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TIPS FOR NAVIGATING THE CONFERENCE

CONFERENCE APP

• Navigate the conference with your computer or device.
  – View program materials for the educational programs
  – Read presenter biographies
  – Search for programs by topics and keywords of interest to you
  – Create your own Schedule
  – Connect with attendees
• Look for the ABA Conference Connections e-mails for information on how to access the App
• For on-site assistance using the Conference App, see the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Table in the Exhibit Hall.

Go directly to mobile markets to download the app: https://crowd.cc/s/tbQ0
To access the App on your browser: https://crowd.cc/spring2017
Event Code: Spring2017

PROGRAM MATERIALS

The program materials are available to attendees in two electronic formats:

• Online PDF compilation, URL e-mailed to all registrants in the Conference Connections e-mails. Because of production deadlines Online PDF Compilation only includes materials provided to the ABA by March 24th.
• Conference App. The conference App is the most comprehensive source for materials.

The ABA does not provide any printed materials.

EVALUATION

We want your feedback! Did you find a session helpful, informative, insightful, or not so much? Complete the session and speaker evaluations in the conference app.

SOCIAL MEDIA

We encourage conference attendees to use social media to make the most of their conference:
Twitter: #Spring2017

CLE

Information on how to get your CLE credits is at the back of this Program Book. Please note that not all ABA DR Section Spring Conference programs are CLE programs. The Program at a Glance, Program Descriptions, and program listings in the app include a “CLE Program” or “Not for CLE” label indicating whether or not the program is accredited for CLE.
The options for wireless Internet are:

**We know wireless access is important during the conference.**

Hyatt Regency hotel guests have access to free wireless in their hotel rooms.

While in the conference meeting rooms, attendees can purchase access to wireless directly from the hotel.

**HYATT REGENCY MEETING SPACE INTERNET**

To purchase internet, connect to the Hyatt Meeting network and open an internet browser.

Internet is $25 per day for up to 5Mbps and will work in all meeting spaces.

Once you select Purchase Access, a page will open and you will be prompted to enter your credit card:
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### PROGRAMS AT A GLANCE

**Wednesday, April 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM to 5:00 PM</td>
<td>ABA Registration Open</td>
<td>Market St. Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM to 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Court Symposium Coffee Hour</td>
<td>Market St. Foyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Symposium on ADR in the Courts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM to 10:30 AM</td>
<td>Symposium on ADR in the Courts Plenary: A Conversation with Judge Jeremy Fogel</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM to 10:45 AM</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td>Market St. Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM to 12:00 PM</td>
<td>Court Symposium Concurrent Sessions</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Evaluation in Civil Court Mediations: How to Facilitate an Inherently Evaluative Discussion</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM to 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 PM to 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Court Symposium Concurrent Sessions</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practices and Lessons Learned: Baltimore’s Rent Court ADR Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM to 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td>Market St. Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to 4:15 PM</td>
<td>Court Symposium Concurrent Sessions</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Many Statutes and Rules, One Mediation Best Practice Guide</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Seac1iff C/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM to 5:00 PM</td>
<td>ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Council Meeting</td>
<td>Pacific M/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Implicit Bias Seminar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM to 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Implicit Bias Fact or Fiction: Effects on Mediator Neutrality and the Mediation Process</td>
<td>Pacific H/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM to 4:15 PM</td>
<td>Does Your Commitment to Neutrality Translate Into Better Judgment?</td>
<td>Pacific H/I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Representation in Mediation Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM to 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Representation in Mediation Competition Round 1 Orientation</td>
<td>Pacific M/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM to 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Representation in Mediation Competition Round 2 Orientation</td>
<td>Pacific M/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ABA Leadership Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM to 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Pacific G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM to 5:00 PM</td>
<td>ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Council Meeting</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM to 6:00 PM</td>
<td>Distinguished Emeritus Chairs</td>
<td>Regency B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM to 7:00 PM</td>
<td>ABA Registration Open</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM to 7:00 PM</td>
<td>Exhibit Hall Open</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM to 8:15 AM</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast and Committee Networking Meetings</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ombuds Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy, Consensus Building, and Democracy Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court ADR Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Securities ADR Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welcome Conference Newcomers Table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check the Conference App for additional Committee Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM to 8:15 AM</td>
<td>ABA DR Section Committee on Committees Meeting</td>
<td>Regency B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(working meeting for members of the Committee on Committees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM to 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Mediation Competition Semi-Finals Orientation</td>
<td>Pacific E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM to 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Implicit Bias: The Illusion of Neutrality Presented by Eva Jefferson</td>
<td>Grand Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM to 10:15 AM</td>
<td>Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 AM to 11:45 AM</td>
<td>Concurrent Series A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid Dispute Resolution Processes – Mediation, Arbitration &amp; In Between – Part I</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embodied Conflict: The Roots of Conflict in Basic Neural Function</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispute Systems in Context: Who Do They Benefit?</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arbitration Update</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyers as Peacemakers and Changemakers</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Healthcare Issues for ADR Professionals: A Primer</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resume Workshop: Tips, Do’s and Don’ts for ADR Professionals</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Party Funding in ADR - What You Need to Know</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Conflict Resolution: Establishing Ombuds Programs in K-12 Schools</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 AM to 1:15 PM</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROGRAMS AT A GLANCE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM to 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Advisory Committee Meeting (Open to members of the advisory Committee)</td>
<td>Golden Gate</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM to 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Meetings of ABA Task Forces and Boards</td>
<td>Baysview B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership Engagement Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM to 5:00 PM</td>
<td>Representation in Mediation Competition Final Round Orientation</td>
<td>Pacific E</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM to 2:30 PM</td>
<td>Hybrid Dispute Resolution Processes – Mediation, Arbitration &amp; In Between – Part II</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Offline and Online Networking in the Digital Age</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Pacific F/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How Modern Sales Theory Can be Effectively Used in Mediation</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific H/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADR Around the World: Country Developments, Global Trends</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power to the People: Addressing Power Imbalances in Employment Mediations</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgiveness: Why It Matters in Mediation</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tricky Business: Avoiding the Pitfalls of Drafting Awards</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Trust and Resilience in Divided Communities</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Mediator’s Role in Managing Electronic Discovery</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINRA Securities Dispute Resolution – What Lies Beyond the Task Force?</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Seacliff D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 PM to 2:45 PM</td>
<td>Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 PM to 3:45 PM</td>
<td>Starting a Successful Career in ADR: Tips From ADR Users</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Pacific F/G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Perspectives on ODR: A Conversation with the Authors of The New Handshake and Digital Justice</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific H/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building a Reflective Practitioner Group: A Tool Kit for the Reflective Practitioner</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing the World to the US: Development of an international commercial and family business mediation practice in the U.S.</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Pacific K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOIA and Mediation: Together at Last</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Pacific L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Dispute Resolution – Making Resolution of Disputes Within The First 60 Days A Reality</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Justice for Separated and Divorcing Families: The Search for a Multidisciplinary Perspective</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff A/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will Your ADR Neutrals’ Disclosures Meet Party Expectations?</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Dispute Resolution: Lessons from the Healthcare Trenches</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 PM to 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROGRAMS AT A GLANCE (continued)

### Program At A Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4:00 PM to 5:15 PM | **Showcase Programs D**  
Arbitration in the Media: Insights and Resources for Practitioners, Academics, and Journalists CLE Program Grand A Street Level  
How Technology is Shaping the Future of ADR Practice CLE Program Grand B Street Level  
A Winning Alternative to Lawsuits: Resolving Legal Claims with Structured Negotiation CLE Program Grand C Street Level |
| 5:30 PM to 7:00 PM | **Conference Reception in the Exhibit Hall**  
Sponsored by University of Missouri Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution and the National Academy of Arbitrators, Research and Education Fund |
| 7:00 PM to TBD | Thursday Evening Dine-Arounds — Go to the Conference App for additional details |

### Friday, April 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM | Registration Open  
7:00 AM to 5:00 PM | Exhibit Hall Open  
7:00 AM to 7:45 AM | **Friday Morning Breakfast and Committee Meetings**  
Mediation Committee  
Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR) Committee  
Government Committee  
Welcome Conference Newcomers  
**Check the Conference App for additional Committee Meetings**  
7:00 AM to 8:00 AM | Dispute Resolution Magazine Editorial Board (working meeting for the editorial board) Regency B Street Level  
8:00 AM to 9:30 AM | **Friday Morning Plenary: The Power Paradox** presented by Dacher Keltner Not for CLE Grand Ballroom Street Level  
8:00 AM to 11:00 AM | Attendee quiet room Pacific J Concourse  
9:30 AM to 9:45 AM | Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall Grand Foyer Street Level  
9:45 AM to 11:00 AM | **Concurrent Series E**  
Cutting Edge Issues For Managing Complex Cases: Part I, Pre-Hearing CLE Program Bayview A Bay Level  
Strange Bedfellows: Achieving Dispute Resolution Success with Hybrid Techniques and Neutral Experts CLE Program Pacific D Concourse  
Evolutionary or Revolutionary: Applying the Model Standards to ODR CLE Program Pacific F Concourse  
Teaching Negotiation on the Tower of Babel: Strategies in a Cross-Cultural Classroom or Workplace CLE Program Pacific H Concourse  
Strategic Negotiations: The Right Number at the Wrong Time is the Wrong Number CLE Program Pacific I Concourse  
Opportunities for Mediators in the Collaborative Process CLE Program Pacific K Concourse  
The Art of Recognizing Transformative Moments in Mediation CLE Program Pacific L Concourse  
The Power Paradox and Mediation: Using Power as a Force for Good CLE Program Seacliff A/B Bay Level  
Rekindle Your Flame: A Revitalizing Workshop Not for CLE Seacliff C/D Bay Level |
# PROGRAMS AT A GLANCE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM to</td>
<td>Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 AM</td>
<td>Concurrent Series F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 AM to</td>
<td>Cutting Edge Issues For Managing Complex Cases: Part 2, Hearings</td>
<td>Bayview A</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 PM</td>
<td>The Future of Conflict Coaching in the Federal Sector</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 PM</td>
<td>Mediating the Muslim Couples’ Marriage and Divorce</td>
<td>Pacific E</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-verbal Communication in ADR in an International World</td>
<td>Pacific F</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Caucus: Using Neuroscience to Adapt Community and Family Mediation</td>
<td>Pacific H</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 PM to</td>
<td>Stories Mediators Tell Around The World</td>
<td>Pacific I</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>What I’m Reading</td>
<td>Pacific J</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 PM</td>
<td>Mediation Research Task Force Committee Meeting (Working meeting for</td>
<td>Regency B</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members of the task force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>Ethical Problems That Arise In Arbitrations And Strategies For</td>
<td>Bayview A</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Dealing With Them</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>Emotionally Intelligent Mediation: What’s Emotion Got To Do With It?</td>
<td>Pacific D</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Managing Positive and Negative Emotions To Reach Resolution</td>
<td>Pacific K</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>Mediation Confidentiality Reconsidered: What’s on the horizon Here in</td>
<td>Pacific E</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>California and Nationwide?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>A New Way of Thinking About Mediation and Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>Pacific F</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Making Negotiation Theory More Helpful for Practitioners</td>
<td>Pacific H</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>Inter-Faith Efforts at Peacemaking</td>
<td>Pacific I</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Resolving Technology and IP Disputes with Online Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Pacific K</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>How to Make Your Mediation Advocacy More Effective</td>
<td>Pacific M</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Black and Blue: Healing the Divide in Police-Community Relations</td>
<td>Pacific L</td>
<td>Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>Fly on the Wall: Videos of Diverse Mediator Styles</td>
<td>Seacliff A/B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Pathways to Success: How to Avoid Mistakes and Create A Thriving</td>
<td>Seacliff C/D</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 PM to</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM to</td>
<td>Pathways to Success: How to Avoid Mistakes and Create A Thriving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 PM to 4:30 PM</td>
<td>Concurrent Series H</td>
<td>Bayview A/B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring the Expertise in Expert Opinion</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Bayview A/B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Every Mediator Needs to Know About Psychology</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific D</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When &quot;Yes&quot; Means &quot;No&quot;: Rethinking Informed Consent to Dispute Resolution Procedures</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific E</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Views of the Mediator's Role in Promoting Justice: Perspectives from the East and West</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Pacific F</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Ethics</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific H</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Restorative Practices in Mediation of Civil Rights Cases</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific I</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing Cost Effective and Productive Expert Solutions to Maximize Settlement</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Pacific K</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Vulnerability to Resolution: the Role and Value of Respect and Understanding</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Pacific L</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers Speak: What Gets A Mediator Hired (Or Not)</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff A/B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Mediators Learn to Have Difficult Conversations: Training Techniques</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff C/D</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 PM to 4:45 PM</td>
<td>Coffee Break in the Exhibit Hall</td>
<td>Grand Foyer</td>
<td>Street Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM to 5:45 PM</td>
<td>Legal Educators’ Colloquium Resource Share</td>
<td>Bayview B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 PM to 5:45 PM</td>
<td>Friday Afternoon Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Seacliff A/B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy, Consensus Building, and Democracy</td>
<td>Pacific G</td>
<td>Pacific Concourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Dispute Resolution Committee</td>
<td>Seacliff A/B</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM to 7:30 PM</td>
<td>ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Awards Reception (ticketed event)</td>
<td>Bayview A</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 PM to TBD</td>
<td>Friday Evening Dine-Arounds -- Check Conference App for details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saturday, April 22**

**Legal Educators Colloquium**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM to 1:00 PM</td>
<td>Registration Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 AM to 8:20 AM</td>
<td>Legal Educators Colloquium Breakfast</td>
<td>Seaciff Foyer</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored by UC Hastings Center for Negotiation and Dispute Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20 AM to 9:20 AM</td>
<td>Colloquium Sunrise Program</td>
<td>Seaciff A</td>
<td>Bay Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dialogue through Difference: Expanding the Legal Skill Set | Not for CLE | Seacliff A | Bay Level |
| 9:20 AM to 9:30 AM | Coffee Break                                                        | Seaciff Foyer  | Bay Level   |
## PROGRAMS AT A GLANCE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM to 11:00 AM</td>
<td><strong>Colloquium Concurrent Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems Analysis as Applied to the Field of Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Grand C Street</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrating Research-Based Skills into Your Regular Mediation Practice</td>
<td>CLE Program</td>
<td>Seacliff A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ABA Standards and Dispute Resolution Courses: Quintessentially Experiential</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM to 11:15 AM</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15 AM to 12:30 PM</td>
<td><strong>Colloquium Concurrent Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What the World Needs Now: Restorative Practices</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Mediation To Law Students, Part 2: Assessment</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 PM to 1:45 PM</td>
<td><strong>Legal Educators Colloquium Luncheon (ticketed event)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM to 3:15 PM</td>
<td><strong>Colloquium Afternoon Shoptalk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Diversity as a Law School Course</td>
<td>Not for CLE</td>
<td>Seacliff C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Join Us Next Year in Washington, DC

**ABA Section of Dispute Resolution**

**2018 Spring Conference**

**April 4-7, 2018 • Washington Hilton**

- Educational Programs on all topics related to dispute resolution
- Multiple Networking Opportunities
- Symposium on ADR in the Courts
- Legal Educators Colloquium
- 70+ Concurrent programs (includes CLE and non-CLE educational programs)

Information about how to submit a proposal for an educational program and other events will be available in June, 2017. Section of Dispute Resolution members should look for program proposal instructions in the *Just Resolutions E-newsletter* and *Dispute Resolution Magazine*. 
AWARDS

ABA SECTION OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION AWARDS RECEPTION
FRIDAY EVENING, APRIL 21

2017 D’Alemberte-Raven Award
Ethan Katsh, the recipient of the 2017 D’Alemberte-Raven Award, a professor at University of Massachusetts Amherst. He is known as the founder for his online dispute resolution (ODR) and co-conducting the eBay Pilot Project in 1999. Katsh also co-wrote Online Dispute Resolution: Resolving Conflicts in Cyberspace in 2001. The D’Alemberte Raven Award recognizes leaders in the dispute resolution community for their significant contributions to the field.

2017 John W. Cooley Lawyer as Problem Solver Awards
The individual recipient, Lainey Feingold, is a U.S. disability rights lawyer, author, and speaker who represents the blind community on technology, digital, and information access issues. She is acknowledged for using a dispute resolution process for negotiating landmarks without lawsuits. The American Bar Association published Lainey’s award winning book titled Structured Negotiation. The JAMS Foundation, the institutional award recipient, is a grant making foundation that inspires the use of alternative dispute resolution, supports education, and advances settlement of conflict worldwide. The funding of the Foundation comes completely from contributions from JAMS, JAMS Neutrals and JAMS employee Associates.

