything, it opened participants' eyes to the great diversity that exists in the dialogue and deliberation community. People are leading dialogue and deliberation programs across the country in schools, in churches, in workplaces, and in virtually every other venue imaginable. They are encouraging people to engage in dialogue and deliberation about issues ranging from race relations in their communities and violence in their schools to how to handle the buildup of nuclear waste or the rapid rate of development in their region. People are organizing D&D programs in order to resolve conflicts, to increase citizen participation in governmental decisions, to educate, to help people build self-awareness, to improve communication skills, to strengthen teams or build coalitions, to stimulate innovation and to foster effective community change.

Participants left the conference with an increased awareness of the various "communities of practice" that exist in our field. They left more aware of arts-based civic dialogue, of collective inquiry models such as Bohm dialogue, of the intergroup work being done at colleges and universities, of the use of technology in large-scale deliberative forums. They left more aware of how they, their work, their organization and their networks fit into this large self-named D&D community.

But they also left with questions, and with work to do. When asked in the Final Day Survey whether the conference helped participants to identify or begin addressing any key questions facing our field, the most popular response was the question of identity. Who are we? What are dialogue and deliberation, and how do they interrelate? Are we a field, a network, a community or a movement?

Long-Term Outcome:

The practice will be improved due to the infrastructure for the dialogue and deliberation community that will be generated at the conference, whether that infrastructure takes the form of a new organization, an annual meeting or conference, an active listserv or online bulletin board, or any other form.

Our Progress on this Outcome

An infrastructure for the dialogue & deliberation community is certainly being developed. The conference led to the development of not only active listservs and plans for future conferences, but also a formal Coalition of leading D&D organizations and individuals. The Coalition's plans and activities range from providing resources online and establishing new ways for practitioners and scholars to connect with one another and learn about each other's work, to creating new, flexible evaluation tools and creating a speaker's bureau to link the press to D&D outcomes.

The Conference Coalition

The following organizations endorsed the first conference by coming together to form the "Coalition for a National Conference on Dialogue & Deliberation." After the conference, these organizations agreed to become the first members of the National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation (NCDD).

AmericaSpeaks

Association of American Colleges and Universities

Building Collaborative Solutions, Inc.

The Center for Negotiations and Conflict Management at the University of Baltimore
The Center for Nonviolent Communication
Citizens' Unity Commission
Clinical Practice Model Resource Center
The Coexistence Initiative
The Co-Intelligence Institute
The Communitarian Network
The Community Building Institute
The Compassionate Listening Project
Conversation Café
The Dayton Dialogue on Race Relations
Demos: A Network For Ideas & Action
Detroit Summer
The Dialogue to Action Initiative
The Dialogue Project
EPPA Consulting
FOCUS St. Louis
Forums Institute for Public Policy
Fusion Partnerships, Inc.
Global Dialogue Institute
Group Jazz
Hope in the Cities
The Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason University
The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy
The Intentional Living Institute
The International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution at Teachers College, Columbia University
The InterRelations Collaborative, Inc.
Iowa Peace Institute
The MultiCultural Resource Center of Portland, Oregon
National Association For Community Mediation (NAFCM)
The National Conference for Community & Justice – Knoxville Region
The National MultiCultural Institute
The Network of Alliances Bridging Race & Ethnicity (NABRE) and the Joint Institute for Political & Economic Studies
New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce College
The Nile Basin Society
Norfolk United Facing Race
Oregon Uniting
Peace Initiatives
The Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center
The Perspectives Group, Inc.
The Public Conversations Project
Search for Common Ground and Search for Common Ground – USA
SpiritHouse: The Jonathan Daniels and Samuel Younge Forum for Justice
Study Circles Resource Center
The Taos Institute

U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

The University of Michigan's Program on Intergroup Relations, Conflict & Community

urbanPEACE/Institute for Integrated Awareness

The World Café