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Dialogue Report
April 2007
Dialogue Is

By Erica Hirschberger, as read by the whole class on March 14, 2007

In dialogue, there is no front of the room. Every person here is as important as the next, and has as much to contribute.

Dialogue is a conversation. It is relaxed and casual, like talking with a long time friend over coffee.

Dialogue is about active listening. It is when we are focused on the person contributing to the conversation, instead of constantly preparing ourselves to respond.

Dialogue is fluid. Ideas flow between participants, and often we find that someone speaks our mind for us.

Dialogue is about collaboration. We move forward by building on each other’s ideas and concerns, not by tearing them down.

Dialogue is about growth. If we come away with a better understanding of another perspective, we know dialogue happened.
Executive Summary

We are dialogue students. More specifically, we are the seventeen students enrolled in the spring 2007 semester of Simon Fraser University’s Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue program. Over the course of the semester, we have focused upon leveraging the Olympic and Paralympic Games and learned from a wide variety of stakeholders. This experience has shaped and reshaped our perspectives on the Games. We planned the public dialogue A 2010-Piece Puzzle hoping it would provide the same kind of experience for our participants. Our event on March 14th, 2007 represented not only the culmination of eight weeks of hard work, but also a turning point for the people in attendance. The dialogue process allows participants to relate to one another in a proactive way and often leads to higher quality outcomes than the reactive, position-based discussions that typically characterize debate. A 2010-Piece Puzzle allowed a diverse group of participants including organizers, business owners, students, educators, community activists and the general public to collaborate despite differences of opinion.

Our goal was to create an environment of listening so that participants could build upon other perspectives. By carefully setting the tone and continually reinforcing the principles of dialogue throughout the day, we created an environment to encourage vibrant, respectful and collaborative discussion. We established this tone through the careful orchestration of a video, a poem and an introduction by two Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue students.

The day was broken down into four distinct sections that took participants from the morning, where they shared their stories and perspectives on the Games, into the afternoon, where they envisioned positive legacies and the actions necessary to make those imagined outcomes a reality. Between dialogues that engaged the whole group in conversation there were small group activities, performances and story telling, which were used to set examples and generate ideas.

As the day progressed, one overriding theme stood out above the rest: we need more dialogues like A 2010-Piece Puzzle.
The following is an account of A 2010-Piece Puzzle from the perspective of the students who made it happen. It takes into account the planning process, what transpired on the day and what came out of it. We feel the lessons that emerged from the dialogue are important, inspiring and need to be shared.

**Introduction**

In many cases, seventeen people is too many to make decisions, especially over seemingly miniscule details such as “should we have keynote speakers?” In the end, it was the vast amount of input from everyone that made our dialogue a success. As with any group, we had our high and low points, but our dedication united us throughout the process.

To transform from a set of complete strangers in January into the cohesive group that put together the public dialogue A 2010-Piece Puzzle midway through March, we had to grow individually and collectively. As a group, we engaged in a number of discussions regarding the themes and outcomes for the day. Early in the process we decided that we wanted to be inclusive of different perspectives and to instigate action through legacies.

Throughout the semester, we were privileged to visit with a variety of stakeholders directly involved with the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games. We not only invited these individuals into our classroom, but we took field trips to Richmond, False Creek, Cypress and Whistler. A list of these guests can be found in the Appendix on page 33. These discussions helped us gain a well-rounded perspective on the Games, which eventually aided us in forming and solidifying the overarching theme for our public dialogue. This theme shifted from sentimental (Feasling the Soul), to visionary (20/10 Vision), to an image that conveyed the complicated and interrelated themes and perspectives surrounding the 2010 Games: A 2010-Piece Puzzle.

As our perspectives and project progressed, input from stakeholders and events in and outside of the classroom directly impacted our planning. One example was the screening of the documentary Muddleball in our classroom. Until that point, the Paralympic Games were an afterthought in many of our discussions, and were rarely touched on by our guests. As a result of this change in our way of thinking, we invited Jeff Adams, Olympic and Paralympic athlete, to act as a participant and key anchor at A 2010-Piece Puzzle.

Other events that affected our planning were tied to the social and political environment outside the classroom. In February our class attended the unveiling of the Olympic Countdown Clock at the Vancouver Art Gallery, an event attended by many supporters of the Games and a large contingent of protesters. The day was given significant coverage in print and television media. We realized that our dialogue could become a magnet for protesters simply by its association with the 2010 Olympics. As a result, we considered different ways of handling potentially volatile situations at our dialogue without excluding anyone or limiting their opportunity to speak freely.

**Preparation for Our Dialogue**
Our learning and planning processes intersected not just around issues directly related to 2010, but also around the process of dialogue. Meeting with different guests every week gave us an opportunity to practice various approaches for making people feel comfortable in our classroom. We thought about how to get to the root of specific issues quickly and concisely without putting guests on guard. Our visitors came with so many different perspectives and from varied positions that every in-class dialogue became a mini-rehearsal for a 2010-Piece Puzzle. Through our successes and failures in practicing dialogue, we learned what to expect and how to adjust. More importantly, by understanding a core set of principles we learned how to set the tone for dialogue.

