



LAWYER TO LAWYER MENTORING PROGRAM

WORKSHEET KK

NEGOTIATION

Worksheet KK is intended to facilitate a discussion about the most important points about negotiation with another lawyer and potential issues associated with negotiations.

WHAT WENT WELL?

Start by sharing with each other a brief story of something that went well in your practice this week:

Share your reflection by on one of these questions: What caused the good event? What does it mean? How did you contribute? Others? How can you have more such events in the future?

ACTIVITIES FOR TODAY

- Discuss how a lawyer should prepare for negotiation of a legal matter, including when and how negotiation should be initiated, particularly in the new lawyer's area of practice.
- Discuss ways to involve the client in negotiation.
- Share with the new lawyer tips for negotiating with an attorney with years of experience, with a friend, with someone you do not get along with, etc.
- Discuss the ethics and professionalism issues in negotiating on behalf of your client.
- Talk about the skills that are needed to be an effective negotiator and how to acquire them.
- Share "best practices" with the new lawyer on how to appropriately deal with others on behalf of your client. Review the tips in the attached article. *What You Need to Know about Dispute Resolution: The Guide to Dispute Resolution Processes* by the American Bar Association at <http://www2.americanbar.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/draftbrochure.pdf>.
- Share with the new lawyer "war" stories of attorneys who have ultimately harmed their client because of their incivility and lack of consideration in dealing with opposing counsel, the judge or the jury.
- Read and discuss the attached. David J. Abeshouse, *Civility and Negotiations*, GPSOLO



MAGAZINE, Oct./Nov. 2005; Stewart Levine, *Developing the Attitude of Resolution*,
LAW PRACTICE TODAY, Sept. 2005.

ACTION STEPS

End the session by discussing what action steps you can take to either improve or set yourself up for future success based on today's discussion. Discuss how one or more of your Signature Strengths can help you achieve success in these steps.



**3rd NATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON THE EMPLOYMENT OF
LAWYERS WITH DISABILITIES**

**May 8, 2012
Washington, DC**

Click to learn more!

Advertisement

[myABA](#) | [About Us](#) | [Join the ABA](#) | [Calendar](#) | [Member Directory](#) | [Shop ABA](#) | [Sign In](#)

Membership	ABA Groups	Resources for Lawyers	Publications & CLE	Advocacy	News
----------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	----------------------



Law Practice Today

ABA LAW PRACTICE MANAGEMENT SECTION
MARKETING • MANAGEMENT • TECHNOLOGY • FINANCE

Law Practice TODAY

Management by Agreement

Resolutionary View: 10 Principles for Developing the Attitude of Resolution

by Stewart Levine

September 2006

A resolutionarySM looks at the situation, and from the perspective of standing in the clients' shoes, tries to design the best process--a process that will get to resolution quickly without making things worse. Learn more about how your firm can incorporate these 10 principles into its culture. It should result in more satisfied clients and employees.

Very few firms or law departments have the luxury of a lawyer operating as a full time manager. One of the occupational hazards, especially of litigators, is to bring the adversary mind set into the management process. This can lead to some very poor results. In this column my aim is to provide 10 principles that make up the "Attitude of Resolution." This attitude is much better suited to managing, motivating, empowering and getting the most out of others. I have also come to believe that in most situations this attitude will engender satisfied clients and more satisfactory relationships, the key to all accomplishment and productivity

During my second year of law school I had my first "real" lawyer's job. I was an intern at a local legal services clinic. On my first day I was handed 25 cases "to work on." This would be my "job" for the semester. Three weeks later I asked the managing attorney for more cases. When he asked about the first 25 he gave me, I told him I resolved them.

He was very surprised--and very curious. He asked how I did it. I told him I reviewed the files, spoke to the clients, thought about a fair outcome and what needed to be done, called the attorney or agency on the other side and reached a satisfactory resolution.

I knew nothing about being a lawyer! I had no idea whether the cases were difficult, needed to take a long time or had to be handled in any particular way. With a beginner's mind, I found the solution that worked best for all concerned. Simple? It was for me.