2017 Chair’s Distinguished Service Award
Section Chair Nancy Welsh will present the Chair’s Award to James J. Alfini, former Section Chair, current delegate to the ABA House of Delegates, and long-time supporter and champion of the Section of Dispute Resolution

2017 Warren Knight Award
At the Friday evening awards reception the JAMS Foundation will present the 2017 Warren Knight Award to the Mosaic Project in Oakland, CA. The Mosaic Project works to build a peaceful future by addressing issues of difference and creating healthy, inclusive communities across race, culture and class. Innovative programs for young children, older students, teachers and families help to reinforce these critical life skills and broaden their impact in the wider community.

LEGAL EDUCATORS COLLOQUIUM LUNCHEON
SATURDAY, APRIL 22

2017 ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Award for Outstanding Scholarly Work
Professor Andrea Kupfer Schneider has been named the 2017 recipient of the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Award for Outstanding Scholarly Work. She is a Professor of Law and the Director of the ADR program at Marquette University School of Law. A prolific scholar, Professor Schneider has focused on increasing the reach of dispute resolution scholarship into international and interdisciplinary realms. She focuses on negotiation, international relations, and pedagogy. Schneider has incorporated a range of social science research into her work such as psychology, economics, and political science. The ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Award for Outstanding Scholarly Work honors individuals whose scholarship has significantly contributed to the dispute resolution field.

The Friday Awards Reception and the Legal Educators Colloquium Luncheon are ticketed events. A limited number of tickets will be available from the ABA Registration Desk in the Grand Foyer.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19

The conference events on Wednesday include the Symposium on ADR in the Courts for court ADR administrators, judges, neutrals, and researchers. On Wednesday afternoon, there is a seminar on Implicit Bias. Attendance at the Wednesday programs is included in the full conference registration. Those who wish to only attend the Wednesday programs should purchase a one-day Wednesday conference registration. Other Wednesday events include the ABA Law School Representation in Mediation Competition Nationals and the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Council Meeting.

ABA Registration Open ........................................ 8:00 am – 5:00 pm
 Market Street Foyer

Symposium on ADR in the Courts

Symposium Networking Coffee ................................. 8:00 am – 9:00 am
 Market Street Foyer

Symposium Opening Plenary .................................. 9:00 am – 10:30 am
 A Conversation with Judge Jeremy Fogel
 Grand Ballroom B, Street Level
 Join in a conversation with the Honorable Jeremy D. Fogel, Director of The Federal Judicial Center, as Howard Herman (former Section Chair and ADR Program Director, N.D.Ca.) visits with Judge Fogel about his extensive career and long-standing support of ADR in the courts.

The Honorable Jeremy D. Fogel, Director, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, District of Columbia
Howard Herman, U.S. District Court, N.D. California, San Francisco, California

CLE Program

Coffee Break ....................................................... 10:30 am – 10:45 am
 Market Street Foyer

Court Symposium Concurrent Programs .................. 10:45 am – 12:00 pm
 Case Evaluation in Civil Court Mediations: How to Facilitate an Inherently Evaluative Discussion
 Grand Ballroom B, Street Level
 Civil court mediations often are characterized by positional bargaining, in which the parties try to achieve the value of their case by old fashioned bargaining. When the parties become locked in their positions, it has become common place for civil court mediators to slip into the role of a neutral evaluator to move their clients through the bargaining process. This session explores a more facilitative, and less directive, approach in helping the parties evaluate their case, principally by the use of well framed, and well placed questions instead of the opinions of the mediator. The speaker is the author of the ABA published book, Making Money Talk: How to Mediate the Settlement of Insured Claims.
J. Anderson (Andy) Little, Mediation, Inc, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

CLE Program
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19 (continued)

Court ADR: What New Research Tells Us About Parties, Neutrals, and Judges
Pacific H/I, Pacific Concourse Level
Join us to learn about and discuss the latest research findings on state and federal court ADR. The panelists will present results from four multi-year projects: a multi-court study of litigant preferences for dispute resolution procedures; a comprehensive five-year study of ADR in the Maryland state courts; a study of judges in the Indiana state courts; and a study of ADR in eight federal district courts. Among other topics, the panelists will touch on research methodologies; the latest findings about how litigants evaluate dispute resolution procedures and their ability to identify their court’s ADR offerings; procedural justice issues; and the latest findings about how judges evaluate dispute resolution procedures.
Victor D. Quintanilla, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Donna Shestowsky, University of California, Davis, California
Donna Stienstra, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, District of Columbia
Nick White, MACRO Maryland Judiciary’s Mediation and Conflict Resolution Office, Annapolis, Maryland

CLE Program

Lunch Break .......................................................... 12:00 – 1:30 pm
Lunch-Arounds organized by members and attendees. Check the conference App for lunch options and suggestions.

Court Symposium Concurrent Programs ..................................... 1:30 pm – 2:45 pm

From Research to Action: Rethinking ADR in the Courts, Part II
Seacliff C/D, Bay Level
In mediation, what skills matter most? This highly interactive session will build on the ground-breaking research in Maryland reported last year to ask (and answer) the question, “What’s next?” Attendees will take a critical look at their own skills and, using movie clips, explore the strategies that we now know empower and enhance the parties’ experiences in ADR. We’ll practice these skills and talk about why they matter. Come spend time with two of the Maryland ADR behavior coders (and Jonathan) who observed these cases live and in action. It’ll be fun, informative, and will rock your mediation world!
Gretchen A. Kainz, District Court of Maryland, Annapolis, Maryland
Jonathan S. Rosenthal, Maryland Mediation and Conflict Resolution Office, Annapolis, Maryland
Emmett J. Ward, Maryland Judiciary MACRO, Annapolis, Maryland

CLE Program

Best Practices and Lessons Learned: Baltimore’s Rent Court ADR Program
Seacliff A, Bay Level
In April 2016, the District Court of Maryland launched the state’s first ADR program dedicated exclusively to Failure to Pay Rent dockets. The ADR program sought to improve the court experience for landlords, agents, and tenants in Baltimore City’s Rent Court by offering same-day mediation as an alternative to otherwise unfacilitated hallway settlements or summary trial. On the eve of the program’s first anniversary, this interactive session will explore the history of the program and lessons learned, as the Chief Judge of the District Court and the Regional ADR Director share program design, challenges, statistics, and best practices.
Shannon M. Baker, District Court of Maryland Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Office, Annapolis, Maryland
John P. Morrissey, District Court of Maryland, Annapolis, Maryland

Not for CLE
**WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19 (continued)**

**The State of the State ADR Offices**  
*Seacliff B, Bay Level*  
Offices of dispute resolution in the states’ judiciary, executive branch, and universities have been a primary impetus for the implementation and growth of mediation programs since as early as 1981. In this highly interactive session, the panel and attendees will discuss the characteristics, successes, and challenges of these statewide ADR offices, including the impact of recent fiscal and structural changes and strategies for building, maintaining, and enhancing these offices. The session will include information about a national study of court-connected ADR programs that is being conducted on behalf of the Section of Dispute Resolution.

Thomas G. Ross, Maryland Judiciary, Centreville, Maryland  
Alan Wiener, MACRO (Maryland Judiciary Mediation and Conflict Resolution Office), Annapolis, Maryland  

*Not for CLE*

**Coffee Break**  
*Market Street Foyer*  
2:30 pm – 3:00 pm

**Court Symposium Concurrent Programs**  
*3:00 pm – 4:15 pm*  

**From Many Statutes and Rules, One Mediation Best Practice Guide**  
*Seacliff A, Bay Level*  
This program will present information about Utah State Courts’ new Mediator Best Practice Guide and discussion with colleagues and peers what other courts and jurisdictions are doing in regards to Mediator Best Practices.

Royal I. Hansen, Utah Third District Court, Salt Lake City, Utah  
James R. Holbrook, University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Nini Rich, Utah State Administrative Office of the Courts, Salt lake City, Utah  
Stacy M. Roberts, Administrative Office of the Courts, Salt Lake City, Utah  

*Not for CLE*

**When Mediators Listen, People Talk; When ADR Program Administrators Talk, Who Listens?**  
*Seacliff B, Bay Level*  
We do! This is a talking and listening session. A challenges and solutions session. A get-it-off-your-chest and hearing-new-ideas session. You’re the subject matter expert in program administration and perhaps a seasoned neutral wondering how to maintain and grow court ADR programs in an era that has seen budget cuts, meanwhile, other programs like problem-solving and specialty courts are receiving tens of millions of dollars in funding. Bring your topics, prepare to share challenges and be receptive to possible solutions and opportunities.

Doug Van Epps, Michigan Supreme Court, Lansing, Michigan  

*Not for CLE*

**Special Masters: A Way of Bringing Alternatives Into Judicial Dispute Resolution**  
*Seacliff C/D, Bay Level*  
Courts have had substantial success bringing the skills of mediation and conciliating into the courthouse. But it is much rarer for them to use adjudicative ADR to help fashion cases, reduce costs, mitigate burdens on the judiciary, and bring matters to faster resolution. This panel explores whether and how courts could make creative use of special masters to bring alternative dispute resolution into the courthouse.

Merril Jay Hirsh (Moderator), Troutman Sanders, LLP, Washington, District of Columbia  
Brittany K.T. Kaufman, IAALS, Denver, Colorado  
Shira A. Scheindlin, JAMS, New York, New York  
Peter Vogel, Gardere, Dallas, Texas  

*CLE Program*
ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Implicit Bias Seminar . . . . . . . . . . 1:00 – 5:00 pm

1:00 – 2:30 pm

Implicit Bias Fact or Fiction: Effects on Mediator Neutrality and the Mediation Process

Pacific H/I, Pacific Concourse Level

Implicit bias may be defined as the attitudes or stereotypes that affect our understanding, actions, and decisions in an unconscious manner. One of the cornerstones of mediation is party autonomy in the selection of a mediator to resolve the dispute. Parties are free to select any mediator they desire to resolve conflict. Another widely held belief which is much touted as an advantage of the mediation process is mediator neutrality. The conflict will be resolved by a third party neutral who will act in a non-biased manner to help the parties to reach settlement. This session will focus on how implicit bias influences the mediation process in various unconscious and subtle ways such as the selection of the mediator by the attorney, the manner in which attorneys treat the mediator, mediator neutrality during the mediation proceedings and the effect these biases have on the outcome of the dispute.

Shirish Gupta, JAMS, San Francisco, California
Frederick Hertz, Law & Mediation Office of Frederick Hertz, Oakland, California
Jaya Sharma, 4N Consultants Inc, Madison, Wisconsin

CLE Program
Primary Track: Implicit Bias Seminar
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, Research, Skills
Sponsored By: Diversity Committee

Coffee Break
Market Street Foyer

2:45 – 4:15 pm

Does Your Commitment to Neutrality Translate Into Better Judgment?

Pacific H/I, Pacific Concourse Level

We expect decision makers, including judges and arbitrators, as well as mediators, to be fair and impartial. Neutrals commit to those principles and adhere to ethical standards/codes that demand impartiality. Yet, social science research has shown that even those who are consciously committed to ideals of equality are still likely to hold implicit biases. Moreover, sometimes the belief that we are impartial increases bias. In an interactive setting that will engage the attendees in experiential learning, this program will address why we have to do more to address implicit biases and how we can do so without making matters worse.

Laura A. Kaster, Appropriate Dispute Solutions, Princeton, New Jersey

CLE Program
Primary Track: Implicit Bias Seminar
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, Research, Skills
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19 (continued)

Section of Dispute Resolution Leadership Events

Section of Dispute Resolution Council Meeting .......................... 1:00pm – 5:00pm
Grand Ballroom C
Open to all ABA Section of Dispute Resolution members and conference attendees.

Distinguished Emeritus Chairs (working meeting by invitation only) .......................... 5:00 pm – 6:00 pm
Regency B

ABA Representation in Mediation Competition Nationals
Opening Rounds on Wednesday, April 6th

Mediation Competition Round 1: ABA Representation in Mediation Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15 – 8:45 AM</td>
<td>Joint orientation for participants, judges and mediators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 – 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Separate orientation: participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:10 AM</td>
<td>Mediators, judges, and participants move to their assigned mediation rooms; participants give mediation plan to their judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 – 9:20 AM</td>
<td>Judges read representation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20 – 10:35 AM</td>
<td>Mediation sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35 AM</td>
<td>Mediators are excused at the end of the mediation session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35 – 10:45 AM</td>
<td>Teams prepare for self-analysis &amp; judges begin to work on score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45 – 11:05 AM</td>
<td>Team self-analysis sessions with judges (10 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05 – 11:20 AM</td>
<td>Judges complete their score sheets and prepare their remarks for the critique session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20 – 11:50 AM</td>
<td>Judges critique team performance and provide feedback (15 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mediation Competition Round 2: ABA Representation in Mediation Competition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:20 – 1:45 PM</td>
<td>Joint orientation for participants, judges and mediators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Separate orientation: participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:10 PM</td>
<td>Participants, judges and mediators move to their assigned rooms; participants give their mediation plan to their judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 – 2:20 PM</td>
<td>Judges read the representation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20 – 3:35 PM</td>
<td>Mediation sessions occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35 PM</td>
<td>Mediators are excused at the end of the mediation session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35 – 3:45 PM</td>
<td>Teams prepare for self-analysis &amp; judges begin to work on the score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:05 PM</td>
<td>Team self-analysis sessions with judges (10 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05 – 4:20 PM</td>
<td>Judges complete their score sheets and prepare their remarks for the critique session; the timekeeper then collects the score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20 – 4:50 PM</td>
<td>Judges critique team performance and provide feedback (15 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thursday events include a networking breakfast, opening plenary with Eva Jefferson Paterson, and concurrent educational programs throughout the day. The Exhibit Hall will be open all day. The day will conclude with a networking reception in the Exhibit Hall and Dine-Arounds for conference attendees wishing to join in evening events outside of the hotel.

**ABA Registration Open ................................................. 7:00 am – 7:00 pm**

**Exhibit Hall Open ........................................................ 7:00 am – 7:00 pm**

**Conference Continental Breakfast and Committee Networking Meetings .................................7:00 am – 8:15 am**

Join your fellow conference attendees for a continental breakfast. ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Committee Chairs will host meetings at tables throughout the breakfast hall. Attendees should feel free to join committee meetings of interest to them. Conference newcomers should come by the Newcomers table for a conference welcome and orientation.

**Breakfast Tables:**
- Arbitration Committee
- Court ADR Committee
- Ethics Committee
- Public Policy, Consensus Building, and Democracy Committee
- Ombuds Committee
- International Committee
- Securities ADR Committee
- Welcome Conference Newcomers

**Thursday Morning Plenary ........................................ 8:30 am – 10:00 am**

After Breakfast move to the adjacent hotel ballroom for our Conference Welcome and Opening Plenary.

**Conference Welcome**

Nancy Welsh, Chair, ABA Section of Dispute Resolution

_The Frank Sander Lecture_

**Implicit Bias: The Illusion of Neutrality**

Presented by Eva Jefferson Paterson

Many of us work as professional neutrals. Yet the process by which we perceive and understand others is not neutral or unbiased. Science has begun to reveal the extent to which our brains are implicitly biased in our perceptions of others. Implicit bias can affect interactions and decisions due to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religion and socio-economic status, as well as other factors. Implicit bias affects our day-to-day work as neutrals, and more broadly, can result in disparate negative treatment towards women and people of color, even when seemingly gender and race-neutral policies are applied. Noted civil rights attorney Eva Jefferson Paterson, co-founder and President of the Equal Justice Society, will discuss the importance of recognizing, understanding and addressing our own implicit bias, particularly as it applies to issues of race.
Concurrent Series A ................................. 10:15 am – 11:30 am

Hybrid Dispute Resolution Processes – Mediation, Arbitration & In Between – Part I

Marina, Bay Level

This program will present the newest developments in the increasing use of hybrid (mixed mode) dispute resolution processes that draw on the characteristics of both mediation and arbitration. It will present these cutting edge practices and will include both domestic and international developments. This program is Part One of two programs focusing on how mediators and arbitrators can work creatively with techniques more commonly thought of as restricted to one mode of dispute resolution. It is one of five programs presented by Fellows of the College of Commercial Arbitrators.

Thomas Stipanowich (Moderator), Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, Pepperdine School of Law, Malibu, California
John R. Holsinger, College of Commercial Arbitrators, Hackensack, New Jersey
Richard R. Mainland, College of Commercial Arbitrators, Los Angeles, California
John A. Sherrill, Dispute Resolution Resources, Atlanta, Georgia
Edna Sussman, Sussman ADR LLC, Scarsdale, New York

CLE Program
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Mediation, Dispute System Design, Research
Sponsored By: College of Commercial Arbitrators

Lawyers as Peacemakers and Changemakers

Pacific N, Pacific Concourse Level

In law school, we’re led to believe that we can either litigate or practice transactional law. Later, some of us learn about ADR and expand our toolboxes. And some of that group apply our training, tools, and creativity to become leaders, sometimes even expanding what is possible for lawyers. Following the footsteps of prominent lawyers like Gandhi and Mandela, we become peacemakers, changemakers, and leaders in transforming society. This panel includes some of those changemakers, sharing our own journeys, and engaging participants in specific inquiries and dialogue. How do we lead as peacemakers and changemakers in the current social and political climate?