The roles of the day were established so that each class member took on a balanced workload that they were comfortable with (for committees see appendix page 38). The roles included facilitators for each dialogue, various addresses during dialogue (introductions, reflections and conclusions), and behind-the-scenes roles (meeting with media, technical duties). Only as a diverse but collective group going through this process did we...
The overall objectives of the day were to:

- Establish a dialogue environment that was inviting and comfortable for all participants
- Share a wide variety of stories and perspectives about the Olympic and Paralympic Games, as well as the impacts and benefits of the 2010 Games
- Focus on creating collaboration rather than conflicts between opposing ideas
- Engage the public in deeper issues surrounding the Games
- Focus on creating collaboration rather than conflict between opposing ideas
- Engage the public in deeper issues surrounding the Games
- Urged further involvement around Olympic and Paralympic issues and initiatives

Each dialogue session was designed to build on the previous one, and together the four themes provided structure for the day:

- Dialogue One: Sharing Personal Connections to the Games
- Dialogue Two: Exploring the Perspectives Surrounding the Games
- Dialogue Three: Envisioning Legacies
- Dialogue Four: Taking Action

A 2010-Piece Puzzle

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

OPENING OF THE DAY

The introduction to the dialogue played a critical role in setting a respectful and collaborative tone for the rest of the day. We tried to establish this environment with a video on aspects of the 2010 Games and a poem on dialogue. The objective of this section was to create a safe environment that encouraged stimulating conversation around the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

DIALOGUE ONE: SHARING PERSONAL CONNECTIONS TO THE GAMES

Question: What is the story of your personal connection to the Games?

The objective of Dialogue One was to allow people to get to know one another by sharing personal stories. This process allowed barriers to fall down, and perspectives to become better understood and articulated. We wanted everyone in the room to get comfortable with each other so they would feel at ease and explore deeper opinions, perspectives, legacies, and actions throughout the day.

An important component of the day was to acknowledge diverse opinions and backgrounds in the room. The first dialogue achieved this by allowing participants to share their stories. Jeff Adams set an example by sharing his own connection to the Games and suggesting how the Olympic and Paralympic Games represent a valiant struggle that everyone faces on a daily basis. He linked his own challenge as a disabled athlete to the challenge facing VANOC and the region. Jeff suggested the Olympics and Paralympics have two separate messages: the Olympic Games represent faster, higher, stronger and the Paralympic Games represent body, mind, and spirit. Jeff’s story revealed his passion for athleticism and the need to keep the Paralympics a separate entity.

Several key stories shared with the room related to conflicts occurring in Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside. For example, a volunteer at Main and Hastings for more than 20 years said that while she loves watching the Olympics on television, she cannot disregard the fact that people are being thrown out of their homes. Her story revealed that she is deeply connected to the social housing concern in Vancouver and is in search of a solution.

Another participant shared his story and revealed that he thinks the Olympics will only benefit the rich. To him, the Olympics mean corruption. A representative from Whistler shared his experience at the Turin Games and admitted that it was his first time witnessing a Paralympic event. He was
so inspired by the Paralympians in Turin and is people. To wrap up this portion of our dialogue we thanked everyone for participating and encouraged conversation to continue into the lunch hour.

During this dialogue many points were raised, but a few key points stood out. One of these was when Jeff Adams spoke of how the issues such as poverty and low-income housing, even if the section this had a low income and housing were not as critical as Vancouver, citing Torontos as an example of a city with similar issues. Adams said that he believes the Games bring social consciousness to host cities and that the focus on issues that otherwise may go unnoticed.

Another key point that resonated with everyone in the room was to bring more attention to the Paralympics and the struggles that its athletes face on a day-to-day basis. Also... the quality of a society by how they treat their weakest and most vulnerable members, such as the elderly and disabled.

were asked to consider their underlying interest with regards to 2010. Finally, they were asked to use their interest, and not their position, to develop their own Olympic and/or Paralympic legacy. The activity was guided by the facilitator's example: “I think that the issue of inclusion is a really important part of the success of the Olympics.”

I think that the issue of inclusion is a really important part of the success of the Olympics.”

Key messages from this portion of the dialogue were to encourage people to keep an open mind, listen to what everyone had to say, and to identify as many different viewpoints and perspectives as we could. Hopefully after participants connection to their example, people had a better understanding of the diversity of opinion.

On the other hand, there were two main obstacles that were resistant to coming up with positive legacies as a result of feelings of opposition to the Games. It was therefore important to help participants frame their ideas around positive outcomes. For example, one participant stated that his position was that the Games are simply a gathering for the world elite. His interest was to see greater accessibility to the Games, and a positive legacy was to see people gathering to fight for their democratic rights. Having participants move from their positions into recognition of their underlying interest allowed them to develop the third principle, building blocks for further exploration of positive legacy building. This was the second objective for Dialogue Three.

Dialogue Three: Exploring the Perspectives Surrounding the Games

The objective of Dialogue Three was to hear and understand the depth of the different points-of-view of participants and to connect them within the bigger picture of the Games. It was intended to give participants the opportunity to reflect and express their own opinions on the social, environmental, economic, and cultural aspects of the Games.

A short break, we enjoyed a performance called Squeamish, put together by a group of dancers from Simon Fraser University’s Contemporary Dance program. This collaborative, inventive dance was performed by a large group of people of all ages and had a fascinating energy that was infectious. Even between seemingly unrelated ideas. Even though we had taken great care to ensure the flow of dialogue early in the day, we felt that this section had a lot of potential for getting stuck, or, worse, for becoming a shouting match. With this in mind, we tried to set the tone from the start.