I spent the next 12 years becoming a successful lawyer--and becoming less effective at resolving matters. Then, feeling frustrated, anxious and fearful, I stopped practicing law. I spent the next 15 years unlearning--recovering what I knew about resolution when I started, discovering its component parts and learning how to teach and model it for others.

I found that the most effective judges and lawyers understand people's real concerns. They know what to honor and what to respect. They know how to frame situations and condition people's expectations. They embody a tradition that accommodates competing concerns and builds consensus. Winning or losing is not the point of their work. Their game is resolution, and getting people back to their lives. They are "resolutionariesSM."

Developing the Attitude of Resolution

The 10 principles that follow reflect the values that make up the attitude of resolution. This attitude is the place of beginning, a critical first step. It is not enough to go through the motions of any dispute resolution process mechanically, without first cultivating an attitude of resolution.

It will take time to change the way lawyers think. The beliefs and patterns you have about conflict took a long time to develop. They are embedded deeply and operate in unconscious ways. It will require reflection, intention and repetition to change our thinking habits about collaboration and conflict. Faith and trust in yourself and others is called for. You can accomplish it.

This is a foundational step. The goal is internalizing the principles.

Principle 1: Abundance. One of the primary contributors to adversity is the belief that "if you get yours, then there won't be enough for me." This is a scarcity mentality. But the most powerful negotiating tactic is to find out what the other side wants and figure out how they can have it. The likelihood is that they will try to do the same for you. In most situations there is enough for everyone to get what they need. Rather than fighting about dividing a small pie, we need to focus on how to make the pie bigger.

Principle 2: Efficiency . We spend a great deal of time and process wasting resources. Often the patient dies while we are operating--the business is ruined or the assets are consumed during the battle. How many times have you seen the marital home, the only asset of a marriage, consumed by the process, or the cost of litigation exceed the amount at stake? How many lawyers have huge, never-to-be-collected receivables? We need to be concerned early on about using resources efficiently, not wasting them.

Principle 3: Creativity. Lawyers are trained to see issues and problems. We spend a good part of our legal education studying adversarial situations. We learn to think in terms of problems and issues. We look for them in every situation instead of focusing our brainpower on the potential creative solutions that will take care of the needs and concerns of all involved. We need to use creative thinking to figure out how everyone can get what they need.

Principle 4: Fostering resolution . A key to becoming a resolutionary is becoming a quick study in process design. The traditional adversarial process often makes the conflict worse. The time it takes and the standard admonition to cut off communication are not very helpful. The other side becomes demonized. As the battle escalates, it becomes the enemy. The systems are systems of "confliction," like pouring gasoline on an already-burning fire.

A resolutionary looks at the situation, and from the perspective of standing in the clients' shoes, tries to design the best process--a process that will get to resolution quickly without making things worse. Bottom line outcomes are more important than following the steps prescribed by some traditional process.

"Mediation is not for Sissies" was written by a colleague a few years ago. The premise is that traditional litigation follows a set of rules and has a degree of predictability, while mediation has no rules ... you go where resolution wants to take you.

Principle 5: Openness. This is not about opening your chest cavity, bearing your soul and putting your heart on your sleeve. It's about telling the truth you believe in the situation, and listening to what others say is their truth. Posturing wastes resources. The sooner people have the opportunity to share their side of a situation directly, the sooner resolution can happen. Hiding behind procedures or rules of evidence does not help the catharsis and disclosure needed to resolve a situation. Authenticity is the key.

Principle 6: Long-term collaborations. The resolutionary uses a context of fostering relationship. This is the basis of all productivity and satisfaction. Even when relationships are broken down, it is possible to see the situation as temporary. The worst conflicts are among people with the deepest relationships. A resolutionary sees relationships as long term. That is a perspective that fosters continuity. When you consider the cost of putting in place new personal or professional relationships, it is obvious that preservation is an important value.

Principle 7: Feelings and intuition. As lawyers, our conditioning is that our primary means of analysis is logic. Resolutionaries understand that legal practice is usually more about life situations and transitions that people experience. In guiding them to satisfactory results, we must go beyond logic and include the human and emotional aspects that impact the personal and professional lives of our clients. Our internalized experience over time also will allow us to trust our own instincts and intuition in advising clients. Given that the transitions and major life transactions we advise clients through are based on personal relationships, we can trust and use the personal assessments on which we base our advice.