Eileen Barker, The Path of Forgiveness, San Rafael, California
Kenneth Cloke, Center for Dispute Resolution, Santa Monica, California
J. Kim Wright, Cutting Edge Law Enterprises

Not for CLE
Primary Track: ADR and the Law

Resume Workshop: Tips, Do’s and Don’ts for ADR Professionals

Seacliff A/B, Bay Level

A practical and highly interactive workshop led by the leading ADR providers, this session is a must for mediators and arbitrators interested in refining their resumes. Learn what clients look for when selecting an arbitrator or mediator, what you must include and should consider leaving out of your resumes, and how to best organize your information. We’ll also discuss social media strategies (including a personal website, LinkedIn, etc.) and branding efforts every neutral should employ (and avoid!). Bring your resume as part of the workshop for real-time feedback and pointers!

Serena K. Lee, American Arbitration Association, San Francisco, California
Renee Spertzel, JAMS, San Francisco, California
Traci Stuart, Blattel Communications, San Francisco, California

Not for CLE
Primary Track: ADR Practice Management, Business and Skills Development
Sponsored By: ADR Young Professionals & Law Students Committee
Third Party Funding in ADR—What You Need to Know

Seacliff C, Bay Level

Third party funding (TPF) in arbitration is increasingly popular and is now a billion dollar industry. First used in international arbitration and now making its appearance in domestic arbitrations, TPF is a practice few ADR practitioners know much about. This program will educate participants on how the TPF works, who’s using it, and how it might change the dynamics of arbitration.

Susan Dunn, Harbour Litigation Funding Ltd, London, United Kingdom
Ruth V. Glick, Glick Dispute Resolution, Burlingame, California
Spencer Hosie, Hosie Rice LLP
Loren Kieve, Kieve Law Offices, San Francisco, California
Lester W. Schiefelbein, Schiefelbein Global Dispute Resolution, San Francisco, California

CLE (General)
Primary Track: Advocacy
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, Arbitration
Sponsored By: Arbitration Committee

Arbitration Update

This panel will discuss the most important arbitration issues of the past year, including the United States Supreme Court rulings dealing with arbitration issues, as well as notable federal and state court decisions. Of particular note, the panel will discuss issues relating to the Supreme Court rulings in the areas of arbitrability and class action arbitrations. The panel will also cover updates in legislation and regulations at the federal level.

Ronald G. Aronovsky, Southwestern Law School, Los Angeles, California
Kristen M. Blankley, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
James Madison, Madison Arbitration & Mediation, Menlo Park, California
Maureen A. Weston, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Research

Embodied Conflict: The Roots of Conflict in Basic Neural Function

Pacific J, Pacific Concourse Level

In this workshop, we will discuss the essential neural function of encoding perceptual experience that is the basis of learning, memory, cognition, and identity and consider the implications for our conflict resolution work. There are several characteristics of the brain’s encoding function that contribute to the causes of conflict and that explain why conflicts can be difficult to prevent or resolve. Knowledge of the embodied physical underpinnings of human behavior will help us better understand the dynamics of perception, communication, relationship, and meaning-making and provide guidance for our practice interventions, which we will review in light of this information.

Tim Hicks, Connexus Conflict Management, Eugene, Oregon

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Skills
Dispute Systems in Context: Who Do They Benefit?

*Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level*

Are our systems for managing conflict just and accountable to the people who use them? Dispute system design (DSD) can provide a powerful framework for rethinking how to reform old systems. It serves as a lens to challenge the current roles stakeholders and experts play. Systems designed without participation by stakeholders and people who will use them may have unintended consequences. DSDs function nested in the context of larger systems. As dispute resolvers, we have an ethical duty to identify and improve how the systems assure justice and are transparent or accountable to participants. Who do systems benefit?

Lisa Blomgren Amsler, Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Bloomington, Indiana
Mariana H.C. Gonstead, University of St. Thomas School of Law, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Janet Kathryn Martinez, Stanford Law School, Stanford, California

**CLE Program**
Primary Track: Dispute Systems Design (DSD)
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics

Key Healthcare Issues for ADR Professionals: A Primer

*Pacific H/I, Pacific Concourse Level*

Healthcare is a relatively new but burgeoning practice area for many mediators and arbitrators. Inside knowledge of the field matters, for the neutral’s effectiveness and credibility. In this session, three long-time veterans of healthcare dispute resolution will help you get up to speed on three key areas: [a] payor-provider disputes; [b] False Claims Act mediations; and [c] peer review disputes. Each speaker will begin by posing a case or two for audience input, then weaving in insights about how s/he would handle it as mediator or arbitrator, followed by additional case(s) raising further issues.

Michael J. Jordan, Jordan Resolutions, LLC, Cleveland, Ohio
Cary Miller, Fleming PC, San Diego, California
Haavi Morreim, College of Medicine, University of Tennessee, Memphis, Tennessee
R. Wayne Thorpe, JAMS, Atlanta, Georgia

*Not for CLE*
Primary Track: Health Care
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Skills
Sponsored By: Healthcare Committee

Patent Mediation: What is the Future?

*Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level*

The conventional wisdom is that mediation is underutilized in patent cases. Is it? When should patent cases be mediated and when should they not? Who should decide, lawyers or judges? What makes a good patent mediator? How much “science” and how much “business” should a patent mediation contain? Are patent cases really so different from any others? Leading tech practitioners explore these challenging questions and more.

Jeff Kichaven, Jeff Kichaven Commercial Mediation, Los Angeles, California
Michael Ng, Kobre & Kim, San Francisco, California
Stefani E. Shanberg, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, San Francisco, California
Lauren Sliger, LTL Attorneys LLP, Los Angeles, California
Roderick M. Thompson, Farella Braun + Martel LLP, San Francisco, California

**CLE Program**
Primary Track: Intellectual Property
THURSDAY, APRIL 20 (continued)

Education Conflict Resolution: Establishing Ombuds Programs in K-12 Schools
Seacliff D, Bay Level
This program will describe how ombuds can be a valuable resource for conflict resolution in our K-12 schools. Presenters will include an ombudsman and general counsel for a large public school district and a medium size public school district, and the program will be moderated by the chair of the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Ombuds Committee.
Charles L. Howard, Shipman & Goodwin LLP, Hartford, Connecticut
Judi Lynn Martin, Portland Public Schools, Portland, Oregon
Jollee Faber Patterson, Miller Nash Graham & Dunn, Portland, Oregon
Joyanna S. Smith, Office of the Ombudsman for Public Education, Washington, District of Columbia

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Ombuds
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design
Sponsored By: Ombuds Committee

Lunch Break .................................................. 11:30 am – 1:15 pm
Lunch-Arounds organized by members and attendees. Check the conference app for lunch options and recommendations.

Concurrent Series B ........................................ 1:15 pm – 2:30 pm
Hybrid Dispute Resolution Processes – Mediation, Arbitration & In Between – Part II
Marina, Bay Level
This is Part Two of two programs that can give neutrals who are primarily mediators other tools for use in mediations by exploring how an increased understanding of the arbitral process and emerging hybrid processes can benefit them and the parties. The program will include both domestic and international developments. It is one of five programs presented by Fellows of the College of Commercial Arbitrators.
Thomas Stipanowich (Moderator), Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, Pepperdine School of Law, Malibu, California
Veronique Fraser, University of Sherbrooke, Longueuil, Quebec, Canada
Herbert H. (Hal) Gray III, Ragsdale Beals Seigler Patterson & Gray, LLP, Atlanta, Georgia
John R. Holsinger, College of Commercial Arbitrators, Hackensack, New Jersey

CLE Program
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Research, Skills
Sponsored by: College of Commercial Arbitrators
THURSDAY, APRIL 20 (continued)

Tricky Business: Avoiding the Pitfalls of Drafting Awards

*Pacific N, Pacific Concourse Level*

The ultimate outcome of an arbitration is the award. Oddly enough, the governing statutes, such as the Federal Arbitration Act, and the rules of provider organizations such as the American Arbitration Association, JAMS, and CPR say little about the actual content of the award. This interactive program will discuss: the pros and cons of various types of awards; guidance for award content provided by relevant case law; issues with issuing partial or interim awards including functus officio and ripeness issues; best practices for drafting the content of awards; and related issues. The audience will be asked a series of questions on these topics to generate interaction with the panel.

Gary Benton Arbitration, Palo Alto, California
Edward B. Lozowicki, Lozowicki ADR, Palo Alto, California
Dana Welch, Welch ADR, Berkeley, California

*CLE Program*
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Skills
Sponsored By: Arbitration Committee

Forgiveness: Why It Matters In Mediation

*Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level*

Give the upset and turmoil in the world, there is a deep need for lawyers and mediators to step up as peacemakers, to not only help resolve disputes, but also hatred and animosity. In the face of conflict, forgiveness uniquely enables parties to achieve peace and closure, not just in cases of interpersonal harm, but also with major historical wounds, such as those between nations and races. Join us for a rich discussion of how and when forgiveness can be used in mediation and other conflict resolution settings. We will explore the reasons for resistance to forgiveness, the tension between truth, forgiveness, accountability and justice, and how to balance these competing needs.

Eileen Barker, The Path of Forgiveness, San Rafael, California
Nicole Diaz, Touching Ground Consulting, Los Angeles, California

*CLE Program*
Primary Track: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Skills

Building Trust and Resilience in Divided Communities

*Seacliff A/B, Bay Level*

Incidents of civil unrest continue to draw attention nationwide. Dispute resolution practitioners have the opportunity and the skill-set to help communities address divisive issues and build resilience. This panel will explore varying approaches to planning in advance of civil unrest and rebuilding community trust in the aftermath of civic tension. In Ohio, attorneys and bar associations have convened conversations to plan in advance of civil unrest; in Minnesota, Mitchell-Hamline partners with state office of Collaboration and Dispute Resolution to build community trust; in California the Institute for Local Government helps communities plan to bridge community division.

William Froehlich, The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, Columbus, Ohio
Grandé H. Lum, Ohio State Moritz College of Law, Burlingame, California
Sharon Press, Dispute Resolution Institute Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota
Sarah Rubin, Institute for Local Government, Sacramento, California
Michelle Renee Vilchez, Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center, San Mateo, California

*Not for CLE*
Primary Track: Community and Social Justice
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience, Dispute System Design
Power to the People: Addressing Power Imbalances in Employment Mediations

Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level

Federal government mediations of employment disputes in an investigatory agency (such as the U.S. Office of Special Counsel and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) present classic power imbalances in a unique context. The panel will discuss how dispute systems design principles were used to identify recurring power imbalances among stakeholders and develop strategies to overcome them. Successful process features such as the use of subject matter experts, the inclusion of “support” (non legal) participants, and a flexible mediation structure will be explored. The panel will work with attendees to dissect two complex scenarios and, through that process, pose ethical considerations and discuss the impact of whether “disadvantaged” parties do better in mediation or in court. They will also discuss how their lessons learned can be implemented beyond the government realm, in private sector mediations.

Jane Juliano, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, Washington, District of Columbia
Deirdre McCarthy Gallagher, Voices of Value, LLC, Rockville, Maryland
Marcia K. Thompson, ADR Vantage, Washington, District of Columbia

CLE Program
Primary Track: Employment
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Ethics, Research, Skills
Sponsored By: ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Government Committee

ADR Around the World: Country Developments, Global Trends

Pacific J, Pacific Concourse Level

In the face of enormous court backlogs, nations outside the U.S. have increasingly turned to ADR. This panel will offer an excellent opportunity to learn first-hand about new developments in Asia, Latin America, and the Balkans from ADR practitioners who are working in these countries. Panelists will share the successes and challenges they have faced drafting new laws, establishing public & private ADR programs, and convincing skeptics to embrace litigation alternatives. Inter-jurisdictional trends, obstacles, and “best practices” will be identified as a springboard for lively discussion and audience engagement.

Hiro Aragaki, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, California
Sheila R. Purcell, UC Hastings Center for Nego and DR., San Francisco, California
Dorcas Quek Anderson, Singapore Management University School of Law, Singapore
Victor Schachter, Foundation for Rule of Law initiatives, San Francisco, California
Srdan Simac, High Commercial Court of the Republic of Croatia, Zagreb, Croatia
Mariana Freitas de Souza, PBVS Advogados, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Bernadette Rutembya Uwicyeza, Kigali International Arbitration Centre, Kigali, Rwanda

CLE Program
Primary Track: International
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Research, Skills
Sponsored By: International Committee; ADR Practice Management & Business Skills Committee; Young Lawyers Committee; Women in Dispute Resolution Committee

The Mediator’s Role in Managing Electronic Discovery

Pacific M, Pacific Concourse Level

Increasingly courts and parties are soliciting the use of mediators to manage the exchange of electronically stored information (ESI). Additionally, nearly every arbitration will involve the exchange of ESI. This course will detail the basics of ESI: what is it, how is it maintained, and how can it be produced; the role of the mediator as discovery master in lawsuits involving the exchange of large amounts of ESI; setting protocols for the exchange of ESI in arbitrations; ethical implications for the exchange of ESI.

Dean J. DiPllato, Gilberti, Stinziano, Heintz & Smith PC, Syracuse, New York

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Technology, Ethics

Go directly to mobile markets to download your app: https://crowd.cc/s/tbQ0
or access the App on your browser: https://crowd.cc/spring2017 (Event Code: Spring2017).
How Modern Sales Theory Can be Effectively Used in Mediation

Pacific H/I, Pacific Concourse Level

Selling and Negotiating require many of the same skills. But, while there have been very few scientific studies of negotiation skills, selling skills have been extensively studied. Ava Abramowitz, a mediator and a George Washington Law School instructor of negotiations, will explore how practitioners can tap into these studies and use their findings to improve their negotiation and mediation skills.

Ava J Abramowitz, George Washington University Law School, Washington, District of Columbia

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Research, Negotiation
Sponsored By: Mediation Committee and Women in Dispute Resolution Committee

FINRA Securities Dispute Resolution – What Lies Beyond the Task Force?

Seacliff D, Bay Level

This session will discuss recommendations from the special FINRA Task Force related to changing rules and procedures. We will cover new panel selection strategies as well as expungement, mediation as a first option, and arbitrator quality and diversity. The panel includes an experienced investor attorney, a member of the Task Force who is outside counsel to numerous brokerage firms and employees, and a mediator and arbitrator in the forum. The moderator is Chief Counsel for FINRA’s Office of Dispute Resolution.

Kenneth L. Andrichik, FINRA Office of Dispute Resolution, New York, New York
Sandra D. Grannum, Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, Florham Park, New Jersey
Joan Stearns Johnsen, University of Florida Levin College of Law, Gainesville, Florida
Darlene Pasieczny, Samuels Yoelin Kantor LLP, Portland, Oregon

CLE (Skills)
Primary Track: Securities ADR
Sponsored By: Securities ADR Committee

Effective Offline and Online Networking in the Digital Age

Pacific F/G, Pacific Concourse Level

How can you effectively leverage connections to build business? What are some strategies to make the most of in-person networking in today’s digital world? ADR and other legal industry marketing experts will share their best practices for making connections, nurturing those relationships, and turning them into business opportunities. Panelists will provide real-life examples about capitalizing on both face-to-face interactions and digital connections to get results.

Mark J. Smalls (Moderator), JAMS, Irvine, California
Neel Chatterjee, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP, Menlo Park, California
Neda Mansoorian, Oleander Law Partners LLP, San Jose, California
Cathy Yanni, JAMS, San Francisco, California

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Technology
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Marketing, Practice Development/Management
Sponsored By: Practice Development Committee
Concurrent Series C ..................................................... 2:45 pm – 3:45 pm

Bringing the World to the US: Development of an International Commercial and Family Business Mediation Practice in the U.S.

*Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level*

In an ever-increasingly interconnected world, the US is poised to become a viable venue for international mediation. This program concentrates on helping practitioners develop an international mediation practice in the U.S., not only in the context of traditional commercial mediation, but in the important and undeveloped area of internationalized family businesses which account for 3/4 of all businesses worldwide. International mediation of commercial and family owned business cases is an appropriate tool for resolution and even prevention of disputes particularly in internationalized family businesses. Mediation of these disputes provide an excellent professional opportunity for the audience.

Jennifer Brandt, Brandt Law & Mediation, LLC, Springfield, New Jersey
Danny P. McFadden, CEDR Asia Pacific and World Bank Group, Hong Kong, SAR Hong Kong
Anja von Rosenstiel, Self Employed, Cambridge, Massachusetts
David Samuel Weiss, New Jersey City University, Jersey City, New Jersey
Rebecca J. Westerfield, JAMS, San Francisco, California

*Not for CLE*

Primary Track: ADR Practice Management, Business and Skills Development
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design

Starting a Successful Career in ADR: Tips From ADR Users

*Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level*

Are you new to the ADR profession or looking to expand your ADR profession into other practice areas? Hear from a panel of seasoned lawyers about what would encourage them to use a neutral for the first time. ADR users will share tips about getting the word out, successful strategies to employ in a mediation, and soft skills necessary to achieve success as a neutral.

Harmeet K. Dhillon, Dhillon Law Group, San Francisco, California
Gina Upshur Miller, JAMS, San Francisco, California
Thomas E. Wallerstein, Venable, LLP, San Francisco, California
Lizbeth (“Beth”) V. West, Weintraub Tobin Chediak Coleman Grodin, Sacramento, California

*Not for CLE*

Primary Track: ADR Practice Management, Business and Skills Development
Sponsored By: Practice Development Committee

Early Dispute Resolution – Making Resolution of Disputes Within The First 60 Days A Reality

*Pacific M, Pacific Concourse Level*

Early Dispute Resolution (EDR) refers to developing and systematically using structured processes to resolve disputes in their earliest stages. EDR is particularly compelling in light of how few cases ever go all the way to trial or arbitration. By focusing on resolution at the very beginning of a dispute, parties can significantly reduce their costs and the time involved in litigation or arbitration and preserve business relationships. A panel of experienced neutrals will explain how EDR processes are developed and implemented, how neutrals can work with parties to effectively use EDR, and how EDR has been used successfully.

Eric O. English, Resolution Strategies LLP, Portland, Oregon
Anne Jordan, Jordan Associates, Chicago, Illinois
Stephen L. Roof, RA Law & ADR, Miami, Florida
Peter R. Silverman, Shinmak, Loop & Kendrick, Toledo, Ohio

*CLE Program*

Primary Track: Early Dispute Resolution
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Practice Development/Management, Skills
Sponsored By: Task Force on Early Dispute Resolution

Go directly to mobile markets to download your app: https://crowd.cc/s/tbQ0
or access the App on your browser: https://crowd.cc/spring2017 (Event Code: Spring2017).
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Will Your ADR Neutrals’ Disclosures Meet Party Expectations?

*Marina, Bay Level*

Do parties expect mediators’ disclosures to be the same—as extensive as arbitrators’ disclosures? A panel of mediators, arbitrators and practitioners will discuss party expectations with reference to the UMA, RUAA, ABA and provider guidelines together with state rules. Can there be adverse consequences if disclosures meet the requirements in one jurisdiction but not another in multi-state or cross-border disputes?

Nancy J. Glidden, Unruh Turner Burke & Frees, West Chester, Pennsylvania
Linda A. Michler, Linda A. Michler, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Daniel Yamshon, Daniel Yamshon, Esq., FCIArb, Sacramento, California

*CLE Program*

Primary Track: Ethics
Sponsored By: DR Section Ethics Committee

Access to Justice for Separated and Divorcing Families: The Search for a Multidisciplinary Perspective

*Seacliff A/B, Bay Level*

The term “access to justice” is widely used, but there is no clear consensus on its meaning and application to family law matters. Does it refer to access to legal representation? An opportunity to address the court? Mediation for all? Working toward a clear definition across disciplines is critical because programs, processes and services made available to the public are driven by priorities of the various stakeholders and their views about how best to address the needs of families. The presenters will provide survey results of definitions, beliefs and priorities across disciplines related to access to justice of family law.

Michael Saini, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario Canada
Peter Salem, Association of Family and Conciliation Courts, Madison, Wisconsin

*Not for CLE*

Primary Track: Family
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Research
Sponsored By: Association of Family and Conciliation Courts

FOIA and Mediation: Together at Last

*Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level*

One highlight of 2016 was the 50th anniversary of the Freedom of Information Act. Additionally, both houses of Congress unanimously passed—and the president signed—significant amendments that bolster the use of dispute resolution in every federal agency’s FOIA process. With 700,000+ requests each year, disputes regularly arise between the public and federal agencies. Improving communications and resolving disputes save administrative resources and avoid costly litigation. The amendments also give the FOIA Ombudsman (the Office of Government Information Services) additional authority and institutional independence. Find out what led to these changes and how will they improve our original Open Government law.

Cynthia S. Mazur, FEMA ADR, Washington, District of Columbia
Miriam M. Nisbet, Retired, Washington, District of Columbia
Deborah M. Osborne, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, District of Columbia

*Not for CLE*

Primary Track: Government
Sponsored By: Government Committee; Ombuds Committee
Creative Dispute Resolution: Lessons from the Healthcare Trenches

Seacliff D, Bay Level

From healthcare ombudsman to no-fault patient compensation programs, the healthcare industry has often successfully utilized unique forms of dispute resolution to address the distinct challenges faced by the industry and avoid costly litigation. This program will survey the different approaches used in the industry including proactive mediation with patients in the case of unexpected adverse events, utilizing ADR to improve health outcomes and alternative means of compensating injured patients, such as the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program. We will look at the effectiveness of these unique ADR approaches, the challenges and whether some of these approaches could benefit litigants (and those contemplating litigation) in other areas of law.

Abdul (Abdel) R. Al Hamamsy, The Risk Authority Stanford, Palo Alto, California
Komal Chokshi, Cooper & Scully PC, San Francisco, California
Nora Freeman Engstrom, Stanford Law School, Stanford, California
Carolyn Welty, UCSF School of Medicine, San Francisco, California

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Health Care
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Dispute System Design

Building a Reflective Practitioner Group: A Tool Kit for the Reflective Practitioner

Pacific J, Pacific Concourse Level

At the 2016 ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Spring Conference, the Mediation Committee introduced the Dispute Resolution Section to its newest member service—the Reflective Practitioner Group (RPG). RPGs are a vehicle for sharing mediation experiences and insights to help address the angst and loneliness of being a mediator while increasing mediator skills and effectiveness. Since then, the Committee has set up a monthly RPG call available to its members. During this 2017 Conference, we invite everyone to join in exploring RPGs and in developing the tool kit necessary to support them. We are open to all ideas. Indeed, we need them. Come join us.

Dan Berstein, MH Mediate, New York, New York
G. Daniel Bowling, GD Bowling Mediation, Sausalito, California
Richard B. Lord, Upchurch, Watson, White & Max Mediation Group, West Palm Beach, Florida
Laura J. Stipanowich, Washington, District of Columbia

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, ADR Practice Management, Business and Skills Development, Skills
Sponsored By: Mediation Committee
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New Perspectives on ODR: A Conversation with the Authors of The New Handshake and Digital Justice

_Pacific H/I, Pacific Concourse Level_

Join us for a conversation with the authors of two important new Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) books (published Winter 2017): _The New Handshake: ODR and the Future of Consumer Protection_ by Colin Rule and Amy Schmitz (American Bar Association) and _Digital Justice: Technology and the Internet of Disputes_ by Orna Rabinovich and Ethan Katsh (Oxford University Press). The first book focuses on e-commerce and how we can use technology to negotiate terms, build trust and resolve disputes without meeting face to face. _Digital Justice_ looks at e-commerce, healthcare, social media, labor, the courts, and access to justice in virtual environments.

Ethan Katsh, National Center for Technology and Dispute Resolution, Needham, Massachusetts
David Allen Larson, Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota
Orna Rabinovich-Einy, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel
Vikki Rogers, Pace Law, Brewster, New York
Colin A. Rule, Modria, San Jose, California
Amy J. Schmitz, University of Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri

CLE Program
Primary Track: Technology
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Technology, Dispute System Design, Ethics, Research, Skills
Sponsored By: ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Technology Committee

Showcase Programs D .................. 4:00 pm – 5:15 pm

Arbitration in the Media: Insights and Resources for Practitioners, Academics, and Journalists

_Grand A, Street Level_

Critical descriptions of arbitration in the media often are accompanied by a lack of clarity regarding different types of arbitration and the arbitration process. The National Academy of Arbitrators and University of Missouri’s Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution have responded with arbitrationinfo.com, a neutral, noncommercial, and comprehensive website about labor arbitration. This panel explores interesting issues raised by the website project, including how journalists perceive and write about arbitration, what journalists need from arbitrators to conduct accurate reporting on arbitration, and how arbitrationinfo.com can be of help not only to journalists, but also to practitioners and legal educators.

Margaret R. Brogan, President, National Academy of Arbitrators, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Carli N. Conklin, University of Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri
Rafael Gely, University of Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri
James S. Urban, Jones Day, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

CLE Program
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Technology, Ethics, Marketing, Practice Development/Management, Research
Sponsored By: National Academy of Arbitrators and University of Missouri’s Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution
A Winning Alternative to Lawsuits: Resolving Legal Claims with Structured Negotiation

*Grand C, Street Level*

Structured Negotiation is a collaborative, win-win dispute resolution process with a twenty-year track record of achieving far-reaching results without lawsuits. Speaker Lainey Feingold has used the method to negotiate settlement agreements with Walmart, Bank of America, Houston’s transit agency, and dozens of other organizations. While these agreements have advanced access to technology for the blind community; the process has application to a wide range of civil disputes. Lainey will explain Structured Negotiation and give participants needed tools to use in their own practice. The ABA Section of Dispute Resolution published the speaker’s book about Structured Negotiation in August 2016.

Lainey Feingold, Law Office of Lainey Feingold, Berkeley, California

*CLE Program*

Primary Track: Negotiation

Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Technology, Dispute System Design, Ethics, Neuroscience, Psychology, Skills

Sponsored By: Section of Dispute Resolution Publications Board

How Technology is Shaping the Future of ADR Practice

*Grand B, Street Level*

Technology is changing the way we interact with each other, information, and the law. How are these changes impacting the practice of ADR? This session provides insights from three different perspectives: neutrals, in-house counsel, and law firm attorney, discussing how technology is impacting their practice and use of ADR. They will discuss emerging technology related disputes ripe for ADR, the value of using ADR in these new frontiers, and the potential for hiring neutrals with expertise in resolving technology disputes and/or tech experts to facilitate the ADR process. From cyber-security and e-discovery, to social media and apps, ADR practitioners need to know the types of disputes we will face in the future and the resources available to do it right.

Roderick M. Thompson, Farella Braun + Martel LLP, San Francisco, California (Moderator)
Daniel B. Garrie, JAMS, New York, New York
Gary L. Benton, Gary Benton Arbitration, Palo Alto, California
Daralyn J. Durie, Durie Tangri, San Francisco, California
Renny Hwang, Director of Litigation for Google, San Francisco, CA

*CLE Program*

Primary Track: Technology
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**Conference Reception in the Exhibit Hall** .......................... **5:30 pm – 7:00 pm**

Join fellow conference attendees for a reception in the exhibit hall. Visit with exhibitors and also look for “Networking Hubs” — practice areas and affinity groups of interest to you.

*The Thursday Conference Reception is sponsored by the University of Missouri Center for the Study of Dispute Resolution and the National Academy of Arbitrators, Research and Education Fund.*

**Thursday Evening Conference Dine-Arounds**

Committee chairs and conference attendees have organized dine-arounds. The Conference App lists all Dine-Arounds and instructions for how to rsvp for events.

**ABA Representation in Mediation Competition Thursday Events**

Representation in Mediation Competition Nationals — Semi-Finals

*Competition Orientation Room: Pacific E*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15–8:45</td>
<td>Orientation for judges and mediators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Check-in for law students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45–9:00</td>
<td>Separate orientation: Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00–9:10</td>
<td>Participants, judges and mediators move to their assigned rooms; participants give their mediation plans to their judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 – 9:20</td>
<td>Judges read the representation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20–10:35</td>
<td>Mediation sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35</td>
<td>Mediators are excused at the end of the mediation session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35–10:45</td>
<td>Teams prepare for self-analysis &amp; judges begin to work on their score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45–11:05</td>
<td>Team self-analysis sessions with judges (10 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:05–11:20</td>
<td>Judges complete their score sheets and prepare their remarks for critique session. The timekeeper then collects the score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20–11:50</td>
<td>Judges critique team performance and provide feedback (15 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation in Mediation Competition Nationals — Final Round

*Competition Orientation Room: Pacific E*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:30–2:00</td>
<td>Orientation for judges and mediators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–2:10</td>
<td>Participants, judges and mediators move to their assigned rooms; participants give their mediation plan to their judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10–2:20</td>
<td>Judges read the representation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:20–3:35</td>
<td>Mediation sessions occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>The Mediator is excused at the end of the mediation session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35–3:45</td>
<td>Teams prepare for self-analysis &amp; judges begin to work on the score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45–4:05</td>
<td>Team self-analysis sessions with judges (10 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05–4:20</td>
<td>Judges complete their score sheets and prepare their remarks for the critique session; the timekeeper then collects the score sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:20–4:50</td>
<td>Judges critique team performance and provide feedback (15 minutes for each team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A decade of success and counting.

Nationally recognized as a leader in conflict engagement and education, the Werner Institute provides a cutting-edge interdisciplinary program rooted in Jesuit values and a systems approach to conflict. We look forward to another 10 years and beyond, training the next generation of practitioners and scholars.

law.creighton.edu/werner-institute
3 New Books Every Dispute Resolution Professional Should Have

COMING SOON . . .

The New Handshake
By Amy J. Schmitz and Colin Rule

The time is right to take advantage of new technology to build an accessible, transparent, scalable resolution system for both consumers and businesses. The New Handshake offers insight on how to best harness the power of the internet to resolve e-commerce disputes.

REleased February 2017

Stories Mediators Tell—World Edition
By Lela P. Love and Glen Parker

This second edition of Stories Mediators Tell encompasses stories from around the world. From these amazing stories, mediators will learn how to help clients find positive outcomes to conflict resolution.

Best Seller! — Released September 2016

Structured Negotiation: A Winning Alternative to Lawsuits
By Lainey Feingold

Resolve legal claims without depositions, expert battles, or runaway costs. Offer win-win solutions and encourage relationships without lawsuits.

3 Easy Ways to Order:

1. Call us (800) 285-2221
2. Order online www.ShopABA.org
3. Mail to: American Bar Association ATTN: Service Center 16th Fl. 321 N Clark Street Chicago, IL 60654
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Friday events include a networking breakfast, opening plenary with Dacher Keltner and concurrent educational programs throughout the day. The afternoon will conclude with a committee meetings and the Legal Educators Resource share (open to all interested attendees). The Exhibit Hall will be open all day. The final event of the day is the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Awards Reception, where attendees will honor award recipients. The Awards Reception is a ticketed event.

ABA Registration Open ........................................ 7:00 am – 5:00 pm

Exhibit Hall Open ...................................................... 7:00 am – 5:00 pm

Friday Morning Breakfast ........................................... 7:00 am – 7:45 am
Join your fellow conference attendees for a continental breakfast. ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Committee Chairs will host meetings at tables throughout the breakfast hall. Attendees should feel free to join committee meetings of interest to them. Conference newcomers should come by the Newcomers table for a conference welcome and orientation.

Breakfast Tables:
Mediation Committee
Women in Dispute Resolution Committee
Government Committee
Welcome Conference Newcomers

Friday Morning Plenary .............................................. 8:00 am – 9:30 am
Friday morning welcome and presentation of the ABA Representation in Mediation Competition Championship trophy.

The Paradox of Power
Presented by Dacher Keltner
As mediators, arbitrators and lawyers we struggle with issues of power every day. Dacher Keltner, Professor of Psychology at UC Berkeley and Faculty Director of the Berkeley Greater Good Science Center argues that empathy and social intelligence are more important to acquiring and exercising power than are force, deception, or terror. But he also cautions that once we assume positions of power, we’re likely to act more selfishly and aggressively, and will have a harder time seeing the world from other people’s points of view. This is the paradox of power: the skills most important to obtaining power and leading effectively are the very skills that deteriorate once we have power. Join Professor Keltner for a look at a new model of power, one rooted in social intelligence, responsibility, and cooperation.

Concurrent Series E .................................................. 9:45 am–11:00 am
The Power Paradox and Mediation: Using Power as a Force for Good
Seacliff A/B, Bay Level
As mediators, we are routinely called on to work with parties and lawyers grappling with issues related to power, and we wield power and influence ourselves. Understanding more deeply the various ways people both gain and maintain power, and how we can use power as a force for good, makes for more effective mediators and advocates. This program will apply the recent work of key note speaker psychologist Dacher Keltner, which suggests that contrary to popular wisdom enduring power is actually based on empathy and compassion, to real life problems faced in mediation and negotiation practice.
Claudia Bernard, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, San Francisco, California
Howard Herman, U.S. District Court, N.D. California, San Francisco, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Ethics, Skills

Go directly to mobile markets to download your app: https://crowd.cc/s/tbQ0
or access the App on your browser: https://crowd.cc/spring2017 (Event Code: Spring2017).
Rekindle Your Flame: A Revitalizing Workshop

_Seacliff C/D, Bay Level_

After a certain number of years, mediators can hit a plateau. They can feel burn-out creeping into their work. They can hear themselves saying the same lines that they have used before. The bigger problems from this are that they can grow shorter in patience, and simply enjoy the work less. If a mediator’s motivating goals are to keep their settlement rate high, or “at least I’m making $X,000 today,” then it’s time for this workshop. In this workshop, we will explore causes of burn-out, and help mediators find their passion again. We will help them find new reasons to put on that suit of armor and go do another day of battle, by finding their joy, and seeing new challenges, by seeing new things in the same, old rooms.

