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“Deliberation”

- "thoughtful, careful, or lengthy consideration" by individuals
- "formal discussion and debate" in groups
Models of online deliberation

- Citizen dialogue – formation of public opinion
- Public consultation – citizen input as part of an official process online
- Collective decision making – group democracy, egalitarian power
- Community organizing – loose group with shared interests, guided by organizers
- Managed, cooperative work – deliberation as an aspect of business/formal organizations
- Group learning – educational settings
“Online deliberation”

A common theme:
The challenge of using electronic media in a way that deepens thinking and improves mutual understanding.

See also:
http://www.online-deliberation.net
Partnership for
• Internet Equity
and
• Community Engagement

between…
• the East Palo Alto Community Network
and
• the Symbolic Systems Program at Stanford
Ideals of the PIECE approach

- Community-based
- Participant-observation
- Problem-driven
A Problem-Driven Design Process

- Problems Identified
- Other Observations and Assumptions
- Available Approaches
- Principles
- Consequences
- Initial design and feedback
- Re-design
QuickTime and a H.263 decompressor are needed to see this picture.
Participant observations in East Palo Alto (2002-2003)

Problems posed by reliance on f2f meetings for community decision making:

- Low attendance and representation
- Insufficient meeting duration and frequency
- Not enough communication between meetings
- Not enough information available during meetings
- Not enough communication between groups
- Insufficient (access to) group records
- Streamlined decision procedures
- Lack of transparency for those unable to attend
- Present in all communities, but of amplified importance in underserved communities
Other Observations and Assumptions

- Email use universal in some, technology-oriented groups (e.g. TechCollab)
- Other tools being used: Yahoo! Groups, Zoomerang
- Many residents in non-tech oriented groups did not use email
- Community Network making Internet access nearly universal, with training opportunities
- Language and literacy barriers can be overcome through representation
- Decision making thought to require face-to-face meetings
Available Approaches

- Making more effective use of existing asynchronous tools for threaded text conversation (email, message boards, blogs, wikis)
- Synchronous tools (e.g. voice chat software used by Fishkin/Luskin), combined with email
- Better publicity for and public records of f2f meetings
- New asynchronous tool for deliberation tailored to target groups
Deme: a platform for online deliberation (2003- )

Principles:

- **Supportiveness.** The platform should support the group overall, so that there is either an improvement or no decline in the ability of the group to meet the needs of its members or stakeholders.
Deme: a platform for online deliberation (2003- )

Principles:

- **Supportiveness**
- **Comprehensiveness.** The platform should allow the group to accomplish, in an online environment, all of the usual deliberative tasks associated with face-to-face meetings.
Deme: a platform for online deliberation (2003- )

Principles:

- **Supportiveness**
- **Comprehensiveness**
- **Participation.** The platform should maximize the number of desired participants in the group's deliberations, and minimize barriers to their participation.
Deme: a platform for online deliberation (2003- )

Principles:

- Supportiveness
- Comprehensiveness
- Participation
- Quality. The platform should facilitate a subjective quality of interaction and decision making that meets or exceeds what the group achieves in face-to-face meetings.
Principle 1: Supporting the Group

Consequences:

- Sovereign control
- Free and open source
- Integrate with existing practices (e.g. decision procedures, email list, other tools)
- Responsiveness of designers
Principle 2: Comprehensive Deliberation

Consequences:

- Discussion focused on agenda items
- Shared display (WYSIWIS)
- Flexible polls and decisions
- In-text comments in documents
- Document revision
- Project management tool integrated with discussion
- Customizable group website/archive
- Flexible integration with email
- Multiple meeting areas per group space
- Ability to share meeting areas across groups
Principle 3: Maximizing Desired Participants

Consequences:

- Asynchronous (different times/places)
- Compatible and interoperable
- Familiar features
- Simple, intuitive design
- Accessibility to those with special needs
- Fast, robust, secure
Principle 4: High Quality Deliberation

Consequences:

- Built-in feedback
- Proven structures for discussion
- Tutorials/models of practice
- Features that encourage directed discussion rather than paraphrasing
Present version of Deme (v0.5)

Live Demo....

(see at groupspace.org)
Welcome, todd ::::my settings ::::logout ::::my groups

Meeting Areas

- Learn Deme Here
- Sandbox
- Deme Discussion
- mymeetingname
- RM Players
- testi testi
- Discussion
- Members assembly
- Eureka!
- Puppu
- The Cybernetics of on-line deliberation

Create new meeting area...

