<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Distinguishing Characteristics</th>
<th>Notable Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AmericaSpeaks                 | 21st Century Town Meeting                     | • Large-scale forums (100–5,000) engage citizens in public decision making processes at local, regional and national levels of governance. Dialogue is supported by trained facilitators, keypad polling, networked laptop computers and (at times) interactive television.  
• Demographically representative groups of citizens are recruited through a variety of means, including grassroots organizing and the media. Major stakeholders are engaged in the process and a clear link to decision making is established from the start. | • Listening to the City: Rebuilding Lower Manhattan, 2002  
• Neighborhood Action: Washington, DC Strat. Plan and Budget, 1999-2003  
• Americans Discuss Social Security, 1997-1999  
  For more information, visit www.americaspeaks.org |
| Center for Deliberative Democracy | Deliberative Poll                               | • Dialogues (2-3 days) between a random sample of citizens, issue experts and public officials are televised to reframe an issue in terms that reflect the views of a representative, informed public.  
• Surveys before and after the dialogue measure the change in opinion that results from the deliberation. The resulting changes in opinion represent the conclusions the public would reach, if people had a good opportunity to become more informed and more engaged by the issues. | • By the People: America’s Place in the World, 2003  
• Australian Deliberative Poll on Aboriginal Reconciliation, 2001  
• U.S. National Issues Convention, 1996  
  For more information, visit www.cdd.stanford.edu/|
| Information Renaissance       | Large-Scale Online Dialogue                   | • Asynchronous online dialogues, several weeks long, engage large groups in discussions of public issues.  
• Dialogues include panelists–public officials, issue experts and advocacy groups–and extensive background materials.  
• Regular summaries encapsulate daily discussion and enable participants to remain current without reading all comments.  
• Often sponsored by public agencies as part of their policy-making processes. | • Calif. Master Plan for Education, 2002  
• Public Involvement in EPA Decisions, 2001  
• National Dialogue on Social Security, 1999  
  For more information, visit www.info-ren.org |
| Jefferson Center              | Citizen Jury                                  | • A randomly selected panel of about 18 citizens meets for 4-5 days to examine an issue of public significance, serving as a microcosm of the public. Jurors are paid a stipend for their time. They hear from a variety of expert witnesses and are able to deliberate together on the issue.  
• On the final day of their moderated hearings, the members of the Citizens Jury present their recommendations to the public. | • Citizen Jury on Global Climate Change, 2002  
• Penn. U.S. Senate Election, 1992  
• Presidential Election Issues, 1976  
  For more information, visit www.jefferson-center.org/|
| National Charrette Institute  | Dynamic Planning Charrette                    | • A multi-day process consisting of a series feedback loops between public workshops and a design studio. A multidisciplinary design team develops alternative plans based on public feedback and presents those plans back to the public at workshops. Over the course of at least four consecutive days, the plans are refined and developed further.  
• Generally used for urban and regional planning processes. | • Dynamic Planning Trainings for the New York Dept. of Transportation, Arizona Dept. of Transportation, and the US Navy in addition to hundreds of individuals in public trainings  
  For more information, visit: www.charretteinstitute.org |
| National Issues Forums Institute | National Issues Forum | • Structured, local dialogues that occur across the country around a critical national policy issue. Dialogues are moderated by trained NIF facilitators.  
• Non-partisan “issue books” provide background information and frame the discussion in terms of three policy options. Forum results are presented to national and local leaders. | • Terrorism: What Should We Do Now? 2002  
• Money and Politics, 2001  
• Mission Uncertain: Reassessing America’s Global Role, 1996  
For more information, visit: www.nifi.org |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public Conversations Project | Constructive Conversations | • Customized, structured dialogues to foster new relationships among polarized groups. Both single session "citizen dialogues" and multi-session projects. Often small groups (6-8) but sometimes large with break out.  
• Much attention paid to pre-meeting preparation, collaborative and appreciative stance of facilitators, clarity of purpose, and careful crafting of questions. Theoretical roots in the field of family therapy. | • Ongoing Dialogues with Pro-Choice and Pro-Life Leaders (1995-2001)  
• Maine Forest Biodiversity Project (1994-1999)  
For more information, visit: www.publicconversations.org/ |
| Study Circles Resource Center | Community-Wide Study Circles | • Multiple groups of 8-15 people within a community or region meet regularly over a period of months to discuss an issue. At the end of the process, all participants take part in a community-wide meeting, called an Action Forum, to create strategies for the future.  
• The objective is often to help people become more active in their neighborhoods and communities by engaging them in informed discussions. | • How Should We Move Forward After 9/11, 2002  
• Balancing Justice in New York, 1998  
• Race Relations, Lima, OH, 1993  
For more information, visit: www.studycircles.org |
| Viewpoint Learning | Choicework Dialogue | • Day-long (8-hour) structured dialogues in which up to 40 randomly selected participants learn to see an issue from viewpoints other than their own. Together they identify what choices they are willing to support and grapple with the tradeoffs they are willing to accept.  
• Materials present values-based scenarios. These scenarios are presented in citizen language, not as policy choices, and used as a starting point for participants to work through hard choices with one another to define a shared vision, practical steps towards that vision and a set of tradeoffs they could accept. | • Citizen Dialogues on Canada’s Health Care System  
• Citizen Dialogues on the Housing Crisis in San Mateo County  
• Citizen Dialogues on the Canadian Social Contract  
For more information, visit: www.viewpointlearning.org |
| Web Lab | Small Group Dialogue | • Asynchronous online dialogues that convene citizens in small groups over multiple weeks to encourage greater interaction, investment and accountability amongst participants. Groups can be facilitated or self-facilitated. Dialogue Monitors track group activity and intervene as needed. Document libraries provide background material and polls take the pulse of participants.  
• Dialogue objectives may be to impact policymaking or to influence individual participants through their participation in the dialogues. | • Listening to the City: Rebuilding Lower Manhattan, 2002  
• Project 540, High School Civic Engagement, 2002  
• What Now: Politics, the Economy, Your Life, 2001  
For more information, visit www.weblab.org |