Lee Jay Berman, The American Institute of Mediation, Los Angeles, California

_Not for CLE_

Primary Track: ADR as a Profession
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Marketing, Practice Development/Management, Psychology, Skills

Cutting Edge Issues For Managing Complex Cases: Part I, Pre-Hearing

_Bayview A, Bay Level_

This program is Part One of a two part program discussing the most current ideas for managing complex arbitrations, focusing on the pre-hearing part of the arbitration process. Part Two will focus on the hearing. The program will include both domestic and international developments. This is one of five programs presented by Fellows of the College of Commercial Arbitrators.

Susan H. Nycum (Moderator), Tech Disputes, Portola Valley, California
John R. Holsinger, College of Commercial Arbitrators, Hackensack, New Jersey
Elliot Edward Polebaum, Fried Frank LLP, Washington, District of Columbia
Richard H. Silberberg, Dorsey & Whitney, New York, New York

_CLE Program_
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks:
Sponsored By: College of Commercial Arbitrators

Opportunities for Mediators in the Collaborative Process

_Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level_

Mediators and collaborative lawyers are trained and skilled in assisting parties in resolving disputes before a dispute is submitted to an adjudicatory tribunal. Mediators trained in the collaborative process can work in the collaborative process in a number of ways as third party neutrals: serving a facilitators as the process progresses, assisting in resolving issues that may arise regarding jointly retained experts or the voluntary production of relevant information, and assisting in avoiding an impasse in the process.

Sherrie R. Abney, Global Collaborative Law Council, Carrollton, Texas
David A. Hoffman, Boston Law Collaborative, LLC, Boston, Massachusetts
Lawrence R. Maxwell, Jr., Collaborative Lawyer–Mediator–Arbitrator, Dallas, Texas
Lynda J. Robbins, Mediator and Counselor at Law, Reading, Massachusetts

_CLE Program_
Primary Track: Collaborative Law
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Ethics, Skills
Sponsored By: Collaborative Law Committee
Strange Bedfellows: Achieving Dispute Resolution Success with Hybrid Techniques and Neutral Experts  
Pacific D, Pacific Concoursce Level  
It is easy to get “stuck” in examining the best modes of dispute resolution by focusing on better known “off the rack” dispute resolution processes of mediation and arbitration and neutrals with traditional backgrounds. This session will explore a different approach by designing a process that is responsive to each situation, creating hybrid processes, and utilizing newer approaches and non-traditional neutrals such as damages experts or case evaluators. The goal is to offer a tailored process that provides the flexibility and creativity needed to satisfy the parties’ interests, needs and business objectives.

Carol Ludington, Ludington Ltd., St. Paul, Minnesota  
Conna Weiner, Conna Weiner ADR, Boston, Massachusetts  
Michael A. Zeytoonian, Dispute Resolution Counsel, LLC, Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts

CLE Program  
Primary Track: Dispute Systems Design (DSD)  
Sponsored By: Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR)

Evolutionary or Revolutionary: Applying the Model Standards to ODR  
Pacific F, Pacific Concoursce Level  
During the last 20 years, online dispute resolution (ODR) has grown exponentially, escalating ethical challenges. In its infancy, third-party neutrals used information and communication technology (ICT) primarily to assist in dispute engagement for disputes created online. More recently, companies are designing ICT platforms specifically for ODR, and technology has found its way into third party practice in almost every venue. This panel will offer the premier opportunity to engage in a high level discussion of whether and how the Model Standards should be revised to include ODR. Through a series of questions, the audience and panel members will discuss critical issues for the third-party neutral, and the burgeoning fourth and fifth parties.

Susan Nauss Exon, University of La Verne College of Law, Ontario, California  
David Allen Larson, Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota  
Daniel Rainey, National Mediation Board, Washington, District of Columbia

CLE Program  
Primary Track: Ethics  
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Technology, Ethics  
Sponsored By: Ethics Committee

Teaching Negotiation on the Tower of Babel: Strategies in a Cross-Cultural Classroom or Workplace  
Pacific H, Pacific Concoursce Level  
Teaching dispute resolution involves teaching a common language and common culture around interest-based bargaining. But what happens when our students speak different languages and come from very different cultures? Whether you teach international LL.M, JD, college, graduate students, or executives in conflict resolution, you are likely to encounter cultural differences in bargaining style and understanding. As American higher educational institutions see increasing enrollment from foreign students — as well as first-generation college students and students for whom English is a second language — what strategies should we employ in our ADR classrooms? How can we teach the skills of dialogue across difference? How can we transmit the core practices and theories of our field to an increasingly diverse populations? And how do these skills apply to executive training at diverse corporations? This panel will interrogate these questions and offer teaching suggestions.

Donna Erez Navot, Kukin Program for Conflict Resolution–Cardozo Law School, New York, New York  
Brian Farkas, Goetz Fitzpatrick LLP, New York, New York  
Sukhsimranjit Singh, Pepperdine University, Malibu, California  
James J. Alfini, South Texas College of Law, Houston, Texas

CLE Program  
Primary Track: Negotiation  
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Dispute System Design
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Strategic Negotiations: The Right Number at the Wrong Time is the Wrong Number
Pacific I, Pacific Concourse Level
Decisional errors are costly. Drawing on law, behavioral economics, psychology, and historical data, including a one-of-a-kind offer pattern database, we will explore ways to reduce impasse. We’ll graph specific negotiations and watch as the parties fall into predictable patterns – including the cognitive biases that make negotiations interesting. That data will provide the grist for group discussion and forming tools mediators can use to reduce impasse immediately.
Douglas E. Noll, Noll Associates, Clovis, California
Donald R. Philbin, Jr., Donald R. Philbin, Jr., P.C., San Antonio, Texas

CLE Program
Primary Track: Negotiation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Technology, Neuroscience, Psychology, Research

The Art of Recognizing Transformative Moments in Mediation
Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level
This interactive participatory workshop will examine the mediation process, and in particular the opportunities for ‘transformative moments’ that arise in many mediations. Distinguishing from the transformative approach to mediation, we will be focusing on particular moments or occasions during mediation that have the potential to be empowering and even transformative for the parties – perhaps even the lawyers- and what mediators can and should do to ensure that these are acknowledged and addressed.
Kimberlee Kovach, Kovach Dispute Resolution, Austin, Texas
Mark S. Rudy, Rudy Exelrod Zieff & Lowe, LLP, San Francisco, California
Jerome Weiss, Mediation Inc, Cleveland, Ohio

CLE Program
Primary Track: Skills
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Ethics, Psychology

Concurrent Series F .................................................. 11:15 am – 12:15 pm
The Challenge: Achieving Uniformity in State ADR Law
Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level
The Uniform Law Commission (ULC, also known as the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws) has been at work for more than 100 years providing states with draft legislation in critical areas of state law. This interactive program will feature background and legislative updates on the ULC’s uniform acts in the area of alternative dispute resolution, including the Uniform Mediation Act, Uniform Collaborative Law Act, and the newly approved Uniform Family Law Arbitration Act. Join us to discuss these acts, talk trends in state ADR laws, and learn how you can help shape future uniform acts in ADR.
Kaitlin A. Dohse, Uniform Law Commission, Chicago, Illinois
Miriam M. Nisbet, Retired, Washington, District of Columbia
Richard C. Reuben, Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri
Larry R. Rute, Associates in Dispute Resolution LLC, Topeka, Kansas

Not for CLE
Primary Track: ADR and the Law
Sponsored By: Government
What I’m Reading

Pacific J, Pacific Concourse Level

This is the fifth year of What I’m Reading, a rotating panel of established ADR scholars and practitioners speaking about recent ADR-related books or articles (or movies, or other artwork) that inspired them. This panel has the following objectives: 1. Bring together people from different parts of the ADR universe, both on the panel and in the audience. 2. Provide a sense of the breadth of ADR-relevant scholarship, to facilitate connections or insights between scholars and/or works that might not otherwise come together. 3. Relatedly, highlight the diverse literatures that junior or established scholars and/or practitioners might turn to in their work. 4. Compile a reading list of new books/materials for ADR classes, workshops, and book groups.

Noam Ebner, The Werner Institute, Creighton University School of Law, Omaha, Nebraska
Michael Z. Green, Texas A&M, Fort Worth, Texas
Rebecca E. Hollander-Blumoff, Washington University Law School, St. Louis, Missouri
Sheila R. Purcell, UC Hastings Center for Negotiation and Dispute Resolution, San Francisco, California
Rachel A. Viscomi, Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program at Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Not for CLE

Primary Track: ADR Outside the Box

Cutting Edge Issues For Managing Complex Cases: Part 2, Hearings

Bayview A, Bay Level

This program is Part 2 of a two-part program discussing the most current ideas for managing complex arbitrations by focusing on the hearing. Part 1 will focus on the pre-hearing stage of the process. The program will include both domestic and international developments. This is one of five programs presented by Fellows of the College of Commercial Arbitrators.

Susan H. Nycum (Moderator), Tech Disputes, Portola Valley, California
John R. Holsinger, College of Commercial Arbitrators, Hackensack, New Jersey
Elliot Edward Polebaum, Fried Frank LLP, Washington, District of Columbia
Richard H. Silberberg, Dorsey & Whitney, New York, New York

CLE Program

Primary Track: Arbitration
Sponsored By: College of Commercial Arbitrators

Early Caucus: Using Neuroscience to Adapt Community and Family Mediation Models

Pacific H, Pacific Concourse Level

The Early Caucus Mediation Model evolved from an understanding of the physiologic stress response and how the inevitable stressors in mediation sessions can be minimized using short, individual caucus meetings before joint session in order to facilitate a more effective mediation. Quantitative and qualitative data was collected to assess the value of starting facilitative community and family mediation sessions using the model. The investigators will discuss the neuroscience behind the program and the data collected. Party satisfaction and agreement rates will be compared with comparable cases where no early caucus was used and mediator satisfaction will be discussed.

Rae Kyritsi, Center for Conflict Resolution, Chicago, Illinois
Jill S. Tanz, Chicago Mediation LLC, Chicago, Illinois

CLE Program

Primary Track: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Research
Sponsored By: Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR)
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The Impact of Employment Arbitration and Increasing Legalism on Traditional Labor Arbitration
*Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level*
Those who handle Employment Arbitration as advocates often are not often conversant in traditional Labor Arbitration. This is an interactive session using case studies and guided group discussion to examine various approaches and techniques which adr professionals may use in addressing the increasing use of laws, legal principles and courtroom tactics in labor arbitration practice.
Jeanne Vonhof

*CLE Program*
Primary Track: Employment
Sponsored By: Labor and Employment Section of the ABA

Mediating the Muslim Couples’ Marriage and Divorce
*Pacific E, Pacific Concourse Level*
Divorcing Muslim couples face an intricate situation as they attempt to reconcile religious values with the desire for a civil marriage and divorce in US courts. The couple generally always enter the marriage with an Islamic, “Mahr,” contract that takes place before or simultaneous to the legal marriage. As the “Mahr” is approached by different courts in various methods, Muslim couples rarely have an understanding of what to expect as they walk into the marriage and what to expect when they seek divorce. This program will provide an overview on how to assist those couples in resolving these couples’ issues.
Fatina Abdrabboh (Moderator), American Arab Anti Discrimination Committee, Dearborn, Michigan
Sahar F. Aziz, Texas A&M School of Law, Fort Worth, Texas
Reem Subei, Perrysburg, Ohio

*CLE Program*
Primary Track: Family
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics

The Future of Conflict Coaching in the Federal Sector
*Pacific D, Pacific Concourse Level*
Conflict coaching is a critical component of organizational dispute systems and is increasingly used in the public and private sectors as a stand-alone dispute resolution process and as an auxiliary process to mediation and other ADR processes. This panel addresses critical questions about how to optimize the use of conflict coaching in the federal sector and proposes a research agenda for collaborative research across agencies.
Merri Hanson King, Peninsula Mediation & ADR, Williamsburg, Virginia
Tricia S. Jones, Temple University and Conflict Coaching Matters LLC, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Vik J. Kapoor, Federal Government, Washington, District of Columbia
Cynthia S. Mazur, FEMA ADR, Washington, District of Columbia
Cinnie Noble, CINERGY Coaching, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

*Not for CLE*
Primary Track: Government
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Research
Non-verbal Communication in ADR in an International World

Pacific F, Pacific Concourse Level

In a world where conflict is a part of everyday life, ADR platforms are welcomed worldwide. However, only knowledge of mediation and its process isn’t sufficient for mediators to be successful. Mediators must recognize the importance of non-verbal communication in resolving disputes. Non-verbal cues provide important information about what the parties are feeling in mediation. Parties also instinctively make their assessment of the mediator based on non-verbal cues. However, non-verbal communication can vary greatly across countries, cultures, regions. This session, led by international mediators from India and U.S., will help you strategically recognize and use non-verbal communication effectively to improve your mediation sessions.

Anupama Ahluwalia, International Mediation & Arbitration Center, Delhi, India
Rishi Batra, Texas Tech University School of Law, Lubbock, Texas
Charles Crumpton, Crumpton Collaborative Solutions, Honolulu, Hawaii

Not for CLE
Primary Track: International
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Neuroscience, Practice Development/Management, Research, Skills

Stories Mediators Tell Around The World

Pacific I, Pacific Concourse Level

Stories Mediators Tell: World Edition will be showcased at the spring conference. This session will feature some of the superb international mediators* telling stories from the book. Time permitting, audience members will also be asked to tell a story from their practice, followed by audience commentary. So, come ready, to enjoy stories from around the world, and, if you wish, to tell a story about mediation that you think your colleagues should know.


Lela P. Love, Cardozo School of Law, New York, New York
Glen Parker, NYS Unified Court System, New York, New York

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Skills
Sponsored By: Section of Dispute Resolution Publications Board

Artificially Intelligent Mediators: Futureproofing ADR

Seacliff A/B, Bay Level

Artificial intelligence (AI) evokes hyperbole and fear in many. In reality, we all have come to expect our machines to do many things better, faster and cheaper than we can do ourselves. Particularly in the legal services industry, many forms of AI are already providing practical functionality from which many ADR professionals and their clients would benefit. This session will demonstrate how many existing AI applications can make every mediator/arbitrator better at what they do.

Larry Bridgesmith (Moderator), Lean.Law LLC, Nashville, Tennessee
Allyson Carrel, Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law, Chicago, Illinois

CLE Program
Primary Track: Technology
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Technology, Dispute System Design, Ethics, Marketing, Neuroscience, Practice Development/Management, Research, Skills

Go directly to mobile markets to download your app: https://crowd.cc/s/tbQ0
or access the App on your browser: https://crowd.cc/spring2017 (Event Code: Spring2017).
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Does Training Help Experienced Mediators?
*Seacliff C/D, Bay Level*

Successful mediators possess a great many skills – organizational, interpersonal, intellectual and more. In today’s highly competitive marketplace, by the time a mediator becomes successful – that is, in demand in their chosen practice area – these skills all need to be in place. This begs the question – can an experienced mediator improve meaningfully by participating in training? Or do they improve only by working on cases? Or do they improve at the beginning of their career and then plateau? This interactive mock-debate will pit “no they can’t” against an “of course they can.” Together with the audience, we will explore the benefits and limits of training for experienced mediators.

Richard Birke, JAMS, Portland, Oregon
Jay Welsh, JAMS, Los Angeles, California

**CLE Program**
Primary Track: Tools for Trainers
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Practice Development/Management Skills

**Lunch Break** ................................................................. 12:15 pm – 1:45 pm
Lunch-Arounds organized by members and attendees. Check the conference App for lunch options and suggestions

**Concurrent Series G** ......................................................... 1:45 pm – 3:00 pm

Pathways to Success: How to Avoid Mistakes and Create A Thriving Practice
*Seacliff C/D, Bay Level*

This program combines the big picture observations of a business development coach with personal stories and examples from successful ADR practitioners. The program starts with the 11 Common Mistakes Neutrals Make When Developing a Practice. Mediators and arbitrators will then present their own paths to success and share anecdotes and advice based on their personal experiences. Whether you are pursuing a local, national or international practice, these tips and personal stories will provide clarity about where to put your energy and keep you inspired moving forward.

Marc Fong, Fong Dispute Resolution, Alameda, California
Anna H. Rappaport, Excelleration Coaching, Washington, District of Columbia
Cynthia L. Remmers, Remmers Global, Oakland, California
Kyungah/ Kay Suk, Forward Mediation, San Francisco, California

**CLE Program**
Primary Track: ADR Practice Management, Business and Skills Development
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Skills
Sponsored By: Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR)

Ethical Problems That Arise In Arbitrations And Strategies For Dealing With Them
*Bayview A, Bay Level*

This interactive program will address many of the most challenging ethical issues that arise in arbitrations. The most experienced arbitrators will discuss these challenges, invite questions and discussion, and offer techniques for managing the unique difficulties that arbitrators and advocates may encounter. The program will include both domestic and international developments. This is one of five programs presented by Fellows of the College of Commercial Arbitrators.

Harold Coleman, Jr., American Arbitration Association-Mediation.org, San Diego, California
Eugene I. Farber, Farber, Pappalardo and Carbonari, White Plains, New York
John R. Holsinger, College of Commercial Arbitrators, Hackensack, New Jersey

**CLE Program**
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics
Sponsored by: College of Commercial Arbitrators
Emotionally Intelligent Mediation: What’s Emotion Got to Do With It? Managing Positive and Negative Emotions To Reach Resolution

Pacific D, Pacific Concourse Level

Emotions often find their way into the mediation process regardless of the type of case that is presented, or whether the mediation is in person, telephonic, by video-conference, or conducted in joint session or caucus. Emotions can cause participants to get stuck, but they can also be used positively to facilitate settlement. It is important for mediators and negotiators to know how to accurately recognize different emotions and to respond appropriately for productive mediation sessions in all types of cases. In this multidisciplinary and interactive session, experienced private and court mediators from different backgrounds will use multimedia and experiential exercises to show attendees how to enhance their emotional intelligence. The panel will share tools to help participants recognize and constructively address the emotions that mediators, parties and their representatives have consciously or unconsciously attached to issues. Participants will also gain insight into how their own relationship to emotionality can profoundly affect the tenor and outcome of a mediation.

Cynthia R. Mabry-King, Fourth Circuit, Richmond, Virginia
Inga Watkins Sinclair, Mediator, Washington, District of Columbia
Robert Terris, Family Counseling & Mediation Center, Berkeley, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Practice Development/Management, Skills

A New Way of Thinking About Mediation and Intimate Partner Violence

Pacific E, Pacific Concourse Level

This session explores a new approach to addressing the persistent debate about mediation in the context of intimate partner violence. Policymaking is challenging because intimate partner violence varies across families, mediation processes differ significantly, and there is little empirical research. Panelists and participants will evaluate a court model and an approach to practice that supports parties in making informed and reality-based choices based on their own lived experiences and accurate information about the mediation process available to them. The analysis is straightforward, makes no assumptions, and attends to the aspects of intimate partner violence that are most significant for mediation.

Amy G. Applegate, IU Maurer School of Law, Bloomington, Indiana
Kelly Browe Olson, UALR, Little Rock, AR
Nancy Ver Steegh, Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota

CLE Program
Primary Track: Family
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Research, Skills

Resolving Technology and IP Disputes with Online Dispute Resolution Technology

Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level

The technology sector encompasses a wide range of disputes involving intellectual property law. In a parallel track, online dispute resolution (ODR) is building the means to resolve disputes through the use of information and communication technology. This session will pose select IP disputes and explore means by which ODR could contribute to their resolution. The panel includes senior IP counsel, experienced court, arbitration and mediation neutrals, and an academic with experience in system design and ODR.

Janet Kathryn Martinez, Stanford Law School, Stanford, California
Harrie Samaras, ADR Office of Harrie Samaras, West Chester, Pennsylvania
Joshua Simmons, Kirkland & Ellis
Neil A. Smith, Schwegman Lundberg and Woessner, San Francisco, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Intellectual Property
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Technology, Dispute System Design
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How to Make Your Mediation Advocacy More Effective
Pacific M, Pacific Concourse Level
This interactive program will bring together two prominent mediators with different backgrounds, two outside counsel who represent clients in mediation, and two in-house counsel who will offer the client perspective, on how to make mediation advocacy more effective. The panel will discuss the preliminaries (whether and when to mediate, selection of the mediator, mediator style); written submissions; the mediation session itself (tactics, tone, participants); and avoiding and overcoming impasse.
Laurel Beeler, US District Court, NDCA, San Francisco, California
Karen Boyd, Turner Boyd LLP, Redwood City, California
Joseph (Joe) Paul Esposito (Moderator), Hunton & Williams LLP, Washington, District of Columbia
Keith J. Harrison, Crowell & Moring LLP, Washington, District of Columbia
Thomas J. Knapp, Galena Biopharma, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland
Mark LeHockey, JudgeWest, San Francisco, California
Lisa A. MacVittie, Freddie Mac, Arlington, Virginia

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation
Sponsored By: Mediation Committee

Mediation Confidentiality Reconsidered: What’s on the Horizon Here in California and Nationwide?
Pacific E, Pacific Concourse Level
This interactive session will debate pending legislation in California to amend the state’s confidentiality statutes, update you on Uniform Mediation Act developments and other confidentiality trends nationwide, and explore why it might be time for a uniform federal mediation privilege.
James R. Coben, Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota
Ellen E. Deason, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law, Columbus, Ohio
Ron Kelly, Mediator/Arbitrator, Berkeley, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Mediation

Making Negotiation Theory More Helpful for Practitioners
Pacific H, Pacific Concourse Level
Negotiation theory is overwhelming, confusing, and often ignored by negotiation and mediation practitioners. This is particularly true about the models described in Getting to Yes but also about other theoretical concepts and frameworks. This session will invite practitioners to describe what theoretical concepts they find helpful or not. The panel of scholars and practitioners will discuss their analyses and recommendations growing out of a symposium entitled, Moving Negotiation Theory from the Tower of Babel Toward a World of Mutual Understanding. Finally, the panel will engage the audience in a discussion of how theorists can help practitioners in their work.
Daralyn J. Durie, Durie Tangri, San Francisco, California
Noam Ebner, The Werner Institute, Creighton University School of Law, Omaha, Nebraska
Rebecca E. Hollander-Blumoff, Washington University Law School, St. Louis, Missouri
Sanda Kaufman, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio
John Lande, University of Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri

CLE Program
Primary Track: Negotiation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Dispute System Design, Psychology, Research, Skills
Inter-Faith Efforts at Peacemaking

Pacific I, Pacific Concourse Level

A group of leaders from faith communities — Christian, Jewish and Muslim — will report on initiatives to increase interfaith dialogue with the goal of achieving peaceful outcomes.

Fatih Ferdi Ates, Pacific Institute, San Francisco, California
Linda L. Crawford, Interfaith Center at the Presidio, San Francisco, California
F. Peter Phillips, Business Conflict Management LCC, Montclair, New Jersey
Susan M. Strouse, First United Lutheran Church, San Francisco, California

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Public Policy, Consensus Building, and Democracy
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Skills

Black and Blue: Healing the Divide in Police-Community Relations

Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level

Widespread and recurring incidents of violence involving law enforcement and local communities have exposed long-standing and deep-rooted distrust on both sides of this divide. For dispute resolvers, these incidents offer a historic opportunity to bring their skills and perspective to addressing these divisions and helping to promote greater understanding. Engaging and resolving such deep-seated tensions requires a variety of targeted approaches and a broad coalition of interested stakeholders at both grassroots and policy-making levels. The JAMS Foundation has been committed to supporting several of these initiatives, including specialized mediation training for police officers, integration and expansion of community-based training and services, and resources to enable local governments and community stakeholders to avert, and if necessary prepare for and constructively respond to outbreaks of civic unrest and violence. We invite you to participate in this discussion of these vital efforts to foster understanding and trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

David Brandon, JAMS Foundation, San Francisco, California
Brad Heckman, New York Peace Institute, New York, New York
Grande H. Lum, Ohio State Moritz College of Law, Burlingame, California
D. G. Mawn, NAFCM, Louisville, Kentucky

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Public Policy, Consensus Building, and Democracy
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Dispute System Design, Psychology
Sponsored By: Public Policy, Consensus Building and Democracy Committee

Fly on the Wall: Videos of Diverse Mediator Styles

Seacliff A/B, Bay Level

It’s a lonely profession…Have you ever wondered how other mediators do their work? We’ve filmed several of America’s best-known legal mediators—and found that these neutrals’ styles are much too varied to fit comfortably into a “Riskin Grid.” You’ll see how some top mediators select, and change, their format, tactics, intensity and body language as they strive to move recalcitrant parties toward settlement. We’ll stop the video often, to ask audience and presenters to consider and discuss how they would have dealt with the same situations.

Marjorie Corman Aaron, University of Cincinnati College of Law, Cincinnati, Ohio
Dwight Golann, Suffolk Law School, Boston, Massachusetts

CLE Program
Primary Track: Tools for Trainers
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, Psychology, Skills
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Concurrent Series H ......................................................... 3:15 pm – 4:30 pm

Comparative Views of the Mediator’s Role in Promoting Justice: Perspectives from the East and West

Pacific F, Pacific Concourse Level

Critics of mediation complain that “mediation is not about just settlement; it is just about settlement” (Genn 2012). The claim is that enthusiasm for agreement per se obscures the fact that some settlements are fairer than others and that power imbalances can result in oppressive terms for the less resourced. The question of who, if anyone, is responsible for the justice of the agreements mediated remains murky under most ethics codes. The panel, comprising mediation scholars and practitioners from Australia, Hong Kong, Scotland and the United States will discuss ethical dilemmas arising out of the blurred role of lawyer-mediators.

Lola Akin Ojelabi, La Trobe Law School, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
Charlie Irvine, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, United Kingdom
Anna K. C. Koo, Faculty of Law, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
Ellen Waldman, Thomas Jefferson School of Law, San Diego, California
Bobette Wolski, Bond University, Faculty of Law, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

Not for CLE
Primary Track: ADR as a Profession
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, Skills

Measuring the Expertise in Expert Opinion

Bayview A, Bay Level

The “battle of the experts” is a hallmark of modern litigation. Arbitration is not immune. The arbitrator is often left in the unenviable position of evaluating complex expert opinions. Yet, when no expert claims to know all fields from accounting to zoology, why do we expect arbitrators to have such knowledge? This program aims to have a frank discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of using alternative methods to evaluate expert opinions: the appointment of neutral experts, “hot-tubbing,” and peer review of expert reports.

David L. Faigman, UC Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco, California
Vaughn R. Walker, Arbitrator/Mediator, San Francisco, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Arbitration
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Technology, Research

What Every Mediator Needs to Know About Psychology

Pacific D, Pacific Concourse Level

We all know that disputes between people have something to do with psychology. But as lawyers, we tend shy away from working with human dynamics in which we have no training, and focus instead on objective measures such as odds of success at trial and cost of litigation. Unfortunately, this “rational actor” approach to dispute resolution often misfires in the face of heated emotions and strong personalities, and rarely leads to reconciliation and repair of ongoing relationships. This workshop will demonstrate that you don’t have to be a licensed psychologist to work skillfully with difficult people and challenging dynamics in mediation. Participants will learn basic psychological concepts related to the psychology of conflict, and how to apply them in practice, including: • The formation and nature of ego defenses and unconscious inner conflicts; • The relation of internal defense structures and conflicts to external conflict; • The most common psychological obstacles to resolving conflicts; • Working skillfully with difficult people and interactions in mediation; • How mediators can unconsciously contribute to impasse.

Stephen H. Sulmeyer, Mediation Offices of Stephen H Sulmeyer, San Francisco, California

CLE Program
Primary Track: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Skills
From Vulnerability to Resolution: the Role and Value of Respect and Understanding

*Pacific L, Pacific Concourse Level*

Vulnerability sits behind the masks we put on. It shouts in anger, it finds blame so as to appear blameless, it cowers and accepts loss, it can be both destructive and self-destructive. But if “vulnerability is the birthplace of innovation, creativity and change,” (Brené Brown), we need to channel its power through true respect and understanding. Through reflective questioning, verse and personal story, we offer to transform a passive mediator response to vulnerability into active engagement through trust- and relationship-building. In this completely interactive session, participants can expect it to be personal, in-depth and truth-seeking.

Charles Crumpton, Crumpton Collaborative Solutions, Honolulu, Hawaii
Nicola M. Hartfield, Nicola Hartfield Dispute Resolution, Wellington, North Island, New Zealand
Amrita Mallik, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii

*Not for CLE*
Primary Track: Communication/Psychology/Neuroscience
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Skills

Including Restorative Practices In Mediation of Civil Rights Cases

*Pacific I, Pacific Concourse Level*

The San Francisco Bay Area is home to some of the most experienced restorative justice practitioners and educators in the nation as well as to judges and mediators who have thought long and hard about the resolution of federal civil rights cases. This program will provide an overview of restorative practices, followed by a discussion about how to draw from restorative principles to enhance both self-determination and satisfaction among the participants when mediating or conducting settlement conferences in federal civil rights cases. Special attention will be given to the challenge of using restorative principles when parties prefer to meet in caucus, the fear of being perceived as ineffective, and the impact of a restorative lens on counsel’s negotiation strategies. We’ll include some small-group discussion and report back to capture specific strategies for incorporating restorative practices.

Robert (Roman) Haferd, Impact Justice, Oakland, California
Tamara Lange, ADR Program, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco, California
Donna M. Ryu, United States District Court, NDCA, Oakland, California
Marissa Wertherimer, MW Mediation, Mill Valley, California

*CLE Program*
Primary Track: Community and Social Justice
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Dispute System Design, Ethics, Psychology

When “Yes” Means “No”: Rethinking Informed Consent to Dispute Resolution Procedures

*Pacific E, Pacific Concourse Level*

Informed consent is the fulcrum of dispute resolution. However, too often disputants neither receive nor comprehend information relevant to their decision-making process. This impedes their ability to give meaningful consent to participate in a given dispute resolution procedure. You’re invited to this interactive workshop to learn about ground-breaking research on litigants’ understanding of, and preferences for, dispute resolution procedures. Culling from the work of colleagues in the medical, social science and IT fields, participants are invited to consider what might be included in a more personalized approach to informed consent. Become part of this innovative approach to an important problem.

Elayne E. Greenberg, St. John’s Law School, Queens, New York
Donna Shestowsky, University of California, Davis, California
Gil Siegal, University of Virginia School of Law, Charlottesville, Virginia

*CLE Program*
Primary Track: Dispute Systems Design (DSD)
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Technology, Ethics, Neuroscience, Practice Development/Management, Psychology, Research, Skills
FRIDAY, APRIL 21 (continued)

Negotiation Ethics
Pacific H, Pacific Concourse Level
When lawyers negotiate, they regularly misstate their client values and settlement intentions. When they engage in such deception, does this constitute unethical behavior? Model Rule 4.1 prohibits deliberate misrepresentations of material fact, but Comment 2 expressly exempts statements regarding client values and settlement intentions. To what degree may attorneys misrepresent such matters? What are their ethical obligations when they communicate about other matters? When, if ever, are they obliged to disclose factual or legal information they think is not possessed by their counterparts? Are their obligations different when they are communicating with judicial mediators?

Charles B. Craver, George Washington Univ. Law School, Washington, District of Columbia

CLE Program
Primary Track: Ethics
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Communications, Dispute System Design, Skills

Lawyers Speak: What Gets A Mediator Hired (Or Not)
Seacliff A/B, Bay Level
Experienced consumers of mediation—litigators and in-house counsel—share perspectives on mediator practices that help or hinder achieving settlements and client satisfaction with the process with specific examples. Expect candid remarks about how to insure never to get repeat business as a mediator and how to stay off the “do not hire this mediator” list.

Doris Cheng, Walkup Melodia Kelly & Schoenberger, San Francisco, California
Rachel K. Ehrlich, Judicate West, San Francisco, California
Gary T. Lafayette, Lafayette & Kumagai LLP, Oakland, California
Gilda R. Turitz, Sideman & Bancroft LLP, San Francisco, California
Shannon Walpole, Ferber Law, A Professional Corporation, San Ramon, California

Not for CLE
Primary Track: Mediation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Ethics, Practice Development/Management, Skills
Sponsored By: ADR Practice Development; Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR)

Constructing Cost Effective and Productive Expert Solutions to Maximize Settlement
Pacific K, Pacific Concourse Level
Expert information plays a significant role in construction defect litigation. The experts generally focus on plaintiff’s biggest ticket item: the cost of future repairs. Alternatively, if the project is an income producing property, such as an apartment building, hotel, university dormitory or professional business, the experts may concentrate on repair scopes that minimize move out or business interruptions. Expert discussions assist the parties in defining potential problems and developing repair proposals and pricing. Participants will learn how to effectively use experts to settle complex construction defect cases. From the use of separate repair scopes and bids to joint scopes to expert hot tubbing, we will look at the benefits of early expert involvement in the mediation process as a means of narrowing issues and maximizing settlement opportunities.

Anne M. Lawlor Goyette, Griffiths Goyette, Burlingame, California
Sandy M. Kaplan, Gordon & Rees, San Francisco, California
Daniel L. Rottinghaus, Berding & Weil LLP, Walnut Creek, California
Timothy J. Stokes, Richard Avelar & Associates, Oakland, California

CLE
Primary Track: Negotiation
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Dispute System Design, Ethics, Psychology, Skills
Sponsored By: WIDR (Women In Dispute Resolution)
Helping Mediators Learn to Have Difficult Conversations: Training Techniques
Seacliff C/D, Bay Level
We all find ourselves conducting trainings and wondering whether our trainees are truly actively absorbing our lessons and incorporating them into their future practice. We will discuss techniques we have used in short-term sessions and in longer-term training relationships to help participants internalize some of the more intangible lessons of mediation. Topics will include using the Implicit Association Test in discussing bias, designing role-plays for seasoned mediators, and incorporating spirituality into reflective practice. Bring a laptop or touch-screen phone: this session will be interactive!
Erin R. Archerd, University of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, Michigan
Jacqueline N. Font-Guzman, Werner Institute–Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska
Zena D. Zumeta, Mediation Training & Consultation Institute, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Not for CLE
Primary Track: Tools for Trainers
Additional Practice Area/Tracks: Neuroscience, Psychology, Skills

Legal Educators’ Colloquium Resource Share .................. 4:45 pm – 6:00 pm
Bayview B, Bay Level
Law faculty are always looking for good materials to use with their classes. Join Professors Sharon Press and Bobbi McAdoo as they once again lead a highly interactive sessions in which legal educators describe, in a minute or two, a resource they use (could be a web link, simulation, TED Talk ...) with their classes. The session is like an in-person listserv with the opportunity for attendees to follow-up with colleagues in real time. Half-page handouts are encouraged and all information is collated and posted to the legal educators’ listserv after the conference.
Facilitators:
Bobbi McAdoo, Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota
Sharon Press, Dispute Resolution Institute Mitchell Hamline School of Law, Saint Paul, Minnesota
Not for CLE
Primary Track: Law Schools/Legal Educators Colloquium

Friday Afternoon Committee Meetings .................. 4:45 pm – 5:45 pm
Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR) Committee
Public Policy and Consensus Building Committee

ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Awards Reception ............. 6:00 pm – 7:30 pm
Join the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution to honor Ethan Katsh, the recipient of the D’Alemberte-Raven Award, and Lainey Feingold and the JAMS Foundation, recipients of the Lawyer as Problem Solver Award.
The Reception is a ticketed event.


**SATURDAY, APRIL 22**

**ABA Registration Open** ........................................... 7:00 am – 12:30 pm

**Legal Educators Colloquium Continental Breakfast** 7:30 am – 8:20 am

*Sponsored by UC Hastings College of the Law, Center for Negotiation & Dispute Resolution*

Seacliff Foyer

**LEC-1 Sunrise Program** ........................................... 8:20 am – 9:20 am

**Dialogue through Difference: Expanding the Legal Skill Set**

*Seacliff A, Bay Level*

Traditional legal education has focused on developing a student’s ability to analyze, argue, and advocate. These skills are both critically important and patently insufficient for today’s lawyers. Lawyers must learn to bridge partisan divides and build connections in the face of difference. Join us as we share our efforts to build pedagogy that will enable law students to master the critical skills of dialogue, facilitation, perspective-taking, and empathy that are foundational to effective leadership. We will share video, case, and programmatic resources that we have developed as part of our growing facilitation and political dialogue initiative and engage a conversation around what comes next.

Danielle S. Bart, Goodwin Procter LLP, New York, New York
Tobias C. Berkman, The Consensus Building Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Robert C. Bordone, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Rachel A. Viscomi, Harvard Negotiation and Mediation Clinical Program at Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts

*Not for CLE*

**Coffee Break** ......................................................... 9:20 am – 9:30 am

**LEC Concurrent Series 1** ......................................... 9:30 am – 11:00 am

**Integrating Research-Based Skills into Your Regular Mediation Practice**

*Seacliff A, Bay Level*

Recent empirical studies tell us what works—and what doesn’t work—in mediation. But where do we go from here? How can we incorporate these findings into our mediation practice? In this highly interactive session, presenters will briefly highlight empirical ADR research on the impact of different mediator interventions. Then, they will lead the audience through a number of simulations and skills exercises that emphasize those skills found to be most effective. This session is appropriate for mediators who want to improve their skills, as well as trainers and legal educators looking for new ways to teach mediation skills.

Bruce Edwards, Edwards Mediation Academy, Tiburon, CA
Deborah Eisenberg, University of Maryland Francis K. Carey School of Law, Baltimore, Maryland
Toby Guerin, Center for Dispute Resolution Maryland Carey Law, Baltimore, Maryland
Lydia R. Nussbaum, UNLV Boyd School of Law, Las Vegas, Nevada

*CLE Program*
The ABA Standards and Dispute Resolution Courses: Quintessentially Experiential

*Seacliff C, Bay Level*

In 2014 the ABA dramatically revised its Standards and Rules for Approval of Law Schools. You may remember that mediation clinics had been defined out of the clinical realm, and while they are back in good graces, there are several issues that still impact dispute resolution courses. For example, the majority of ADR courses have simulation components, but are they simulation courses as defined in the standards? The answer is not as clear cut as you may think. In this session the presenters will break down the relevant standards, suggest ways in which to comply with them, and ask for feedback on potential interpretations of them.

Art Hinshaw, Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law, Arizona State University, Phoenix, Arizona
Carolyn Wilkes Kaas, Quinnipiac University School of Law, Hamden, Connecticut
James H. Levin, University of Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri
Jennifer W. Reynolds, University of Oregon School of Law, Eugene, Oregon

*Not for CLE*

Systems Analysis as Applied to the Field of Dispute Resolution

*Grand C, Street Level*

Systems analysis is the cutting edge of thinking as applied to intractable conflicts. When good people are coming up with good ideas and things are still not changing, that is a sign of a systemic failure. A systems analysis can approach this differently and provide tools for dispute resolution professionals. This session will apply systems analysis to the dilemma of why public officials and politicians tend not to follow known dispute resolution wisdom as a way of teaching how to apply these tools in general.

Robert Ricigliano, The Omidyar Group, Washington, District of Columbia
Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Nancy A. Welsh, Penn State University, Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pennsylvania

*Not for CLE*

Coffee Break .......................... 11:00 am – 11:15 am

LEC Concurrent Series 2 .................. 11:15 am – 12:30 pm

What the World Needs Now: Restorative Practices

*Seacliff A, Bay Level*

Multiple law schools provide restorative justice programs, clinics, or courses that promote collaborative healing by using alternative approaches to disputes. Operating typically in a clinical context, law school restorative justice programs bring together victims and offenders in community, prison, court, tribal, and school contexts. This session explores the various types of offerings and the opportunities and challenges of establishing law school restorative justice clinics, courses, and activities.

Barbara L. Creel, Southwest Indian Law Clinic University New Mexico School of Law, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Sheila M. Murphy, John Marshall Law School, Chicago, Illinois
Brian Pappas, Michigan State University College of Law, East Lansing, Michigan
Jon Powell, Campbell University Law School, Raleigh, North Carolina
Jonathan Scharrer, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wisconsin

*Not for CLE*

Seacliff B, Bay Level

How has ADR teaching improved in the last twenty years? Are we using different kinds of role plays? What are some new ways to teach “difficult conversations,” diversity, or cross-cultural awareness? Are we adequately harnessing the power of technology? Should we train students in coaching techniques so they can coach each other? What other strategies and experiences can we incorporate to better prepare students for jobs in the real world? During this highly interactive session, attendees will learn the most innovative ADR teaching tools and practices being used today.

Cynthia J. Alkon, Texas A&M School of Law, Fort Worth, Texas
Hiro Aragaki, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, California
Rishi Batra, Texas Tech University School of Law, Lubbock, Texas
Lauren A. Newell, Ohio Northern University, Pettit College of Law, Ada, Ohio
Peter R. Reilly, Texas A&M University School of Law, Fort Worth, Texas
Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Elizabeth C. Tippett, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Not for CLE

Teaching Mediation To Law Students, Part 2: Assessment

Seacliff C, Bay Level

The panelists will begin with a discussion of various assessment practices for mediation courses including but not limited to written requirements, video recordings and critiques, final exams, and pass/fail options. The panelists will next explore how their assessment practices meet the new ABA standards. The ABA now requires written and measurable learning outcomes in all syllabi with the goal being to assess student learning, improve their learning, and provide them with meaningful feedback. Several years’ worth of empirical data assessing and measuring learning outcomes in mediation courses will be shared.

Debra Berman, South Texas College of Law Houston, Houston, Texas
Jacqueline N. Font-Guzman, Werner Institute–Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska
James J. Alfini, South Texas College of Law, Houston, Texas
John Lande, University of Missouri School of Law, Columbia, Missouri

Not for CLE

Legal Educators Colloquium Luncheon .................. 12:15 pm – 1:45 pm

The Luncheon is an opportunity for conference and Colloquium attendees to break bread and converse. During the Luncheon we will honor Andrea Kupfer Schneider, the 2017 recipient of the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Award for Outstanding Scholarly Work.

Legal Educators Shoptalk ................................. 2:00 pm – 3:15 pm

Teaching Diversity as a Law School Course

Seacliff C, Bay Level

In January 2017, Harvard Law School offered a course on “Diversity and Dispute Resolution” for the first time. In this interactive workshop, led by David Hoffman, who proposed the course and taught it, attendees will share their experiences incorporating diversity issues into the courses they teach. In addition, Hoffman will provide an outline of the Harvard course, suggest guidelines for teaching such courses, and share some of the lessons from the first iteration of this course. The workshop will conclude with a discussion of the reasons why law schools should offer such courses.

David A. Hoffman, Boston Law Collaborative, LLC, Boston, Massachusetts

Not for CLE
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
2016–17 NATIONAL REPRESENTATION IN MEDIATION COMPETITION

The Competition provides an environment in which law students can learn and demonstrate their advocacy skills and model appropriate preparation for and representation of a client in mediation. The competition is designed to familiarize law student participants with advocacy skills in alternative dispute resolution processes, specifically mediation. The judging criteria are designed to reward those participants who use an effective combination of advocacy skills and a problem-solving approach in the mediation. Conference attendees are invited to attend the National Round of the Competition that is held in conjunction with the conference on April 19-20. Look for the detailed schedule the Conference Program Book.

Alexander Blewett III School of Law at the University of Montana
American University Washington College of Law
Antonin Scalia Law School at George Mason Univ. Law School** (Regional Host)
Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law**
Brooklyn Law School
California Western School of Law
Chicago-Kent College of Law
Emory Law School
Fordham University School of Law
Fowler School of Law, Chapman University
Frederic G Levin College of Law
Georgetown University Law Center
Liberty University School of Law
Marquette University Law School
Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University
Michigan State Univ. College of Law** (Regional Host)
Mitchell Hamline School of Law
New York Law School
Pepperdine University School of Law
Quinnipiac University School of Law
Regent University School of Law (Regional Host)
Rutgers Law School (Regional Host)
Samford University Cumberland School of Law
Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law at Arizona St. Univ.** (Regional Host)
Seattle University School of Law (Regional Host)

South Texas College of Law Houston
Southwestern Law School**
St. John’s University School of Law
Stetson University College of Law
SUNY Buffalo Law School** (Regional Host)
Texas A&M University School of Law
Texas Tech University School of Law
The George Washington University Law School
The John Marshall Law School
The Ohio State University Moritz College of Law
The University of South Dakota School of Law
Thomas Jefferson School of Law
Tulane University Law School
UC Hastings College of Law (Nationals Host)
University of Idaho College of Law
University of California, Berkeley, School of Law
University of Denver - Sturm College of Law** (Regional Host)

University of Houston Law Center
Univ. of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law**
University of Mississippi School of Law
University of Missouri-Columbia
University of Oklahoma College of Law (Regional Host)
University of Richmond School of Law**
University of Utah - S.J. Quinney College of Law
Washington and Lee University School of Law
Washington University Law**
William & Mary College of Law

** Indicates the schools that are participating in the Competition Nationals.

COMPETITION COORDINATING COMMITTEE:

Eric DeGroff, Regent University School of Law, Co-Chair
Lauren A. Newell, Ohio Northern University, Pettit College of Law, OH, Co-Chair
Rishi Batra, Texas Tech University School of Law, Vice-Chair
Brian Pappas, Michigan State University (Immediate Past Co-Chair)
Erin Archerd, University of Detroit Mercy
Mariana Hernandez Crespo, University of St. Thomas School of Law
Alexandra Buenaventura Gillet, Connecticut Judicial Branch
Rae Kyritsi, Center for Conflict Resolution
Kelly Navarro, John Marshall Law School
Gail E. Silverstein, University of California Hastings College of the Law
Linda Warren Seely, ABA Section of Dispute Resolution
EXHIBITOR PROFILES

The exhibit hall is located in the Grand Foyer

EXHIBIT HALL HOURS:
Thursday, April 20 7:00 am–7:00 pm
Friday, April 21 7:00 am–5:00 pm

American Arbitration Association (AAA) ................................. Booth 17
Address: 120 BROADWAY FL 15 New York, NY 10271-0016
Web: https://www.adr.org/
The American Arbitration Association (AAA), is a not-for-profit organization with offices throughout the U.S. AAA has a long history and experience in the field of alternative dispute resolution, providing services to individuals and organizations who wish to resolve conflicts out of court.

ABA Section of Dispute Resolution ........................................ Booth 5
Address: 1050 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 662-1680
Web: www.americanbar.org/groups/dispute_resolution.html
Learn about member benefits from the ABA and Section of Dispute Resolution. Make sure you are aware of free resources from the Section, including publications, teleconferences, and webinars. Learn how to access the ABA membership database and ABA directories of women and minority neutrals. Take a tour of the National Clearinghouse for Mediator Ethical Opinions, an online resource created by the Section’s Ethics Committee. Pick up a copy of the winter issue of Dispute Resolution Magazine on the topic of Mediation Practice: Challenges and New Horizons.

ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Committees .......................... Booth 6
Address: 1050 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 662-1680
Web: http://www.americanbar.org/groups/dispute_resolution/committees_task_forces.html
Stop by and talk with Section of Dispute Resolution Council Members and Committee Chairs about what the Section can do to meet the needs of today’s dispute resolution professionals. Want more information on committee resources and projects? Want to be involved in Section of Dispute Resolution Committees? Our committees cover every area of dispute resolution practice, from mediation to arbitration, Intellectual Property to Health Care. Get involved in a Section Committee to make connections and make the most of your membership.

Association of Family and Conciliation Courts .......................... Booth 14
Phone: 608-664-3750
Web: https://www.afccnet.org/
AFCC is an interdisciplinary and international membership association dedicated to improving the lives of children and families through the resolution of family conflict. AFCC has more than 5,000 members in over 25 countries.
EXHIBITOR PROFILES

Cardozo Law School–Kukin Program for Conflict Resolution .........................Booth 13
Address: 55 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10003
Phone: 212-790-0873
Web: http://www.cardozo.yu.edu/programs-centers/kukin-program-conflict-resolution
The Kukin Program for Conflict Resolution at Cardozo Law School is a pioneer of legal education in dispute resolution. Since 2000, US News and World Report has placed Cardozo among the top ten dispute resolution programs in the country. Cardozo offers an LL.M. in Dispute Resolution and Advocacy; a Certificate in Dispute Resolution for J.D. students; clinical and course offerings in negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and disputing processes; a Dispute Resolution Society; and an ADR Competition Honor Society. The Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution publishes three editions annually, hosts cutting-edge symposia, and sponsors the International Advocate for Peace Award.

Dispute Resolution Institute, Mitchell Hamline School of Law ...................Booth 15
Address: Mitchell Hamline School of Law, 875 Summit Avenue, St. Paul, MN
Phone: 651-695-7677
Web: http://mitchellhamline.edu/dispute-resolution-institute/
In a world drawn ever closer by globalization yet still fractured by historical and cultural division, understanding and managing conflict is critical. Through the Dispute Resolution Institute, we teach mediation because it provides a unique perspective on mutual understanding and creative problem-solving. We teach the art of negotiation because it is central to both making and saving deals. We teach arbitration because it is the global forum of choice for business.

Edwards Mediation Academy .................................................................Booth 3
Address: 1550 G Tiburon Blvd, St. 623, Tiburon, CA 94920
Phone: 415-272-6085
Web: https://edwardsmediationacademy.com/
Edwards Mediation Academy provides high-quality commercial mediation training in an online interactive teaching forum accessible around the world. Bruce Edwards, founder, has personally taught mediation to thousands of attorneys, judges and aspiring mediators throughout Europe, Africa, Asia, India and North America. Students learn from a variety of methods reflecting best practices in online learning. From traditional lectures, unique role-play formatting, commentary by industry experts to “virtual shadowing”, students receive the best in mediation theory and practical experience. Courses include Advanced Mediation, Basic Mediation Skills and Mediation Skills for the Indian audience.