To do this we invited a pre-selected group of people into the middle of the room who were joined by three volunteers from a random group of participants to take part in the dialogue, called a ‘shbowl’. The ‘shbowl’ activity involved a group of participants who dialogued while the rest of the participants listened. This exercise was intended to cover a wide range of topics and demonstrate how we wanted the rest of the room to participate when we later opened up the discussion to everyone. After 15 minutes of the ‘shbowl’, all participants were invited to share their own viewpoints in a large dialogue and expand upon the smaller discussion. We encouraged everyone to listen to other’s concerns and, if possible, connect their input to that of the speaker before them. To top up this portion of our dialogue we encouraged everyone for participating and encouraged conversation to continue into the lunch hour.

During this dialogue many points were raised, but a few key points stood out. One of these was when Jeff Adams spoke of how the issues such as poverty and low-income housing were not as critical as Vancouver, citing Toronto as an example of a city with similar issues. Adams said that he believes the Games bring social consciousness to host cities and that the focus on issues that otherwise may go unnoticed.

The objective of the third dialogue was to talk about the Olympics and Paralympics and that is it will bring to the world’s attention the plight of the North West Coast ecosystem... “I just see marginalized people getting more and more marginalized. We’re not working towards a sustainable outcome. "
how something as simple as sounds have inspired him in various contexts. To Jeff, the sound of joy created by a young boy riding in his racing wheelchair was as important as the sound of laughter.

We must use this opportunity to help give people what they need, whether it is housing, employment, or inspiration.

After going around the room, it was apparent that there were many overlapping actions. There was a feeling that the dialogue process on the Olympics and Paralympics was as important as the culture.

L. Promote wildlife and natural landscape of the many regions of B.C.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

There were then attached to each breakout group's puzzle piece. An example of a legacy was to make B.C. a more inclusive province; the corresponding action was to make BC's business community become educated about actions they can take to support environmental and social sustainability.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability. Dialogue.

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and 'green' buildings.

This enabled Dialogue Three to reach its final objective: to set a foundation for action, the topic of discussion for the breakout session.

BREAKOUT SESSION:

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability.

something as simple as sounds have inspired him in various contexts. To Jeff, the sound of joy created by a young boy riding in his racing wheelchair was as important as the sound of laughter.

We must use this opportunity to help give people what they need, whether it is housing, employment, or inspiration.

After going around the room, it was apparent that there were many overlapping actions. There was a feeling that the dialogue process on the Olympics and Paralympics was as important as the culture.

L. Promote wildlife and natural landscape of the many regions of B.C.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

There were then attached to each breakout group's puzzle piece. An example of a legacy was to make B.C. a more inclusive province; the corresponding action was to make BC's business community become educated about actions they can take to support environmental and social sustainability.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability. Dialogue.

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

This enabled Dialogue Three to reach its final objective: to set a foundation for action, the topic of discussion for the breakout session.

BREAKOUT SESSION:

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability.

something as simple as sounds have inspired him in various contexts. To Jeff, the sound of joy created by a young boy riding in his racing wheelchair was as important as the sound of laughter.

We must use this opportunity to help give people what they need, whether it is housing, employment, or inspiration.

After going around the room, it was apparent that there were many overlapping actions. There was a feeling that the dialogue process on the Olympics and Paralympics was as important as the culture.

L. Promote wildlife and natural landscape of the many regions of B.C.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

There were then attached to each breakout group's puzzle piece. An example of a legacy was to make B.C. a more inclusive province; the corresponding action was to make BC's business community become educated about actions they can take to support environmental and social sustainability.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability. Dialogue.

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

This enabled Dialogue Three to reach its final objective: to set a foundation for action, the topic of discussion for the breakout session.

BREAKOUT SESSION:

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability.

something as simple as sounds have inspired him in various contexts. To Jeff, the sound of joy created by a young boy riding in his racing wheelchair was as important as the sound of laughter.

We must use this opportunity to help give people what they need, whether it is housing, employment, or inspiration.

After going around the room, it was apparent that there were many overlapping actions. There was a feeling that the dialogue process on the Olympics and Paralympics was as important as the culture.

L. Promote wildlife and natural landscape of the many regions of B.C.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

There were then attached to each breakout group's puzzle piece. An example of a legacy was to make B.C. a more inclusive province; the corresponding action was to make BC's business community become educated about actions they can take to support environmental and social sustainability.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability. Dialogue.

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

This enabled Dialogue Three to reach its final objective: to set a foundation for action, the topic of discussion for the breakout session.

BREAKOUT SESSION:

L. Create demand in the home buyer for sustainable and ('green') buildings.

L. Accountable/Responsive governance

L. Realizing a common ground.

L. Greater understanding and awareness of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.

A. Raise awareness of issues through education - tell a friend. Raise your voice! Dialogue.

A. Organize and participate in public forums to distress and convey the value of sustainability.
Throughout A 2010-Piece Puzzle, individuals expressed a strong need for dialogue between the variety of individuals affected by and involved in the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Participants recognized that it is important to understand what other groups are doing and thinking about the 2010 Games. Dialogue allows individuals to gain knowledge about connections between the thoughts and actions in the community. There is a strong need for greater public awareness and involvement in the years to come and dialogue can help us get there. With the success of A 2010-Piece Puzzle, it is evident that collaboration is possible and this effective process must continue to grow.

Already, the Carnegie Community Action Project is planning to create an art display at the Carnegie Centre featuring photos and words related to and inspired by A 2010-Piece Puzzle. The dialogue is also being continued through articles in the Carnegie Newsletter and a feature in the BC Centre for Tourism’s April 2007 Newsletter.

Where do we go from here?
The Games can be used to leverage ideas and actions – to create positive outcomes and Olympic legacies.

“A well-organized and successful day by the students. I am very impressed with the quality of the SFU Dialogue Program and the confidence it has fostered in our leaders of tomorrow.”

Out of 86 attendants 98% completed the evaluation forms.

97% of respondents found the day to be a positive experience overall.

Less than 1% provided a negative response. The negative responses generally referred to a lack of Aboriginal representation at the dialogue.

2% of respondents mentioned their overall response to the day was mixed.

Feedback

The Games can be used to leverage ideas and actions – to create positive outcomes and Olympic legacies.

“Yes, I have seen how a large event like the Olympics and Paralympics can have such a vast impact on society. I have seen the balancing act that the city has to make with the benefits and negative impact of the Games also.”

There was encouragement throughout the day for athlete Jeff Adams. Full story featured on page four. Quotes from Adams, dialogue student Jennifer Laidlaw and former Carnegie Community Centre Director Bharbara Gudmundson.

There was an ongoing openness and willingness to listen to a variety of perspectives – people didn’t become entrenched in their positions or become combative.”

Coverage Prior to the Dialogue

A 2010-Piece Puzzle was listed in the Current Events section of the campus newspaper, one week prior to the event.

The Province – March 15

Story featured on A6. Article mentions SFU forum and quotes Gudmundson, Adams and Ann Duffy, Senior Director of Sustainability for the 2010 Olympics.

Feedback

Out of 86 attendants 98% completed the evaluation forms.

97% of respondents found the day to be a positive experience overall.

Less than 1% provided a negative response. The negative responses generally referred to a lack of Aboriginal representation at the dialogue.

2% of respondents mentioned their overall response to the day was mixed.

Feedback
Reflections

In the lead-up to the dialogue there were moments of glory and times of stress shared among the class. We put everything we had into this day. At points of intense emotion and satisfaction, inspiration flows freely. Following are a variety of perspectives that class members felt upon the day’s conclusion:

“After March 14th, I was one! There was no stress, no worries. I could count on everyone to work together at the right time.” - Tara Piersanti

“In the end, our worst fears never materialized: there was no blockade of protestors, nobody banging at the door to get in, the computers and microphones worked, and none of us forgot our lines. Had any of these things happened, I have no doubt that we would have handled them with finesse. We didn’t know what our guests were going to say or do throughout the day. We didn’t know that Jeff Adams and Bharbra Gudmundsun would speak so eloquently, or that William Robertson and Paul Sullivan would be able to build the conversation so easily at key points. The fact that we had the right people there to participate is what matters. We had the right speakers and they took the stage with grace and eased matters. We acted appropriately and in doing so, they made others feel comfortable about speaking to the room. That’s not something we could have planned, but it’s something we made happen.” - Mark Dawson

“There was a sense that all the participants had found the same book, and had flipped to the very same page. Through the diversity of each response, there was one consistent underlying tone: that ongoing dialogue was critical to the day, it made me realize how dialogue is an important and underused tool for communication and understanding. Above all, what I realized is that dialogue is empowering. Letting people voice their concerns in a controlled and civil manner gives them a sense of purpose because what they are saying is being acknowledged and heard by members of the community. Though we may not have found a concrete solution to all of the problems brought to the Morris J. Wosk Centre, the purpose of the day was collaboration and communication to create a better understanding and find a common ground, and I think we achieved this. Maybe I’m turning into a dialogue kind of girl after all.” - Shnane Liem

AN ODE TO MARCH 14TH

D-Day is tucked away
Behind a foggy mirror
A memory that will fade with us
An occasion we hold dear
Like giving birth to a child
We, the parents, created it
We saved, prepared and practiced
But a little bit isn't accurate
It took everything we had
It pumped like a drug through our veins
Almost making us go mad
But through the pain and trials
We admittedly had fun
Dialogue became our saving grace
It had ultimately won
We started out as lone stragglers
Thrown onto a team
Our differences fading
Because we were oh so keen
We tried to agree on things
And come up with definitions
We would dialogue for hours
Quite an undertaking, this mission
We bended and we cracked
And shed many tears
But tears of sadness, tears of joy
It showed how much we cared
As the final days crept up
The final days crept up
So prepared, all we could do was sit back
Our minds were so full
The worries began to tighten
As no one thought it could
In those final days of preparation
It really set the mood
Then the moment unfolded
The day we’d all been waiting for
And each one stood tall and proud
We watched each other soar
A dream-like sequence
An unfolding of events
It couldn’t have turned out better
We beamed like proud parents
The room slowly emptied
As the sun began to set
The close of an historic day
One we will never forget

