

## **Dibner Award Nomination Form**

The Dibner Award for Excellence in Museum Exhibits was established in 1985, through the generosity of Bern Dibner, to recognize excellence in museums and museum exhibits that interpret the history of technology, industry, and engineering to the general public. Winning exhibits, in addition to being well designed and produced, should raise pertinent historical issues. Artifacts and images should be used in a manner that interests, teaches, and stimulates both the general public and historians. The award consists of a plaque and up to \$1,000 to cover expenses for a member of the design team to accept the award at the SHOT awards banquet.

The deadline for nominations is 30 April. (For temporary and traveling exhibits the deadline is TWO months before closure.) After completing all three parts of this form, submit as one single PDF document to the established SHOT prize portal. The total size of this file should not exceed 10 Mb.

Late submissions will not be accepted.

## Part 1 Exhibit Information

Exhibit Title:

Showing at (location/museum name):

Exhibit website URL:

Opening Date (must be within the preceding two years):

Closing Date:

*(Notify SHOT Secretary at least two months before this date)*

Exhibit Base area (Square feet or square meters)- IF PHYSICAL:

Curators (please ensure that main exhibit contact is noted):

Mailing address:

E-mail address:

Phone:

Fax:

Name of nominator (if not the same as curator):

Affiliation:

Mailing address:

E-mail:

Phone:

Fax:

## **Part 2 Exhibit's objectives, purpose, and scope (1500 words maximum).**

**This statement should address each of the following five evaluation criteria, with brief but persuasive answers, to help the judges' evaluation based on the subheads:**

1. Eligibility:
  - a. Does the exhibit seek to interpret the past of technology, industry, or engineering?
  - b. How does the exhibit relate to the history of technology as a discipline?
  - c. Does the exhibit (physical or digital) use and interpret original artifacts, or their images, to communicate with audiences?
2. Content:
  - a. Does the exhibit aim to inspire and inform visitors while expanding their views of technology and society?
  - b. Is the exhibit's content particularly innovative or distinctively well interpreted?
  - c. Does the exhibit deal with gender, race, and/or ethnicity appropriately bearing in mind subject, context and audiences?
  - d. Are the artifacts, images and interactive elements well-chosen, well-displayed, and sequenced in a way that makes sense to visitors?
  - e. Does the exhibit use the medium (physical or digital) well to make a convincing argument?
  - f. Does the exhibit use the authenticity of artefacts to have distinctive impacts on the audience?
3. Audience:
  - a. Is it clear for whom the exhibit is intended?
  - b. How, and how well, does the exhibit engage the intended audience(s)?
  - c. Have the exhibit designers made appropriate assumptions about the audiences' concerns and prior knowledge?
  - d. What audiences other than those intended might find the exhibit interesting or informative?
  - e. Will professional historians of technology find the exhibit interesting, challenging, informative, and/or a spur to further thinking and research?
  - f. Are there specific target audiences for whom the exhibit is intended? If so, in what ways does the exhibit engage the intended audience(s)?
4. Accessibility:
  - a. Are the objectives, purpose, and scope of the exhibit clearly shared with visitors?
  - b. Have efforts been taken to make the exhibit as accessible as possible including both physical and cognitive accessibility?
  - c. Is the exhibit's design appropriate to the exhibit's objectives?
5. Resources:
  - a. Does the exhibit reach out beyond the museum itself?
  - b. What other print or digital resources are made available to visitors?
  - c. Can a visitor understand the exhibit and its objectives without these materials?
  - d. Are these materials and any associated online resources useful for teaching and research outside the exhibit?

## Part 3 – Suggestion of “Live” Exhibit Reviewers

Please suggest the names of appropriate exhibit reviewers—either historians of technology or museum professionals—in order of preference, preferably those who reside within reasonable travel distance of the exhibit. These reviewers must NOT be associated with the development or management of the exhibit itself. Live reviewers may discuss the exhibit with the curators if they wish to do so. The SHOT Dibner Prize committee will in all cases exercise its discretion in appointing reviewers.

### **Name of Reviewer #1:**

Affiliation:

Mailing address:

E-mail address:

Phone:

Fax:

### **Name of Reviewer #2:**

Affiliation:

Mailing address:

E-mail address:

Phone:

Fax:

### **Name of Reviewer #3:**

Affiliation:

Mailing address:

E-mail address:

Phone:

Fax: