An Advocate for Everything: Exploring Exhibit Development Models

JANET A. KAMIEN

ABSTRACT This article presents six models, from within and outside the museum profession, useful to consider when creating exhibition teams. The focus is on five roles—client, content specialist, designer, content interpreter, and project manager—and the authority and responsibility assigned to these roles in the different models. The author examines the pros and cons of the models and provides examples from museums in which they were instituted. The developer model was created at The Field Museum of Natural History to replace the team approach model. Both of these models replaced the curatorial model. The broker model was developed at The Children's Museum in Boston. From outside the museum field, the author presents the architectural model and the theatrical model. Each of the models, in differing ways, defines a process, a point of view about the expected outcomes, and assigns specific authorities and responsibilities to staff members in each of the five roles. The author argues that it is not so important which of the models is chosen for any given exhibition project, but emphasizes that the importance lies in being certain that a model be chosen and rigorously implemented. The appendix also includes a sample exhibit process document from one museum.

The question of how best to structure the creative work of exhibit making seems never to be satisfactorily answered. In some institutions the process in place does not work well for many of the individuals involved, yet it is kept because of the "we've always done it this way" factor. In others, a thoughtfully crafted process document exists, but no one uses it. In still others, no policies for exhibit development exist so that with changing times and changing staff, relatively inexperienced people must, in effect, start from scratch in every new exhibit effort.

Exhibits are the most public and often the most expensive investments an institution makes. How to create exhibit teams, launch projects, and control schedules, budgets and outcomes are issues of paramount importance. This paper examines six models from within and outside of the museum profession that can provide insights when

Janet A. Kamien *is a member of The Museum Group and the principal of Janet A. Kamien Museum Consulting, P.O. Box 1293 (179 East Street), Belchertown, MA 01007,* <j.kamien@worldnet.att.net>.

creating a process or changing an existing process. The emphasis will be on the roles that must be played within a structure, rather than on the stages of conceptualization, design development, evaluation, fabrication, installation and revision. The views expressed here reflect the opinions, experience and prejudices of the author.

Roles in exhibit teams—Recognizing the variety of roles to be played and clarifying who will play them is of primary importance in an exhibit effort. While this may seem axiomatic, it doesn't always work out that way in practice, and many of the problems that repeatedly arise in exhibit development and implementation are a result of these roles not being filled or being distorted during the process. Briefly, these roles are:

- *Client*
  This person, usually a director or an upper-level administrator, provides the overall landscape for exhibit efforts. While this person may or may not have provided the creative vision for a specific exhibit, his/her support of that vision is imperative as final approval belongs to the client. The questions clients must answer are: How will the overall resources of the institution be deployed to support this exhibit effort? How will this exhibit support the overall goals of the institution and how, in the end, will this be measured? Does the institution have the necessary staffing, skills and experience to successfully bring the vision to completion?

- *Content specialist (curator, researcher)*
  It's the responsibility of this role to provide the content and assure the accuracy of that content. The questions they must answer are: What ideas are fundamental to the understanding and appreciation of the exhibit material? What are the most engaging aspects of this material? Which objects and archival materials will best support the content and be of interest to visitors?

- *Designer*
  The designer's primary task is to provide the three-dimensional frame for the exhibit's elements and the drawings/documents that will allow the exhibit to be built and installed as designed. Depending on how the team is conceived and managed, this may be a primarily logistical role, or one that helps define what content will be included and its interpretation for the visitor. The questions designers must answer are: How will the space be organized for maximum coherence and best flow through the exhibit? How will the exhibit be made most visually engaging? What props, environments, or devices might be conceived to support content and engage visitors?

- *Content interpreter (developer, interpretive planner, educator)*
  The utility of this role is predicated on the notion that a scholar's or researcher's view of the content is usually not the same as the visitor's view, and must be edited and translated for the visitor to best understand and appreciate. The questions content interpreters must ask are: What will the visitors themselves be bringing to this experience? What organization and selection of material, ideas,

and experiences will make this exhibit content most accessible to its target audiences? What should the overall visitor experience be like?

- *Project manager*
  This is the nuts and bolts role of oversight of schedule and budget. The questions to be asked are: How should the process of creating this exhibit be organized? What processes, milestones, etc. must be put in place in order to meet the deadline and budget? How will this project communicate with other functions outside the institution (such as contractors) and within the institution (such as the finance department)?

Especially in larger institutions, a variety of other roles may be integrated into an extended team. Fabricators may be part of the process early on, as well as label writers, collections managers, visitor researchers, education staff responsible for later programs, marketers, and visitor service and operations staff, to name a few.

Four museum models—The developer model is essentially the creation of Michael Spock that reached its acme at The Field Museum in the exhibit work of the 1980s and 1990s. In it, a senior content interpreter (developer) stands at the center and is supported by a large group of specialists that may include other developers, curators, researchers, evaluators, writers and editors, designers, outside advisors, community advisors, and project managers and production people. In this model, the senior developer takes both the authority and responsibility for the project as a whole and reports directly to the client. It is the developer's vision of the content that the visitor will see.

The developer model replaced a previous Field Museum inspired model: the team approach model. This model proposes that a curator (content specialist), a designer and an educator (content interpreter) share authority and responsibility equally for a project's vision and outcome. All report directly to the client and all other members of a larger team report to one of these individuals.

It could be said that both the previous models were created to replace the most traditional approach, the curatorial model. In this model, especially common to natural history and art museums, the curator, or content specialist, holds primary authority over the creative outcome. In some settings, especially those that do not have subject matter experts on the staff, the designer might be the figure to hold ultimate power over the project and have ultimate accountability for it.

The broker model was created by Elaine Heumann Gurian at The Children's Museum, Boston, to produce exhibitions for the move to Museum Wharf in 1979. It proposed a relationship of creative equality between a designer and a developer, and inserted a "broker" or project manager to be the client's only direct report on the team and to take responsibility for keeping the project on track.

Regardless of their differences, all these models attempt to define three things:

- which member or members of the team will have authority over the product, and what kind of authority;

- who will be responsible for driving the project forward, facilitating the process, and for the accountability of day to day work;

- whose voice or voices will the visitor ultimately hear, whose vision will the visitor see.

The selection of one of these models connotes assumptions about what we expect exhibits to do and for whom. At the most simplistic level, we may choose to have the project primarily driven by content concerns, design concerns, or by visitor concerns. (In the worst of all possible worlds, we could choose to have the project driven by strictly institutional debts, or by strictly budget and schedule imperatives.) We must also decide how important it is to us to stick to a predetermined budget and schedule. And, we must decide how we will integrate the expertise, effort, experience and passions of other members of the team, regardless of what expertise the leader(s) of the project possess.

Experience at The Field Museum: The developer model. At The Field Museum, the developer model was used to create a great deal of change in a relatively short period of time. Exhibit developers were drafted from curatorial and education roles within the institution or hired from the outside. Teams were built around these developers that included designers, a project manager and a production supervisor "loaned" from the Design and Production Department. This department also provided supervision of that staff. In-house and out of house curators were part of the team as well, and provided subject matter expertise, object/specimen approval and label copy review.

Reassigning the authority for exhibit projects from individuals whose main passion was the subject matter, to individuals whose main passion was (or would have to become) the interpretation of that subject matter to a diverse and often naïve audience made an enormous difference in the kind of exhibits the institution now produced. The emphasis shifted from the *presentation* of information to the *interpretation* of information. Since the lead developer reported directly to the client (the vice president for public programs), the overall vision for the direction of new exhibitions could be straightforwardly maintained.

Each of the five major projects completed under this method, was on time, on budget, and, by many measures, successful. All, however, had problems to confront. For the most part, the problematic issues were challenges to the authority of the lead developer, and were conceived as turf issues. Briefly, in the first project, Facilities challenged the right to decide building changes and hire contractors for exhibit purposes. In the second project, the challenge came from Collections and Research over the number of objects to be displayed (not enough) and the selection of those objects. The third project suffered internal difficulties between team members, in which designers sought to challenge what often seemed the inappropriate authority of developers over design issues. The fourth project also suffered internal difficulties among team members, which included some devastating budget and schedule problems. And the fifth went as smoothly as a 25,000-square-foot project can go. The lesson here is that the

breaking-in period for a new planning process is a long and laborious one. But, once people catch on, and if the results are good, the process gets easier to do and more energy can be put into the product. In other words, after a while it turns out that the "new" process becomes "the way we've always done it."

An inherent flaw in this model that never goes away is the toll it takes on the lead developer, especially for projects of the size we were mounting. These ranged from 12,500 to 25,000 square feet with budgets up to $6 million, usually over a two-to-five-year period of effort. Lead developers walked away from these projects tired and limp. One of the reasons that the process seemed to work better as it went along was that although the developer was usually new, the design, production and administrative teams supporting them were building experience. These people could begin to anticipate problems and solutions that the possibly more naïve developer might not have seen or acted upon. When lead developers learned to trust and rely on other competent members in the team, they became delegaters and therefore more effective leaders. When they could not, decision making became protracted and problems arose within the team.

The team approach. Though I have no direct experience with this model, the reported experiences of others are mixed. As a tool to break exhibition efforts away from a totally content driven paradigm, this model gets high points. As a way to efficiently structure the work of a larger team, it does not. The problem is this: there is no inherent single authority within the team that can adjudicate any differences that may arise. People will usually solve this on their own, in one of two ways. They will either tacitly promote one of the players to the position of leader, thereby nullifying the intent of the structure. (The choice will be based on tradition, experience, or power of personality.) Or, they will create an exhibition of good-willed compromise that is made up of bits and pieces of each of their passions—an exhibition that is almost guaranteed to be uneven to the viewer. If team members do not resolve any basic differences between themselves, these can also be hard projects to administrate. At best, the three team leaders are in basic agreement about the approach to the exhibit. At worst, the client is besieged by three staff members, each angling for support for their individual point of view, and visitors are presented with fragmented messages.

Experience at The Franklin Institute: The curatorial/designer model. Like many science museums, The Franklin did not have subject matter experts in many of the fields focused upon in its exhibition efforts, nor did it necessarily employ developers. At the beginning of 1996, generalist researchers worked for an exhibits department with a designer at the helm, and, just as content concerns can overwhelm an exhibit effort driven primarily by scholarship, here, design concerns had often become the most powerful element within the process and sometimes resulted in exhibitions that did not hang together conceptually. This is essentially the curatorial model in disguise, and as in the curatorial model, the danger is that the main force molding the product might not be in tune with the full array of visitor concerns as advocated for by colleagues with

other expertise to offer. In 1996, this shop was also a good example of a place that had developed a process document, but rarely used it. The reason for this seemed to be that it was so detailed that it was unmanageable. In other words, everyone's issues *were* expressed in a document that at its conception no doubt held the promise of a way of doing exhibitions that would honor all the players, but resulted in a document so ambitious as to be useless.

This in some ways resembles a problem that out-of-house design teams sometimes experience. When an institutional client does not or cannot offer a clear vision for the project, designers, by necessity, will invent a frame for the project. It may be a perfectly good frame, but may not be one that takes into consideration the accumulated knowledge of staff and all the aspirations of management.

Experience at The Children's Museum: The broker model. The broker model developed at The Children's Museum in Boston suggested that the creative members of the team—the designer and developer—could be freed of the mundane issues of budget and schedule while the client could rest assured that these things were indeed being tended to. The broker was expected to do just that, and only that. The content, interpretation and look of the product were none of their business. The broker reported directly to the client, while all three figures were expected to present materials for review to the client at regular intervals.

When created, this process was a departure from previous patterns. It was developed to create a number of exhibits simultaneously and keep them all under control. It was successful enough to be kept after the original exhibition push was over. Its main problem is that the successful broker must understand and support the roles and issues of the other players, including the client, yet remain outside the creative process. It can therefore be a difficult role to fill.

What can we learn?—All of these models can and have worked. All of these models have also failed. They succeed when there is agreement among the institution and all the players about what is to be accomplished, by whom and for whom.

The relatively recent inclusion of a developer (or interpretive planner, or educator, or visitor advocate) into this process goes hand in hand with two insights which may, on the face of it, seem counterposed: from an educational or mission point of view, the exhibits that are created with scholarship as their overriding principle are often difficult for the ordinary visitor to penetrate and be engaged by. While these exhibits may meet curatorial standards, they sometimes do not meet visitor interest standards and therefore do not reach their educational goals. And, museums have increased their reliance on the gate for institutional economic health and they experience more competition for visitor-generated cash than in the past. For both these reasons making exhibits that appeal to diverse audiences becomes imperative. But it has also caused problems.

In more traditional museums, this interest in client-centered exhibitions can be seen as a threat to the curatorial role, the designer role, or both. And, it may be assumed by the curator that passion for the subject matter will simply be transferred to

the viewer. Likewise, it can be assumed by the designer that an aesthetically superb presentation will render the concern for increased visitor friendliness moot. If we believe either or both these things to be true, then the curatorial model, led by a content specialist or a designer is the model of choice. If we do not, then we must find a way to instill a knowledge of and a passion for the visitor in the process, either by personifying it, or by demanding that one of these players wear two hats.

Two of the models elevate that role: the developer model, in which, indeed, this advocacy role is the leader of the team, and the team approach model, in which this role is an equal partner to content and design. One of the models, the broker model, assumes that the developer will wear two hats and be both the advocate for content and the advocate for the visitor.

Designers are often asked to wear two hats as well. Most often, it is the role of project manager that is joined to the design role, but, content interpreter may also be a hat that designers—often by default—may be asked to wear.

There is nothing wrong with asking a team member to wear two hats—indeed for smaller institutions there may be no other choice. But there are a couple of tricks here: all the members of the team must know this is happening and accept it; the player wearing two hats must actually know how to do both jobs; and, the player wearing two hats must be given the time and resources to accomplish both jobs simultaneously.

When a role is not filled—We have all seen exhibits in which one of these roles has been left unfulfilled. There are the exhibits whose promise is not met because the aspirations were not backed up with the necessary resources; the content laden, but impenetrable exhibits; the beautifully designed, but apparently pointless exhibits; and the exhibits that aren't finished at opening.

In my experience, these problems exist when an advocacy role is not filled in the project plan. They also are there when the role is filled, but dismissed by other more powerful players; or when the role is filled, but the team member is unable to play it, through lack of skills, experience, or resources.

Fledgling players will need the support and acceptance of other teammates, and it will be up to the team leader and/or the client to make sure that this happens. Some players may also need training. This may be true even for staff who have been in their roles for some time. A designer, for instance, who has come up through the ranks from a related field, may not have the skill to render an adequate three-dimensional presentation. An educator, drafted from program concerns, may not have the skills to transfer what he or she knows about mediated visitor experiences to unmediated visitor experiences. If there is no one within the staff who can help such team members to make the leap, it may be necessary for the institution to send staff to appropriate training or to bring in outsiders to help.

Two more models from outside the museum profession—For those still not convinced about the importance of choosing a model that adequately fulfills the previously stated roles, let's look at other professions. The two models most useful to this discussion are the

architectural model and the theatrical model. While both these models put the primary power over the product in the hands of a single person, they do so in very different ways.

The architectural model describes a process in which the vision for the project is carried by the designer; the institutional and user needs are (hopefully) provided by the client; and the rest of the roles are borne by the designer's staff. The phases of the project are well known and much practiced, with milestones built into the contract at the outset. Successful projects bring fame to the architect and provide not only a beautiful, but a functional and maintainable building to the client.

This model is most similar to the curatorial/designer models, in that it places the main responsibility into the hands of a single expert who decides not only what the content is, but also how it will best be presented to the visitor or user of the product. When it fails, it is often because the client has been unclear about the institution's user needs or has simply been ignored by the designer.

The theatrical model is another well-known and practiced methodology. Here, a director sits at the helm and takes responsibility for the interpretation of the content (provided by the playwright, who is often times dead), on behalf of the producer/client. In addition, this content interpreter is supported by a variety of designers, each with their own specialties, and of course by actors, who will also be interpreting their part of the material. In this way, it most closely resembles the developer model. And as in the developer model, an experienced director will have taken full advantage of the expertise offered from all the members of the team. Team members who cannot perform their tasks (including the director) are replaced. And, although the success or failure of the undertaking may primarily rest with the director, fame for a successful project may come as well to the playwright, actors, and designers. And, of course, success or failure will be decided by the gate as well as by critical review.

These well-honed models can provide us with additional insights about the kinds of processes we would like to see at work in our exhibition efforts. They depend on practice, clarity of role and authority, and expertise of role. Regardless of what models we may feel best fit our aspirations, these qualities will remain imperative.

Choosing a model—As we have seen, all of these models have strengths and weaknesses. But, each defines a process, a point of view about the expected outcome, and assigns specific authorities and responsibilities to various members. In other words, in many ways it is more important that a model be chosen and taken seriously, than which model is chosen. Most important is the understanding that the responsibilities and the work tasks of all five of the roles must be assigned to someone, even if they are not clearly delineated in the model of choice. After this, the choice of models is best based on the aspirations of the institution for the product.

For my part, the theatrical model is the one most worth emulating. At its best, it assumes that both success with the public and critical success will depend on the integration of the various specialties into a coherent whole. It has a built-in respect for the content, the presentation of content, and the interpretation of content. It honors creativity within tightly proscribed and well-understood parameters. It, by necessity,

takes schedule and budget constraints very seriously. And ideally, while there is an ultimate authority figure in the director, supporting designers, cast and crew are seen to have their own expertise, authority and responsibility, deployed towards shared goals. Above all, it honors the viewer/visitor, and understands that it is for this essential player that the project has been undertaken.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

For yet other models, there are these from the business world:

Katzenbach, J. R. and Smith, D. K. 1993. *The Wisdom of Teams.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

For a rebuttal, see:

Hackman, J. R. 1998. Why teams don't work. In *Applications of Theory and Research on Groups to Social Issues,* eds. Tindale, R. S., J. Edwards, and E. J. Posavac. New York, Plenum.

For an example of an exhibit process document, see appendix below:

·   ·   ·

APPENDIX

The Franklin Institute Exhibit Process Guide
Prepared by: Janet Kamien and Polly McKenna-Cress, August 1998

This document is intended to define the roles of the exhibit team as well as to be a guide for scheduling purposes. It should be used as a reference to understand individual responsibilities within the larger whole, not a step-by-step guide to creating exhibits. An awareness of the team's key review points should help individuals create their own personal time schedules. This outline will be applied and tailored to each exhibit as they roll out. There will be other adjustments and changes as we go, but this document should be a helpful reference as we begin to develop and design exhibits for The Franklin Institute of the twenty-first century.

Phase I: Initial Concept   **3–6 months**
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Developer

Lead developers work with the literature, research (in and out of house), collections, resources, subject matter specialists, and a front-end evaluation; i.e., topic, storyline, and baseline information testing, to describe the projects overall conceptual framework.

Products include:
   Initial Concept Document (8.5″ × 11″)

From Developers
- proposed size and location
- initial project description
- expected audience
- expected outcomes
- evaluation results
- exhibit concept and element outline

From Designers
- design and produce "Initial Concept Document"
- overall look-and-feel sketches
- conceptual bubble diagrams
- base model

From Project Manager
- overall budget
- overall schedule

This phase ends with approval from the president and program committee for the project to continue. If the project already has initial funding, (full funding?) the team goes on to the next phase.

- If the project must now be funded, there is a hiatus of an unspecified time in which the team creates:

From Developers
- proposals for government and other funding agencies

From Designers
- presentation books for corporate or individual donors

Phase II: Concept Development/Schematic Design   **4–8 months**
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Developer

Working with subject matter and/or community advisors, assistants, design, production, and maintenance staff, developers begin to refine ideas, do more focused research, obtain sources for specific objects, photos, footage, etc. and use formative evaluation techniques (mainly prototyping and observation and interview) to create an exhibit outline, script, schedule, and budget that fits the original parameters of the Initial Concept phase.

Products include:
Schematic Design Document (11" × 17")

From Developers
- draft exhibit content outline document
- draft label copy
- draft object list (with dimensions and photographs)
- confirmation of all in-kind contributions, media, and objects in writing
- evaluation report
- define the "special" elements
- AV storyboards, prototypes, and sources for most interactives
- define interpretive program and staff needs

From Designers
- floor plan and perspective sketches
- typical graphic format
- draft graphic element schedule
- draft photo/illustration schedule (xerox copies or scans of images)
- specifications and construction drawings for "special" elements that must begin production immediately
- prototypes in production
- study model
- draft color/finish boards

From Project Manager
- a detailed working schedule and budget
- cost estimate for "special" elements and other unknowns

A museumwide presentation or "brown bag" lunch should happen at the beginning of this phase. During this phase there will be a series of content, preliminary design, and budget reviews for each exhibit section. This phase ends with an overall review of the content, design, schedule, and budget.

Phase III: Final Concept/Design Development   **3-6 months**
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Designer

Exhibit and graphic designers work with developers to continue to refine and finalize all exhibit elements i.e., panels, cases, lighting, mechanical/electrical interactives, etc. All elements to be decided upon and design finalized at the end of this phase. Developers produce final (reviewed and proofread) label copy. Project manager to continue budget and schedule surveillance, and begin specifications.

Products include:
Design Development Document (11″ × 17″)
Beginning Construction Documents (30″ × 40″ sheets)

From Developers
- all final text/label copy
- final object list (with dimensions and photographs)
- final delivery of all contributions, media, and objects
- final evaluation of prototypes

From Designers
- all exhibit elements decided and design finalized
- color/material/finish boards
- final prototyping of all interactives
- floor plan and elevations finalized
- revised typical graphic format
- final graphic element invoice
- final photo/illustration invoice (copies or scans of all images)
- final model completed at end of phase

From Project Manager
- revised budgets for all production
- revised production schedule
- send out package for better defined cost estimates
- work with fabricators to review and revise details
- final review for all "special" elements that are in production.

This phase ends with final review and approval of exhibit as a whole (concepts and design) from the president. This phase will include a review by the Program Support staff if they will be installing and/or maintaining the exhibits.

Phase IV: Construction Documents/ Graphic Production   **2-4 months**
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Designer

Exhibit and graphic designers, working with developers, and in/out of house design and production resources, refine the materials to produce working drawings and specifications for construction of all exhibit elements. Project manager to send out final construction documents for bids.

Products include:
Specification Document (8.5″ × 11″)
Final Construction Documents (30″ × 40″ sheets)

From Developers
- initial teachers guide
- start marketing materials
- develop program

From Designers
- final construction documents for all exhibit elements
- all final graphic layouts (all production completed, digitally or otherwise)
- all prototyping revisions completed

From Project Manager
- final specifications (to include quality standards, sample requests, fabrication requirements, etc.)
- final production schedule
- final budgets for all production
- revised installation schedule

The phase ends with completion of all construction documents and graphic production. Completed package is sent out to exhibit fabricator for final bids and construction.

Phase V: Fabrication/Installation   **3-6 months**
Point Person: Project Manager

Working with in and out of house production, project manager, with the help of the designers, oversees the on-time on-budget production and installation of all exhibit elements. Developers prepare program (teacher materials, floor and theater demonstrations, online resources, kits, merchandise, etc.) and other ancillary materials, and are on call for any last-minute details. A museum-wide coordinating committee is formed to prepare for the opening.

From Developers
- staff training in program
- continue program and marketing materials
- initial teacher's guide handed out for feedback

From Designers
- review complete installation of all exhibit elements

From Project Manager
- final installation schedule
- all construction administration
- staff training in maintenance

- oversee and approve construction and installation of all exhibit elements

This phase ends with the complete installation of the exhibit.

Phase VI: Opening and Punch List   1–3 months

All team members spend time on the floor to observe and fix immediate problems and are on call for the press and any problems experienced by floor staff. Developers continue to train and critique program, and they prepare an evaluation scheme for remedial evaluation. Project managers and designers prepare a maintenance manual.

From Developers
- punch list
- staff training continues
- remedial evaluation scheme

From Designers
- punch list
- all exhibit documentation begun
- final graphic layout document (with final text) begun
- all as-built drawings compiled for archives

From Project Manager
- punch list
- maintenance manual begun
- final exhibit report begun

Phase VII: Revisions and Documentation   3–6 months

All team members work on remedial evaluation. Project managers create a revision budget and schedule based on this process and see that it is completed by the end of the revision period. A summative evaluation is designed and completed. Photo documentation is arranged and a complete archive is created that includes press materials, program materials, drawings, media sources, maintenance manual, photos, label copy, materials, and sources for all purchases of replacement materials and any set-asides for future program or maintenance. Developers complete a final report for funders.

Products include:
     Maintenance Manual (8.5″ × 11″)
     Final Exhibit Report (8.5″ × 11″)
     Remedial and Summative Evaluation Reports (8.5″ × 11″)

From Developers
- remedial and summative evaluation
- revised teacher's guide

From Designers
- all exhibit documentation finalized and archived
- final graphic layout document (with final text)
- all as-built drawings completed for archives
- graphic and interactive revisions

From Project Manager
- final shop drawings and maintenance manual
- final exhibit report
- final budget
- proposal for traveling versions, sales of components, or other spin-offs

SUMMARY

Phase I: Initial Concept   3–6 months
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Developer

Phase II: Concept Development/Schematic Design   4–8 months
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Developer

Phase III: Final Concept/Design Development   3–6 months
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Designer

Phase IV: Construction Documents   2–4 months
Point Person: Lead Exhibit Designer

Phase V: Fabrication/Installation   3–6 months
Point Person: Project Manager

Phase VI: Opening and Punch List   1–2 months
Point Person: Project Manager

Phase VII: Revisions and Documentation   3–6 months

Phase II–VI are the five key phases that can take one to two years to complete. The initial Concept Phase can begin long before the exhibit process is initiated, and can last an indefinite amount of time. Grants and proposals are to be completed before Phase I begins. Phase VII also has a more flexible time frame but should be completed within six month period.