- Jennifer Laidlaw

Suggestions to Improve the Dialogue

1. In worrying so much about keeping overly radical and reactionary positions to a minimum, we eliminated some of the critical edge we were looking for in the dialogue.
2. There could have been a clearer distinction between the goal for the break-out groups and the goal of the final dialogue.
3. We could have more actively encouraged the exploration of a greater variety of perspectives early on in the day, so that the actions and legacies in the afternoon were richer and more diverse.
Recommendations & Conclusion

The following recommendations for future Olympic engagement in this region were drawn from the comments throughout the dialogue, the evaluations and our own reflections of the day.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. As a host nation, we should further the dialogue that was started on March 14th, 2007, by creating similar events and designing dialogues in other spaces, both real and virtual. This idea is drawn from comments articulated by dialogue attendants such as “I think we should keep this going” and “my intention is how we all can build a culture of dialogue around the Games and in Vancouver to address the culture of mistrust”.

2. We should invite people affected by the Games to be participants in this process and take the dialogue into various communities. This recommendation resulted from suggestions presented in the final dialogue and the dialogue evaluation. We received feedback from individuals who would like to see more First Nation’s participants in attendance and suggested that we go to First Nation’s communities to make the dialogue more accessible.

3. In future dialogues, it is important to take the time to establish a comfortable environment and tone for a dialogue that allows for a free flowing discussion, elimination of judgment, and collaborative conversation. On the day of the dialogue many participants and student organizers reflected on how well the tone was established, how important the details were, and how vital that tone was in creating effective conversation.

4. The model developed for this dialogue proved to be effective. The carefully structured flow went from sharing-stories about connections to converting positions into interests, generating legacies and finally determining a personal action to pursue other forms of dialogue. The dialogue’s success was confirmed as we witnessed a great deal of personal transformation. For example, one participant vocally expressed her movement from a position of reaction and opposition to one of collaboration.

5. We should create a greater awareness of the actions individuals can take to create lasting legacies from the 2010 Games. One individual suggested “we all have a role in making this work.” As echoes throughout the day was that more people need to understand what useful actions they can take with regard to the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

CONCLUSION

A 2010-Piece Puzzle is only one step in the process of creating meaningful dialogue around the Vancouver 2010 Olympics and Paralympics. Throughout the planning and implementation of our public dialogue, we discovered the need for people to collaborate and gain a greater understanding of Olympic and Paralympic perspectives. Dialogue can help shape the outcomes of the Games. More opportunities must be created to allow for this important process to continue and expand by spreading knowledge, establishing common ground, increasing transparency, and generating civic engagement. The success of this event speaks to the possibilities that exist for dialogue to transform the thoughts and actions of many.
The 2010 Puzzle dialogue was an extraordinary experience, a stellar example of how dialogue can bridge gaps between seemingly intractable positions. Just the day before, protesters on the streets of Vancouver were denouncing Olympic symbols and confronting police, incensed by their perception that the Olympics is substituting sport for social action, with speed skating, skiing, and hockey absorbing funding they feel should go towards addressing homelessness, mental health, addictions, and poverty.

Yet, in the hands of a group of inexperienced but passionately dialogic students, magic happened within the formal setting of Canada’s premier dialogue facility, the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue’s Asia-Pacific Hall. Rather than yelling, we experienced understanding and compassion. Instead of rants, we saw thoughtful reflection and comfortable recognition of the diverse viewpoints in the room. Yelling was replaced by quiet conversation, and hardened positions softened.

What was most remarkable about that day was that the Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue students set a tone that trained and highly experienced professional facilitators often fail to achieve. Too often, a “dialogue” consists of a panel of experts giving set-piece reports, followed by a Q&A session in which the audience asks questions and the experts provide the answers. These students held dialogue to a higher standard: they began with passion, encouraged us to share our own stories, wove a dance performance into the morning, and gently insisted that all have an equal opportunity to be heard. And, they didn’t stop at stories and perspective, but guided us into the afternoon to produce tangible ideas that would lead to outcomes balancing the concerns of opponents about social issues with the loss of sport that was so apparent among proponents of the 2010 Olympics.

Opponents came away still wanting the Olympics to be judged by its social impact, but with a greater appreciation and acceptance about the good-will of Olympic, government, and tourism representatives. The Olympic side heard the message that they need to do better in insisting that the positive values represented by the Olympics are not only seen on the ice and snow, but spread to inspire us to do better to assist the disadvantaged among us.

Most remarkably, “sides” dissolved during the day, and in its place we experienced curiosity, acceptance, passion, stories, and some great ideas for broadening the conversation in the future, ideas inspired by the teamwork, collaboration, and mutual respect stimulated by dialogue.

Isn’t that what the Olympics is supposed to be about?

Mark L. Winston, FRSC
Academic Director, Centre for Dialogue
I t seemed so simple during the fall semester when Peter Williams and I were planning the Spring 2007 Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue based on the theme of the Olympics. Our plan was to ask the class of undergraduates to organize, host, facilitate and implement a public dialogue at the Morris J. Wach Gener for Dialogues. The room holds 150 people and the topic would be connected to creating legacies for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games. We would give the class a few suggestions during writing, a small budget to cover partial costs of the day and leave the group to decide the objectives, outcomes and process. Little did we know that the planning, networking, lamenting, reflecting and practicing would take an enormous amount of time on behalf of every single member of the class. What we could not have predicted was the incredible feeling in the room when the students’ dialogue – A 2010-Piece Puzzle - was completed on that magical March 14th day.