Principle 8: Disclosing information. Traditionally, lawyers withhold information. We divulge only what we have to, or what the rules require. We come from the premise that information is king, and the less "you" know the better off "I" am. Anything less than full disclosure creates mistrust and sets up a dynamic that does not contribute to resolution. Resolutionaries encourage communication and disclosure. They realize that the resources consumed in holding on are not worth the cost of trust and getting to the bottom of things.

Principle 9: Learning. Resolutionaries understand that their goal is not to win at all cost, but to share information and discover the concerns on the other side. They hold the conflict resolution process as a learning exercise. Everyone teaches everyone else their perspective and what's behind it. When everyone shares this way, the potential for a creative result--a result beyond expectation--becomes possible. As a law student, this is what I thought litigation was about--getting the best result through shared information.

Principle 10: Being response-able. To be a resolutionary is to see the occurrence in a larger context. Resolutionaries try to foster the development of others. They realize there is a great cultural tendency for people not to do the work of taking responsibility for resolving their own situations and to look for another person to take care of "it" for them. Resolutionaries understand that people learn in adverse situations and they coach their best clients to be responsible. It's easy to exemplify noble character when times are good. This gift gives people the experience of participating in resolving their own conflict, and in the process discovering and experiencing their own character.

Evaluating a Situation the Resolutionary Way

When a matter is presented, resolutionaries ask themselves the following questions:

1. Who has what concerns? What is each person's reality about the situation? (They stand in everyone's shoes so they can treat everyone fairly.)

2. How quickly must action be taken?
3. What is the measurable loss and continuing cost and risk of nonresolution? (They are sensitive to wasting resources.)
4. Who is needed for effective resolution? (They want all essential parties to participate.)
5. How do we get everyone to the table with the right attitude? Who needs an attitude adjustment, and what's the best way to do it? (They realize getting people to the table is more than half the work.)
6. What constraints or environmental conditions exist? (They need to know the context in which the conflict is taking place.)
7. Are there laws, regulations, principles, customs, agreements or other standards for the situation? (They look for objective metrics as a basis for evaluation.)
8. What future relationships are essential? Who will continue together? (They are thinking of the long term.)
9. What is acute and needs immediate attention? (They are concerned with others' resources and damage control.)
10. What's the best action plan? Who will do what, by when? (They understand that the best way to get to a place is to set a goal; in the process you become collaborators and teammates.)

These steps allow you to be an advocate without being an adversary.

When you probe and listen to the underlying concerns of the other side, accommodation and satisfaction for everyone is possible. Solutions can be invented to accommodate the interests of both sides. Sometimes, strong partisan advocating for each side is the best way to understand all parameters of a situation.

You must know the difference between advocating strongly and being adversarial. Many lawyers operating today ignore the difference. Remember that effective resolution comes from relationships created from an honorable attitude. Unfortunately, over the past few years "Rambo" tactics have become commonplace. We all would be well advised to read the best-seller "Everything I Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten."

The core competency of the resolutionary is the ability to lead people to a new vision that returns them to the real business of their lives, without the ongoing internal chatter of continuing conflict. The job of the resolutionary is to lead the client to resume collaboration and cooperation.

The solutions of the resolutionary reestablish the working relationships that are essential for business, family or government activity. They provide options that contribute to the present and future quality of our lives.

Conclusion

Your initial, automatic reaction may be that law is based on an adversarial model, and to suggest otherwise would undermine the system. I suggest that lawyers exist to facilitate the machinery of our institutions-- commercial, governmental, political and charitable. If we are better able to facilitate through collaboration, then that is the way to proceed.

Given the levels of professional unhappiness, client complaints, citizen frustration and costs of conflict, we have little to lose and a huge upside potential. In the great majority of situations, clients will be happier, societal transactions will move forward with less friction, and lawyers will reap the benefit of deeper levels of personal and professional satisfaction as they accomplish their work with, not against, other lawyers.