Announcements

- Jan-14: test
- Dec-29: Test2
- Nov-29: This is a short announcement.
- Sep-17: Test
- Mar-15: Welcome to the Demo Group! Click the "Learn Deme Here" meeting area link on the left to get an introduction to meeting area features.

View all announcements
Add new announcement

General Options

- My profile
- Member List
- Calendar
- Links
- Library
- FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions)
- Search
- Chat
- Leave this group

This site uses DEME software.
This item: 3. Example: Document

Preface:
This is an example of a document, and you are reading the "preface" of the document. Read the document below for more information about documents, and, if you like, you can post a comment on this document.

Document posted by: andrew, Feb 02, 17:21

General comments on this document:
New document announcement

Example of a general comment on a document

A document can be anything that contains text you want people to read. It is possible to post and view documents other than plain text ones (e.g., pictures, Word documents, video clips), but currently only plain text documents support in-text commenting (explanation of in-text commenting will follow shortly). But there are many possible documents that can be posted in a meeting area even now. A document could be the proposed bylaws of your group, a press release you are drafting together, an interesting article you want everyone to read, or something else, as long as it is in text form.

Deme was designed to support document collaboration, document-centered discussion, and decision making about documents. "Document collaboration" means that two or more people work together to draft and/or revise a document. In the action menu (the pull-down menu filled in light blue) you can always select "New document" to post a document from scratch. When you are currently viewing a document in the folio viewer's item display, the action menu will also contain an option for...
Example: Decision

Question: Let's try to make a decision. The decision concerns whether the text of 'Example: Document' is sufficient as an overview of how documents function in a meeting area. Click 'Vote now' to make your choice known, and note that you can annotate your vote with a comment. I have selected 'consensus' as the decision rule, meaning that everyone has to agree for this proposal to pass.

Decision called for by: andrew, Feb 02, 17:31

Voting has closed.

Closing message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Total votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve &quot;Example: Document&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Approve &quot;Example: Document&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Member choices/comments:

**Approve "Example: Document"**

andrew  
Feb-02, 17:32

I agree with the current state of "Example: Document"

**Don't Approve "Example: Document"**

guest  
Jul-05, 07:05

Just to see what happens.

Did not vote:

todd, brendan, bhattacharya, salt, mrose
**19. Goals** [Document]

Preface:
Here's the list from my whiteboard last night - feel free to comment/revise/add more. I've added a few things.

Document posted by: todd, Oct 01, 15:16

---

**Presence detection**
Oct 11, 16:04
Would be very useful at some point, especially if profiles had links to IM addresses.

Respond to this comment

Link to this message

- Member participation statistics - todd - Oct 11, 16:07
- Implement poll/survey - todd - Oct 11, 16:41
- look/feel options - todd - Oct 12, 21:06

---

Debugging...
See raw docxred text
See orig text
Meeting Areas

Create new meeting area

1. **General**
   (15 posts since 09/25) | Info
   This is the general development area. Feel free to post any questions or comments you may have. Also, feel free to posit suggestions and advice for the layout.

2. **New Meeting Area**
   (7 posts in last 2 hours) | Info

3. **Testing New Name**
   (9 posts in last 3 days) | Info

4. **New Marea**
   (2 posts in last 23 min) | Info

Announcements

[06/24/05 12:05PM] by aarontam
Action: [Edit] [Delete]
This is a test announcement. There will be many more announcements in the future.
Groups that could benefit...

- Volunteer advisory boards
- Neighborhood associations
- Consortia of nonprofits
- Grassroots activist groups
- Labor union chapters and caucuses
- Clubs and religious congregations
- University-based groups
- Ad-hoc citizen groups (e.g. for community planning)
PIECE Contributors (2002- )

Kim Karen Chen
Alex Angiolillo Cochran
Todd Davies
Magda Escobar
Jonathan J. Effrat
Roma Jhaveri
Christina Mills
Benjamin Newman
Brendan O’Connor
Andrew Parker
Gautam Raghavan
Randy Saffold
Renata Danielle Sanchez
Benjamin Sywulka
Aaron Tam
Brandi Thompson
Tom Wasow
Rolando Zeledon
For more info…

On this project…

- www.groupspace.org (Deme host) - see FAQ
- http://piece.stanford.edu (PIECE project)

HCI Background:

- Stefik et al., “Beyond the Chalkboard” (1987) -- WYSIWIS
- Holland & Stornetta, “Beyond Being There” (1992) - f2f not necessarily gold standard
- Grudin, “Groupware and Social Dynamics: Eight Challenges for Developers” (1994)
- Mashayekhi et al., “AISA” (1995) - visual indicators of focus