The day of the dialogue was beyond all of our expectations. I am beginning to understand that hosting a dialogue is not unlike putting on a major performance or unveiling an art exhibit. The class learned how to build on the strengths of one another and succeed in allowing every person to shine – creating a whole that was greater than the sum of its parts. After weeks of practice and dedication the class created a tone of openness and safety throughout the entire day. The feeling in the room was achieved through the subtle messages in the opening video, the sharing of reflective poetry and personal stories and the camaraderie and professionalism displayed amongst the class through the dynamic mix of facilitators. The group created a space for dialogue to grow and succeeded in allowing a range of perspectives to be shared. We heard angry voices at the beginning of the day become accepting voices open to change and learning by the end of the day. We heard stories of hope and change and genuine commitments to individual action.

We need more opportunities in our communities that encourage students to lead and engage. I learned to trust in the power of students and they exceeded my expectations. To paraphrase Margaret Mead - I saw first hand that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world – indeed it is the only thing that ever has. Thanks for caring so deeply about the future – you are all making a difference.

Janet Moore
Assistant Professor, Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue

Several hours after the conclusion of the 2010-Piece Puzzle dialogue, I eventually removed myself from the immediacy of this inspiring event and reflected on what had transpired. While the Dialogue was but one temporary point in time, in many ways it was also a day of transition for us.

1) First, the many conflicting thoughts and ideas about how the event should unfold, shifted from what seemed like chaos to a very carefully crafted forum where structure and spontaneity combined seamlessly; 2) Second, the diverse talents of the group transformed from what were quite disparate parts into a bonded whole that exhibited all of the hallmarks of a team – trust, responsibility of specific tasks, support for one another, and a commitment to a vision; 3) Third, the many individualistic assumptions of class members expressed as passionately during the semester seemed to be suspended and transformed from positions into intimacy; 4) Fourth, personal tendencies to “speak and shut out”, or conversely “listen but not voice” transformed into a more balanced combination of communication capacities; 5) Fifth, initial tendencies to search for flaws and weaknesses in other positions became more focused on seeking strengths and values in the perspectives of others; 6) Sixth, the tension of seeking a “quick fix” reaction of personal assumptions was suspended for a more exploratory and patient search for other perspectives and options; 7) Seventh, the anxiety associated with the uncertainty and unpredictability of discussions with others shifted to an embrace of the spontaneity and eclectic nature of open dialogues; 8) Eighth, tendencies towards negative responses to the assumptions and statements of others transitioned into more respectful and genuine commitments to individual action.

It was a pleasure being able to sit back with such great confidence in all of the class members and watch this day of transition unfold!

Peter W. Williams
Professor, Department of Resource and Environmental Management
The 17 students came together 3 months ago as a collection of eager, excited, and optimistic individuals, that were looking forward to planning and hosting a public dialogue that focused on leveraging the impact of the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Little time passed before the individuals became collaborative partners that were struggling themselves to grasp the nature of the issues surrounding the Games. We worked as a team to establish a purpose and a vision for the public dialogue event, to guide the planning process. While developing a vision sounds a simple task to achieve, taking 17 very different perspectives supported by the strength of 17 very determined individuals proved to be a great challenge.

The team learned many valuable lessons surrounding collaboration through the struggle to develop a vision, which mobilized their capacity to effectively plan and facilitate the public dialogue. Though there were many struggles and crossroads in the planning process, it was the efforts of 17 students to work to meet their own perspectives as being equally important to the perspectives of their fellow team members that enabled them to rule model the essence of successful dialogues. I truly feel that among the key reasons “A 2010 Piece Puzzle” was such a great success was that the diligence of the students to overcome their team struggles enabled them to embody the essence of dialogue; they showed what can happen when we put personal agendas aside, and truly listen and work together with others to establish a common understanding of the multiple perspectives and issues involved in all subject matters.

Jenn Ness
Teaching Assistant, Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue
A 2010-Piece Puzzle is a project of…

Appendix
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Thank you to the many guests who helped us learn about the Olympics and Paralympics in Vancouver, Whistler, Richmond, and at Cypress Mountain:

Acheson, Elizabeth
Adams, Jeff
Albert, Laura
Ashworth, Joanna
Bayley, Roger
Beamish, Tim
Bellemare, Ken
Benson, Ken
Bernet, Bernice
Brandon, Katrina
Braid, Carolyn
Carr, Meck
Carnas, Cameron
Cantino, Janet
Cayley, Derya
Chan, Ben
Chieg, Doug
Davies, Mark
Duffy, Ann
Dunne, Hilary
Dunne, Ashley
Elkhashab, Alia
English, Britta
Farsai, Shahdin
Fenton, Bonnie
Frezell, Jamie
Front, Vaknin
Gasse, Vanita
Gold, Morgan
Gosse, Donald
Grant, Judy
Grant, Conni
Gudmundsson, Buhara
Haffner, Doreen
Hamel, Kevin
Hart, Craig
Hofbauer, Matt
Hindle, Lindsay
Hirschberger, Erica
Hood, Terry
Horton, Jane
Jones, Donna
Klassen, Amandla
Kwan, Brenda
Laflamme, Bev
Laflamme, Jennifer
Lang, Jennifer
Le, Buddy
Lee, Patrice
Lien, Stinne
Lortman, Rob
Louie, Sandi
Maidman, David
Malinowski, Lucas
Marayama, Brendan
McCarthy, Sharon
Metcalfe, Jonessa
Mojtabavi, Shiva
Moores, Bill
Moore, Janet
Mossosch, Rachel
Nasir, Piern
Noakes, Chris
Noakes, Cliff
Noakes, Lois
Nummensen, Jessica
O’Malley, Erin
Panagiotopoulos, Christine
Pearson, Laure
Peters, Kelcey
Phillips, Jennifer
Primrose, Tara
Plessis, Joanna
Quinn, Ross
Quinn, Baril
Rivers, Patrick
Robison, Jennica
Rhodes, Mitch
Roberts, William
Ross, Judy
Ryan, Rowan
Sawyer, Rowan
Siegmann, Andrew
Stoic, Carolyn
Sullivan, Paul
Terpstra, Jo-Ann
Thompson, Shuchag
Tong, Joanne
VanWynsberghe, Rob
Verdu, Natalia
Vink, Josina
Vink, Mary
Walkorf, Dale
Warren, Jennifer
Wisley, Crystal
Williams, Carol
Williams, Peter
Winston, Mark
Wong, Theresa
Wood, Daniel
Yamaoka, Jarrett
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The official number of guests who signed in for the dialogue was 103. Over the course of the day 53 of these people addressed the participants in the room. Approximately 30 organizations had representatives present. These organizations were:

BC Aboriginal Groups
BC Centre for Tourism
Better Environmentally Sound Transportation (BEST)
Carnegie Community Action Project (CCAP)
Film Ring Circus
Hollyburn Heritage Society
Interchange
Impact on Community Coalition (IOCC)
Olympic athlete Davison
Olympic village planners
Paralympic athletes
Tourism Vancouver
Tripage
Simon Fraser Student Society (SFSS)
Simon Fraser Public Interest Research Group (SFPIRG)
SFU Faculty (Dialogue/Resource and Environmental Management)
SFU Undergraduate Seminar in Dialogue

Sudmen Media
Toronto Residents
University of British Columbia
Vancouver Board of Trade
Vancouver Organizing Committee (VANOC)
Vivian Hotel Dialogue
Whistler City Council
Whistler Dialogue Forum

Peter Williams
Jason Moore
Ken Ness
Linda Bunnell
Mark Winston
Ginni Sigurdson
Ken Bellman
Nicole Mah
Joan Ashworth
Jaye Sunderland
SFU Dialogue Programs
SFU Continuing Studies
Doug Clegg
Susan Jamieson-McLarnon
Eve Provan
Jeff Adams and his travel sponsor, McDonald’s
Megan Davidson, Cort Gerlock, Jamie Kolecky,
Ellen Lachow, Molly McDermott, Ronnie Price,
Justin Rezn and Ken Stevenson of SFU’s School for the Contemporary Arts
Laura Albert and Mitch Rhodes from Treadlight Media
Event volunteers: Timothy Beamish, Erin O’Mellin,
Venita Fung, Angela Padilla
Thank you to the Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue and its staff for all your help.
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An Olympic Dialogue: The 2010 Games and its Legacies

March 14, 2007 – Students from Simon Fraser University’s undergraduate semester in dialogue are pulling together all the pieces – the cultural, environmental, and economic aspects of the Olympic and Paralympic Games in a public dialogue titled, A 2010-Piece Puzzle, Wednesday, March 14, 9am-4:30pm at SFU’s Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue at 580 West Hastings St., Vancouver.

“We are inviting all members of the community to discuss the potential long-term effects of the 2010 Games,” says Jamie Frezell, communication student. “The focus is on stimulating dialogue to help shape legacies for our region.”

Organized by 17 dialogue students, the free public event will use dialogue, activities and performances to ignite thought-provoking and imaginative collaboration on topics related to 2010. “The objective is to build synergy among community stakeholders by providing them with tools to create lasting Olympic and Paralympic legacies and put together the pieces of the Olympic Games puzzle,” says Frezell.

A 2010-Piece Puzzle

You are invited to a dialogue at the Morris J. Wosk Centre March 14, 2007 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Lunch is provided Event is free • Reservations are required Register by calling (604) 291-5100 www.2010piecepuzzle.com

Special Thanks to our Sponsors:

SFU developed the undergraduate semester in dialogue to inspect students with a sense of responsibility, encourage their passion to improve Canadian society, and develop innovative intellectual tools for creating community solutions. For further information please visit our website at www.2010piecepuzzle.com.

Contact:
Jennifer Laidlaw
Communication Student, SFU Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue 778-227-2406 jennl@sfu.ca

Susan Jamieson-McLarnon
Director, Public Relations
Simon Fraser University Vancouver 515 West Hastings Street Vancouver, B.C. Canada V6B 5K3 (604) 291-5151/3210

For further information please visit our website at www.2010piecepuzzle.com.
Seventeen Simon Fraser University students currently participating in an Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue hosted a groundbreaking forum at the Morris J. Wosk Forum on April 13, 2007. This public event simulcast dialogue around the cultural, environmental, and economic aspects of the 2010 Games, with the goal of shaping lasting legacies for the province.