We have an opportunity to reposition ourselves as conflict resolvers. We can be the solution, not part of the problem. In so doing we will restore pride in the calling we answered.

Shifting a basic premise on which a system is based is no simple matter. But if we miss what people are asking for, we will miss a golden opportunity.

What a Resolutionary Embodies

Resolutionaries have the following qualities and abilities. If you aspire to being a resolutionary, it's time to start cultivating these qualities.

- **Collaboration** --They treat everyone respectfully and are always open to learning.
- **Sense** --They make the complex simple.
- **Confidence** --They know the value they contribute; they act on their assessments.
- **Creativeness and innovativeness** --They design what they need to get the job done.
- **Empathy** --They have compassion; they honor and legitimize everyone's concerns.
- **Fairness** --They understand that tomorrow is another day; winning is not everything.
- **Faith and trust** --They know the situation will be resolved.
- **Open** --They create trust and the presence for people to open up into.
- **Getting to the core** --They have an uncanny ability to see the core of the conflict.
- **Honesty and integrity** --This generates trust in everyone; they walk their talk.
- **Intelligence** --They are smart and aware of what's really going on.
- **Judgment** --They have experience and a sixth sense of what will work.
- **Life experience** --They have high mileage (bald, gray or possessing an old soul).
- **Listening skills** --They listen with their entire presence and hear what isn't said.
- **Control of the process** --They know process is integral to resolution.
- **Open mind** --They are not committed to a particular resolution.

- **Practicality** --They try whatever works.
- **Care for people** --They know it's always a relationship problem.
- **Tolerance for conflict** --They remain centered, grounded and fair in the storm.

Author's Note: Resolutionary SM is a service mark of Stewart Levine. The term was first articulated by a satisfied client in 1991 who, after a very delicate matter, looked at me and exclaimed "you are a resolutionary."

About the Author

Stewart Levine, Esq., is a consultant, trainer, mediator and facilitator. He is the author of the award winning "Getting to Resolution: Turning Conflict Into Collaboration" and the recently released "Book of Agreement" that has been called "more practical than Getting to Yes." www.ResolutionWorks.org.



For the Public ABA
Approved Law Schools Law
School Accreditation Public
Education Public Resources

Resources For Bar
Associations Diversity Lesbian,
Gay, Bisexual &
Transgender
Lawyers Judges Law
Students Lawyers of
Color Lawyers with
Disabilities

Military Lawyers Senior
Lawyers Solo and Small
Firms Women Lawyers Young
Lawyers

Stay Connected Twitter Facebook

What You Need to Know about Dispute Resolution: The Guide to Dispute Resolution Processes

What Is Dispute Resolution?

Dispute resolution is a term that refers to a number of processes that can be used to resolve a conflict, dispute or claim. Dispute resolution may also be referred to as alternative dispute resolution, appropriate dispute resolution, or ADR for short. Dispute resolution processes are alternatives to having a court (state or federal judge or jury) decide the dispute in a trial or other institutions decide the resolution of the case or contract. Dispute resolution processes can be used to resolve any type of dispute including family, neighborhood, employment, business, housing, personal injury, consumer, and environmental disputes. In addition, the United States Federal Government utilizes dispute resolution processes to assist government employees and private citizens resolve complaints and disputes in many areas including workplace, employment, and contracting matters.

◆ *Why Use Dispute Resolution?*

Dispute resolution processes have several advantages. For instance, many dispute resolution processes are cheaper and faster than the traditional legal process. Certain processes can provide the parties involved with greater participation in reaching a solution, as well as more control over the outcome of the dispute. In addition, dispute resolution processes are less formal and have more flexible rules than the trial court.

◆ *What Are the Different Types of Dispute Resolution Processes?*

Dispute resolution takes a number of different forms. Here are brief descriptions of the most common dispute resolution processes:

Arbitration

Arbitration is a private process where disputing parties agree that one or several individuals can make a decision about the dispute after receiving evidence and hearing arguments. Arbitration is different from mediation because the neutral arbitrator has the authority to make a decision about the dispute. The arbitration process is similar to a trial in that the parties make opening statements and present

evidence to the arbitrator. Compared to traditional trials, arbitration can usually be completed more quickly and is less formal. For example, often the parties do not have to follow state or federal rules of evidence and, in some cases, the arbitrator is not required to apply the governing law. After the hearing, the arbitrator issues an award. Some awards simply announce the decision (a "bare bones" award), and others give reasons (a "reasoned" award). The arbitration process may be either binding or non-binding. When arbitration is binding, the decision is final, can be enforced by a court, and can only be appealed on very narrow grounds. When arbitration is non-binding, the arbitrator's award is advisory and can be final only if accepted by the parties.

Case Evaluation

Case evaluation is a non-binding process in which parties to a dispute present the facts and the issues to be determined to an experienced neutral case evaluator. The case evaluator advises the parties on the strengths and weaknesses of their respective positions, and assesses how the dispute is likely to be decided by a jury or other adjudicator. The parties may then use this feedback to help reach a mutually agreeable resolution.

Early Neutral Evaluation

Early neutral evaluation is a process that may take place soon after a case has been filed in court. The case is referred to an expert, usually an attorney, who is asked to provide a balanced and unbiased evaluation of the dispute. The parties either submit written comments or meet in person with the expert. The expert identifies each side's strengths and weaknesses and provides an evaluation of the likely outcome of a trial. This evaluation can assist the parties in assessing their case and may propel them towards a settlement.

Facilitation

Facilitation is a process in which a trained individual assists a group of two or more people to discuss issues to be addressed by the group. This may include assistance in defining and analyzing issues, developing alternatives and executing the agreed upon solutions. A facilitator can help to enhance communication, consensus building and decision making among individuals in a variety of settings, including community, corporate, educational and family groups.

Family Group Conference

Family Group Conference is a meeting between members of a family and members of their extended kinship group. At this meeting, the family becomes involved in making a plan to stop the abuse or other ill-treatment between its members. Family

Group Conferencing involves family and friends in resolving the abuse rather than leaving the decision-making entirely in the hands of the legal authorities and service providers. All participants are given a great deal of preparation, support and protection so that all family members can be both safe and informed in having a say in the decision-making.

Mediation

Mediation is a private process where a neutral third person called a mediator helps the parties discuss and try to resolve the dispute. The parties have the opportunity to describe the issues, discuss their interests, understandings, and feelings; provide each other with information and explore ideas for the resolution of the dispute. While courts can mandate that certain cases go to mediation, the process remains "voluntary" in that the parties are not required to come to agreement. The mediator does not have the power to make a decision for the parties, but can help the parties find a resolution that is mutually acceptable. The only people who can resolve the dispute in mediation are the parties themselves. There are a number of different ways that a mediation can proceed. Most mediations start with the parties together in a joint session. The mediator will describe how the process works, will explain the mediator's role and will help establish ground rules and an agenda for the session. Generally, parties then make opening statements. Some mediators conduct the entire process in a joint session. However, other mediators will move to separate sessions, shuttling back and forth between the parties. If the parties reach an agreement, the mediator may help reduce the agreement to a written contract, which may be enforceable in court.

Mini-Trial

A mini-trial is a private, consensual process where the attorneys for each party make a brief presentation of the case as if at a trial. The presentations are observed by a neutral advisor and by representatives (usually high-level business executives) from each side who have authority to settle the dispute. At the end of the presentations, the representatives attempt to settle the dispute. If the representatives fail to settle the dispute, the neutral advisor, at the request of the parties, may serve as a mediator or may issue a non-binding opinion as to the likely outcome in court.

Multi-Door Program

The name "Multi-Door" comes from the multi-door courthouse concept, which envisions one courthouse with multiple dispute resolution doors or programs. Cases are referred through the appropriate door for resolution. The goals of a multi-door approach are to provide citizens with easy access to justice, reduce delay, and

provide links to related services, making more options available through which disputes can be resolved.

Negotiation

Negotiation is a voluntary and usually informal process in which parties identify issues of concern, explore options for the resolution of the issues, and search for a mutually acceptable agreement to resolve the issues raised. The disputing parties may be represented by attorneys in negotiation. Negotiation is different from mediation in that there is no neutral individual to assist the parties negotiate.

Neutral Fact-Finding

Neutral fact-finding is a process where a neutral third party, selected either by the disputing parties or by the court, investigates an issue and reports or testifies in court. The neutral fact-finding process is particularly useful for resolving complex scientific and factual disputes.

Ombuds

An ombuds is a third party selected by an institution—for example, a university, hospital or governmental agency—to investigate complaints by employees, clients or constituents. The ombuds works within the institution to investigate the complaints independently and impartially. The process is voluntary, private and non-binding.

Parenting coordination

Parent coordination is a child-focused alternative dispute resolution process in which a mental health or legal professional with mediation training and experience assists high conflict parents to implement their parenting plan by facilitating the resolution of their disputes in a timely manner, educating parents about children's needs, and with prior approval of the parties and/or the court, making decisions within the scope of the court order or appointment contract.

Pro Tem Trial

Pro Tem trials are similar to other civil trials, but the parties choose their own trial date and the court appoints an attorney to serve as a temporary (Pro Tem) judge for the trial. The pro tem judge has all the same powers of a regular judge, and will make a decision based on the evidence and arguments presented during the trial. Each side in a pro tem trial must follow the same rules and legal procedures as parties who have a trial in the courthouse. There is no option for a jury trial. The parties must provide their own court reporter. Depending on court rules, the decision of the Pro Tem judge may be appealable in the public courts.

Private Judging

Private judging is a process where the disputing parties agree to retain a neutral person as a private judge. The private judge, who is often a former judge with expertise in the area of the dispute, hears the case and makes a decision in a manner similar to a judge. Depending on court rules, the decision of the private judge may be appealable in the public courts.

Settlement Conferences

A settlement conference is a meeting in which a judge or magistrate assigned to the case presides over the process. The purpose of the settlement conference is to try to settle a case before the hearing or trial. Settlement conferencing is similar to mediation in that a third party neutral assists the parties in exploring settlement options. Settlement conferences are different from mediation in that settlement conferences are usually shorter and typically have fewer roles for participation of the parties or for consideration of nonlegal interests.

Special Master

The role of the special master (who is frequently, but not necessarily, an attorney) is to supervise those falling under the order of the court to make sure that the court order is being followed, and to report on the activities of the entity being supervised in a timely matter to the judge or the judge's designated representatives. Special masters often accompany peace officers in searches for documentary evidence in the possession of or under the control of attorneys, physicians, psychotherapists and clergy.

Summary Jury Trial

In summary jury trials, attorneys for each party make abbreviated case presentations to a mock six member jury (drawn from a pool of real jurors), the party representatives and a presiding judge or magistrate. The mock jury renders an advisory verdict. The verdict is frequently helpful in getting a settlement, particularly where one of the parties has an unrealistic assessment of their case.

◆ *If I Participate in Dispute Resolution, Can I Later File a Lawsuit?*

In most instances, dispute resolution processes do not preclude parties from later pursuing their case in court if they fail to reach a resolution. Parties can use dispute resolution before, or even after, they have filed a case in court. However, binding arbitration is final and prevents a party from bringing a court action.

◆ *Do I Need an Attorney to Participate in Dispute Resolution?*

In many processes, you are not required to have an attorney to participate. In cases where the court or judge has referred the case to a dispute resolution process, attorneys often participate. The role of an attorney in a dispute resolution process

varies depending upon the nature of the dispute and the type of dispute resolution process. In many dispute resolution processes, attorneys accompany their clients and participate either as counselors or as advocates.

- ***Who Uses Dispute Resolution?***

The American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution has developed a clearinghouse of contact information in order to track the growth of court ADR and provide basic details to court personnel, members of the public and practicing attorneys regarding the specific programs available in various jurisdictions.

The clearinghouse includes information about the type of cases handled by each program, the ADR processes offered, as well as statutory authorizations and relevant rules.

The catalog has a listing of ADR points of contact, with phone numbers and e-mail addresses (where available), at a variety of court levels. In addition, each listing has a brief synopsis of the type(s) of ADR program the court manages and its scope.

In all, 227 programs are included in the database. Of those 227 programs, 149 are federal district court programs, 13 are federal appellate programs and the remaining 65 are state court programs. We assigned the 65 state court programs to different categories, depending upon the mission, location, and authority of the program. The 65 programs were divided into the following categories:

- Centrally administered state court ADR program (not located in the AOC): (23 programs)
- Dispute Resolution program within the state administrative office of the courts (AOC): (14 programs)
- Locally administered court programs: (10 programs)
- State-wide office of dispute resolution (7 programs)
- Other state: (4 programs)
- Program based in a state bar association: (2 programs)
- State appellate court program: (2 programs)

- Program based in a university: (1 program)

The clearinghouse includes information about the type of processes offered by each program:

- 23 programs reported that they offer Early Neutral Evaluation (15 federal district court programs and eight state court programs)
- 88 programs reported that they offer mediation
 - 59 programs reported that they offer mediation (not specified as voluntary or mandatory) (4 federal appellate courts, 22 federal district courts, 31 state court programs)
 - 20 programs reported that they offer voluntary mediation (3 federal district courts, 17 state court programs)
 - 9 programs reported that they offer mandatory Mediation (1 federal district court, 8 state court appellate programs)
- 48 programs reported that they offer arbitration
 - 25 programs did not specify whether their program is voluntary or mandatory (5 federal district courts and 27 state court programs)
 - 3 state court programs include mandatory arbitration
 - 20 programs offer voluntary arbitration (3 federal district, 17 state court programs)
- 30 programs offer settlement conferences (17 federal district; one federal appellate, 12 state programs)
- 10 programs (2 federal district and 8 state programs) offer summary jury trials
- 6 federal district courts offer summary bench trials
- 6 courts offer non-binding arbitration (3 federal district, 3 state court)
- 5 courts offer mini-trials (3 federal district, 2 state)
- 3 state programs offer facilitation
- 2 programs (1 federal district and one state) offer med-arb
- 1 state court program reported offering pro tem trials
- 2 state court programs reported offering Parenting coordination

- 2 state court programs reported offering family group conferencing
- 2 state court programs offer special masters
- 2 state court programs reported having a multi-door program
- 1 state court program offers case management

For more information:

ABA Section of Dispute Resolution
<http://www.abanet.org/dispute>

Mediation Information and Resource
Center
<http://www.mediate.com>

American Arbitration Association
<http://www.adr.org>

National Arbitration Forum
<http://www.arbitration-forum.com>

Association of Family and Conciliation
Courts
<http://www.afccnet.org>

National Association for Community
Mediation
<http://www.nafcm.org>

Association for Conflict Resolution
<http://www.acresolution.org>

Network of Communities for
Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution
<http://www.apecemaker.net>

Center for Analysis of ADR Systems
<http://www.caads.org>

Policy Consensus Initiative
<http://www.policyconsensus.org>

Conflict Resolution and Information
Network
<http://www.CRInfo.org>

U.S. Department of Justice Office of
Dispute Resolution
<http://www.usdoj.gov/odr>

CPR Institute for Dispute Resolution
<http://www.cpradr.org>

Victim Offender Mediation Association
<http://www.voma.org/>

JAMS
<http://www.jamsadr.org>

The Guide to Dispute Resolution Processes was made possible by the American Bar Association with the support of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The Guide is a service of the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution. The ABA hereby grants permission for copies of the materials herein to be made, in whole or in part, for classroom use in an institution of higher learning or for use by not-for-profit organizations, provided that the use is for informational, non-commercial purposes only and any copy of the materials or portion thereof acknowledges original publication by the ABA, including the title of the publication, the name of the author, and the legend "Reprinted by permission of the American Bar Association. All rights reserved." Requests to reproduce portions of this publication in any other manner should be sent to the Director, Copyrights & Contracts, American Bar Association.

ABA Section of Dispute Resolution
740 15th St. NW
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 662-1680
Fax: (202) 662-1683
Dispute@abanet.org
<http://www.abanet.org/dispute>