Seated around the circular meeting room were leaders representing a range of organizations and communities—each with unique (and often differing) perspectives on the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Facilitating the day’s events were the students themselves, who are currently using Vancouver and Whistler as laboratories to analyze the willingness and ability of host destinations to meet the International Olympic Committee’s requirements in a sustainable way.

The students structured the day into four distinct dialogue sessions. The first dialogue began as Jeff Adams (an Olympic and Paralympic athlete) spoke of his connection to the games as an event “worthy of a valiant struggle for the future” following in the footsteps of previous games in Montreal and Calgary, memories of triumph and disappointment, and personal experiences. Following this first session, contributors were treated to a riveting performance by a troupe of SFU student dancers, entitled “Squeamish,” performed almost entirely in restrictive snowsuits.

Dialogue Two encouraged participants to explore their perspectives surrounding the games. This began with personal (silent) reflection, followed by a “dialogue within a dialogue” in the centre of the room. Speakers in this ‘shibboleth’ presented a range of issues from concerns about environmental impacts to the plight of Vancouver’s Downtown East Side, and a range of opportunities that could arise from hosting the games, from uniting communities to creating further civic dialogue.

After lunch, the third session involved “Envisioning Legacies.” The group was led through an exercise where they stated a “Position” about the games, translated this into “Intentions,” and then moved on to “Declaration.”

The fourth and final dialogue, “Finding Ideas into Action,” was a session of personal ownership and working collectively as each participant was invited to take their position statement and move through intention into a declaration of action.

British Columbia Centre for Tourism Leadership and Innovation (BCTLI) News

April 05, 2007
Public Olympics Dialogue: The 2010 Piece Puzzle Revealed

Squashink, performed almost entirely in restrictive snowsuits.
A 2010-Piece Puzzle Organizing Committees

Communications
- Creating posters and press materials
- Contacting media for the event
- Interacting with media at the event
- Advertising
- Creating a 2010-Piece Puzzle website
- Gathering media coverage

Finance
- Balancing the finances
- Keeping track of expenditures
- Ensuring transactions were completed
- Collecting receipts and invoices
- Creating a master budget from the tentative budgets from each committee

Logistics
- Organizing the lunch and coffee breaks
- Liaising with Morris J. Wosk Centre
- Looking after various details for planning the event
- Creating a timeline of preparation for the dialogue

Sponsorship
- Preparing a sponsorship package
- Contacting organizations to solicit financial sponsorship
- Organizing a system for sponsors to contribute

Hosts
- Collecting names for guests
- Sending letters and emails to potential dialogue participants
- Confirming registration
- Greeting guests at the door
- Signing guests in

The Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue Spring 2007 Class was titled “Going for Gold: Managing the Impacts of Olympic Fever”. Through the course of the semester the class explored many topics relating to the Olympic and Paralympic Games. In weekly, sometimes daily dialogues, we had guests from various groups come in to share their perspective on the Games. We also visited many Olympic sites including Richmond, Whistler, and Cypress to meet with guests whose work is directly involved in the planning for the Olympics and Paralympics.

Besides the dialogues, the class also had many assignments and activities to complete that helped us learn about the Olympics and Paralympics. We were asked to write opinion editorials on an issue and present them to the class. We completed a group assignment that pushed us to interview Olympic stakeholders and find out how their roles fit into the larger picture. Finally, each class member had to research and write a paper on an in depth exploration of a topic related to the Olympics. The diversity of topics and perspectives exposed in our dialogues, interviews, and papers allowed the class to put together the pieces of the Olympic and Paralympic puzzle.

Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue

The Students and their final research projects:

Melissa Carr
Inclusion or Lip Service: A Northern Perspective

Cameron Carolino
Contrapuntal Dialogue: In Audo Interventions in 2010 Pain Projects

Mark Davison
Your Face Piece: The Concept of Amateurism in the Modern Olympics

Jackie Denovan
The Genius is Always Greater: An Inside Look at the Olympic Games (Sports)

Janet Moore
CSI Communities Investigate: The Case of the Inner-City Industry Commitments

Jennifer Langan
Homecoming, Violence and 2010

Erica Hirschberger
Getting the Point: Arctic Community Expression and the 2010 Games

Patrick Lee
A New 2010 Housing Legacy

Shane Luan
The Sport of Snowshoeing

Lucie Malinowski
Artistic: A Different Dimension to Vancouver for 2010

Chris Nimous
Gone Through The Future of Doping in Sport

Tara Pietsch
After the High Comes the Low: The Eclipse of Being an Athlete

Jamie Plisetskaya
A Sound Case of Environmental Collaboration: Around 2010 A Tramway Dialogue Series

Jostja Vink
Great Hall Leader for 2010, Engaging Youth in Sustainability and Olympism

Jennifer Watson
Olympic Spirit Trees: A Dynamic Public Art Installation

Cyril Wickey
Protecting the Rings: The Olympic Brand in 2010

Instructors:
Peter Williams
Professor, Department of Resource and Environmental Management

Janet Moore
Assistant Professor, Undergraduate Semester in Dialogue

Teaching Assistant:
Jamin Nuss