JAMS ..............................................................Booth 4
Address: 18881 Von Karmen Ave Suite 350 Irvine CA 92612
Phone: 949-224-4661
Web: https://www.jamsadr.com/
Founded in 1979, JAMS is the largest private provider of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) services. With Resolution Centers worldwide, JAMS and its more than 300 neutrals are responsible for resolving thousands of cases each year ranging in size, industry and complexity, typically achieving results more efficiently and cost effectively than through litigation. JAMS neutrals are skilled in all ADR processes including mediation, arbitration, special master, discovery referee, project neutral and dispute review board work. JAMS may be reached at 800-352-5267 or on the web at www.jamsadr.com.
EXHIBITOR PROFILES

**Judicate West** ..............................................................Booth 12
Address: 100 Pine Street, Suite 1950 San Francisco, CA 94111
Phone: 415-266-1242
Web: https://www.judicatewest.com/
Judicate West is one of California’s leading providers of private dispute resolution services with a distinguished roster of proven neutrals, including retired state and federal court judges and attorney mediators and arbitrators from a variety of practice areas. Founded in 1993, the firm prides itself on delivering quality results through integrity, flexibility and a commitment to being the gold standard in alternative dispute resolution (ADR). Judicate West has offices in Sacramento, Santa Ana, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco.

**Marquette University Dispute Resolution Program** .....................................Booth 19
Address: PO Box 1881 Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881
Phone: 414-288-8038
Web: https://law.marquette.edu/
The legal profession is multifaceted, requiring a complex combination of knowledge and skills. Marquette University Law School trains compassionate, empathetic professionals capable of advising clients regarding all available avenues for resolving disputes, whether through litigation or alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. A leader in dispute resolution education, Marquette offers its students all the benefits of a nationally recognized DR program, spearheaded by our full-time faculty and the adjunct faculty members who truly practice what they teach. Marquette also offers a Certificate in Alternative Dispute Resolution in Law for students who wish to emphasize training in ADR.

**Mediate.com** .............................................................Booth 2
Address: PO Box 51090, Eugene, Oregon 97405
Phone: (541) 345-1629
Web: www.mediate.com
Mediate.com is the world’s most visited mediation web site with over 5 million annual visitors and over 15,000 articles, news items and videos. Importantly, Mediate.com features the world’s most used Mediator Directory and responsive design web sites and hosting for mediators. Join Mediate.com as a Premium Member and Featured Mediator to get more mediation cases!

**Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution** ........................................Booth 11
Address: 55 W. 12th Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-247-6718
Web: http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/students/groups/osjdr/
The Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution is the America Bar Association’s official journal for the Section of Dispute Resolution. Established in 1985, this student-operated publication publishes issues dedicated to the exploration, criticisms, and development of methods to resolve conflicts outside of the conventional legal process. The Journal serves as an exchange of information between scholars, who develop and comment upon theoretical models of dispute resolution, and practitioners, who are involved in implementing models as arbitrators, mediators, and judges. The Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution prides itself on its groundbreaking theories and celebrating diversity of ideas.
EXHIBITOR PROFILES

Pepperdine University School of Law–Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution.................Booth 16
Address: 24255 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu CA 91320
Phone: 310-506-7454
Web: https://law.pepperdine.edu/straus/
Pepperdine University’s Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution provides professional training and academic programs in dispute resolution including the LLM programs, Master of Dispute Resolution (MDR) and Certificate program. With courses offered in one week, two-weekend and full semester formats, students can go through at their own pace on a full or part-time basis, and complete the program from locations across the US. In addition to the academic programs, Pepperdine offers a number of symposiums, conferences and trainings including the one week Mediating the Litigated Case, three day Professional Skills Program (Malibu and Tennessee), and two day Women’s Negotiation Academy.

Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School .........................Booth 9
Address: Pound Hall 501, 1563 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Phone: 617-495-1684
Web: http://www.pon.harvard.edu
The Program on Negotiation (PON) is a research program at Harvard Law School. We offer trainings in negotiation and mediation as well as publications, case studies and roleplays for teachers and practitioners. At PON, we are committed to developing the theory and practice of negotiation, to nurturing the next generation of negotiation teachers and scholars, and to helping students become more effective negotiators. We accomplish this through research, seminars, courses, conferences, publications and special events. We invite you to stop by our booth to learn more.

Quinnipiac University School of Law Center on Dispute Resolution .................Booth 8
Address: 275 Mount Carmel Avenue, Hamden, CT 06518
Phone: 203 582-3450
Web: https://www.qu.edu/on-campus/institutes-centers/center-dispute-resolution.html
Quinnipiac University School of Law’s Center on Dispute Resolution integrates the theory and practice of dispute resolution by creating opportunities for both dispute resolution professionals and law students to enhance both knowledge and skills. We host workshops and statewide symposia to bring academic discourse to the law school and to the practicing community; we provide trainings to the outside legal and DR community in mediation and negotiation; and we host both a statewide mediation association and a direct service agriculture mediation program. The Center collaborates closely with, and helps support, the law student organization, the Society for Dispute Resolution.

Resolution Systems Institute.........................................................Booth 10
Address: 11 East Adams St, Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60603
Phone: 415.581.8941
Web: http://www.aboutrsi.org/
Resolution Systems Institute is a unique non-profit organization whose mission is to strengthen access to justice by enhancing court ADR systems. RSI provides both court mediation services (for child protection and foreclosure matters) and dispute system design and evaluation services for a wide variety of court cases. RSI also develops and conducts training of neutrals for court programs and provides a free online court ADR resource center. More information is available at AboutRSI.org or by contacting info@aboutRSI.org.
EXHIBITOR PROFILES

UC Hastings, Center for Negotiation and Dispute Resolution.Booth 18
Address: 100 McAllister Street, Suite 408, San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: 415.581.8941
Web: https://cndr.uhastings.edu/
The Center for Negotiation & Dispute Resolution (CNDR) was founded to develop ADR curriculum for the University of California Hastings College of the Law students and to contribute to the law school’s public service mission. Today, there are 19 different course offerings. During the summer, CNDR hosts practitioner training, conferences and events, including the International Court ADR Institute, and a 40-hour Mediation Certificate Training. CNDR has been recognized by US News & World Report as one of the Top ADR programs in the country.

ABA DR Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR) Committee.Booth 1
Address: 1050 Connecticut Ave NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 662-1680
Web: http://apps.americanbar.org/dch/committee.cfm?com=DR589300
The Section of Dispute Resolution Women in Dispute Resolution (WIDR) Committee is committed to ensuring the full scope of opportunities are available to women in the profession. We provide business resources and a supportive community to move ourselves and each other forward. Visit the WIDR Exhibit Table to view the WIDR Member Directory of ADR Practitioners, learn about monthly WIDR educational meetings, networking events, and much more.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION MAGAZINE
• Quarterly issues in print and online.
• Each issue covers important and evolving issues in the dispute resolution field.
• Members of the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution receive the quarterly issues as a free member benefit.
• Renew your ABA and Section of Dispute Resolution membership to make sure Dispute Resolution Magazine continues to arrive in your mailbox and inbox.

ambar.org/membership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXHIBITOR BOOTH ASSIGNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ABA DR Section Women in Dispute Resolution Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mediate.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Edwards Mediation Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section of Dispute Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section of Dispute Resolution Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Quinnipiac University School of Law Center on Dispute Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Resolution Systems Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Judicate West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cardozo Law School - Kukin Program for Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Association of Family and Conciliation Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dispute Resolution Institute, Mitchell Hamline School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pepperdine University School of Law - Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>American Arbitration Association (AAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UC Hastings, Center for Negotiation and Dispute Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Marquette University Dispute Resolution Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Successful Mediations Don’t Just Happen.

Whatever the dispute, from trademarks to personal injury, discover how JAMS neutrals empower the resolution process by crafting mutually agreeable solutions with economy and efficiency.

Resolving Disputes Worldwide

800.352.5267
jamsadr.com/mediation
How to Get Your CLE Credits

The American Bar Association (ABA) has requested continuing legal education (CLE) accreditation for this program in most states that require CLE. Each state has its own rules and regulations on CLE. This program may not receive credit in some states. In addition, the category of credit or the number of CLE credit hours may vary from state to state. Therefore, check with your state CLE regulator for confirmation of approval, the category of credit approved, and to verify the number of CLE credit hours.

Program Evaluation Form

If you were provided a hard copy program evaluation form, please complete it and return it to the ABA program registration desk before you leave. Otherwise, please complete the online program evaluation at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your feedback as it helps us to continue providing the high-quality programs that you expect.

Standard Attendance Form and Uniform Certificate of Attendance for Most States

With exceptions for the states below, attorneys sign in once per program on the standard attendance form and are issued a Uniform Certificate of Attendance for CLE credit. Complete the lower portion of the certificate including your membership, registration, or Supreme Court identification number. Complete a certificate for each state in which you are required to report. Please refer to the top of the certificate for individual state filing instructions and be sure to keep a copy of the certificate for your records. Each state has its own retention period. View MCLE information for your state online at http://americanbar.org/mcle. Do not return your certificate to the ABA.

Delaware Attorneys

Delaware attorneys and speakers seeking CLE credits must sign in at each individual session you attend. You will receive the Uniform Certificate of Attendance.

Illinois Attorneys

Illinois attorneys and speakers seeking CLE credits must sign in at each individual session you attend. The sign-in documentation is used to verify your total number of CLE hours. If you do not sign in at each individual session, the ABA cannot provide you with your customized Illinois Certificate of Attendance or Illinois Certificate of Teaching (for faculty). Certificates are provided either by session or in a combined certificate for the overall program. If an Illinois Certificate of Attendance is not available at the end of the CLE program (or session), the ABA will first verify your attendance then email or mail a completed certificate to you within 60 days.

Louisiana Attorneys (Programs Held in Louisiana)

If the in-person meeting is being held in Louisiana, Louisiana attorneys must complete the State Bar of Louisiana Course Attendance Form to report attendance. Follow the instructions on the form and return the completed form to the ABA program registration desk before you leave so that the ABA may report your credits. For programs outside Louisiana, Louisiana attorneys must use the Uniform Certificate of Attendance (see above).

New York Attorneys

New York attorneys and speakers seeking CLE credits must sign in and sign out of each individual session you attend. The sign-in/sign-out documentation is used to verify your total number of CLE hours. If you do not sign in and out, the ABA cannot provide you with your
CLE

customized New York Certificate of Attendance. Certificates are provided either by session or in a combined certificate for the overall program. If a New York Certificate of Attendance is not available at the end of the CLE program (or session), the ABA will first verify your attendance then email or mail a completed certificate to you within 60 days.

Pennsylvania Attorneys
Pennsylvania attorneys must complete the Pennsylvania CLE Credit Request form to report attendance at in-person programs. Follow the instructions on the form to complete it. Do not return the form to the ABA.

Tennessee Attorneys (Programs Held in Tennessee)
If the in-person meeting is being held in Tennessee, Tennessee attorneys must sign in and sign out of each session on the special Tennessee Course Attendance Form. For all other in-person meetings, Tennessee attorneys sign in on the standard attendance form. In both cases, Tennessee attorneys receive the Uniform Certificate of Attendance.

Texas Attorneys
Texas attorneys must complete the Texas CLE Course Attendance Form to report attendance at in-person programs. Follow the instructions on the form and return the completed form to the registration desk before you leave so that the ABA may report your credits. If you are reporting your CLE credits online, you may obtain the nine-digit Texas Course ID # by visiting www.texasbar.com (use the MCLE Course Search in the MCLE area of website) or by contacting the ABA. It takes approximately 4-8 weeks for the application to be reviewed and the Texas Course ID # to be available.

Questions? Please visit http://americanbar.org/mcle for more information.
AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
UNIFORM CERTIFICATE OF ATTENDANCE

CLE credit has been requested from most states with MCLE requirements. For many live events, credit approval is not received prior to the program. Attendance reporting requirements vary by state. Within 30 days of this activity (or annually if required), the attorney must file this Certificate with his/her MCLE state agency if licensed in AR, CO, FL, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, ME, MS, NH, NM, NV, ND, OH, PR, RI, TN, VA, VI, WV, or WY. Do not file this Certificate with your MCLE state agency if licensed in AL, AK, AZ, BC, CA, GA, Guam, IA, IL, MN, MO, MT, NC, NY, OR, QC, SC, TX, UT, VT, WI or WA. Filing of Certificates is optional in remaining MCLE states. Please keep the original or a copy of this Certificate for your files. The ABA reports attendance and pays applicable fees in states where the sponsor is required to report. Each state has its own rules and regulations indicating what qualifies for “CLE” and “Ethics” credits. Therefore, certain programs may not receive credit in some states. You may wish to check with your state for confirmation of a program.

Sponsor: American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution

Program Name: 19th Annual Section of Dispute Resolution Spring Conference

Date: Apr 19-22, 2017 ABA Program ID: 22138

Location: San Francisco, California, USA

We have requested a total of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17.00</th>
<th>CLE credit hours based on a 60-minute hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>CLE credit hours based on a 50-minute hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of this total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60-minute hour</th>
<th>50-minute hour</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism CLE credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Elimination of Bias CLE credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>Law Practice CLE credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Skills CLE credit hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Substance Abuse/Mental Illness CLE credit hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on your state's rules, welcome/opening remarks may or may not be approved for CLE credit. In addition, some states round down final credit hours (e.g., to the nearest quarter hour). To view MCLE information for your state, visit www.americanbar.org/mcle.

To be completed by attorney:
By signing below, I certify that I attended the activity described above and am entitled to claim CLE credit hours including ethics/professionalism credit hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attorney Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar/License Number Date

State where credits are to be registered:
(Complete a Certificate for each state to which you are required to report.)

Acknowledged by:
Cassandra Williams
Cassandra Williams, MCLE Program Associate
## CLE

### Session Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>End Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>IL Credit</th>
<th>NY Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Conversation with Judge Jeremy Fogel</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>09:00 AM</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Evaluation in Civil Court Mediations: How to Facilitate an Inherently Evaluative Discussion</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court ADR: What New Research Tells Us About Parties, Neutrals, and Judges</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Bias Fact or Fiction: Effects on Mediator Neutrality and the Mediation Process</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>01:00 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Research to Action: Rethinking ADR in the Courts, Part II</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>01:30 PM</td>
<td>02:45 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.25</td>
<td>Skills 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Your Commitment to Neutrality Translate Into Better Judgment?</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>02:45 PM</td>
<td>04:15 PM</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Masters: A Way of Bringing Alternatives Into Judicial Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Apr 19, 2017</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>04:15 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration Update</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispute Systems in Context: Who Do They Benefit?</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.25</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Dispute Resolution Processes – Mediation, Arbitration &amp; In Between – Part I</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Funding in ADR - What You Need to Know</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>10:15 AM</td>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR Around the World: Country Developments, Global Trends</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINRA Securities Dispute Resolution – What Lies Beyond the Task Force?</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.25</td>
<td>Skills 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness: Why It Matters In Mediation</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Modern Sales Theory Can be Effectively Used in Mediation</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Dispute Resolution Processes – Mediation, Arbitration &amp; In Between – Part II</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power to the People: Addressing Power Imbalances in Employment Mediations</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mediator's Role in Managing Electronic Discovery</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricky Business: Avoiding the Pitfalls of Drafting Awards</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>01:15 PM</td>
<td>02:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Skills 1.0</td>
<td>Skills 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a Reflective Practitioner Group: A Tool Kit for the Reflective Practitioner</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>02:45 PM - 03:45 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.0</td>
<td>Skills 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Dispute Resolution – Making Resolution of Disputes Within The First 60 Days A Reality</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>02:45 PM - 03:45 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Perspectives on ODR: A Conversation with the Authors of The New Handshake and Digital Justice</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>02:45 PM - 03:45 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Your ADR Neutrals' Disclosures Meet Party Expectations?</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>02:45 PM - 03:45 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.0</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Winning Alternative to Lawsuits: Resolving Legal Claims with Structured Negotiation</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>04:00 PM - 05:15 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.25</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration in the Media: Insights and Resources for Practitioners, Academics, and Journalists</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>04:00 PM - 05:15 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Technology is Shaping the Future of ADR Practice</td>
<td>Apr 20, 2017</td>
<td>04:00 PM - 05:15 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting Edge Issues For Managing Complex Cases: Part 1, Pre-Hearing</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary or Revolutionary: Applying the Model Standards to ODR</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.25</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Mediators in the Collaborative Process</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strange Bedfellows: Achieving Dispute Resolution Success with Hybrid Techniques and Neutral Experts</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Negotiations: The Right Number at the Wrong Time is the Wrong Number</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Negotiation on the Tower of Babel: Strategies in a Cross-Cultural Classroom or Workplace</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Elimination of Bias 1.25</td>
<td>Elimination of Bias 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Art of Recognizing Transformative Moments in Mediation</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Power Paradox and Mediation: Using Power as a Force for Good</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>09:45 AM - 11:00 AM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td>General 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificially Intelligent Mediators: Futureproofing ADR</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>Law Practice Management 1.0</td>
<td>Law Practice Management 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting Edge Issues For Managing Complex Cases: Part 2, Hearings</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Training Help Experienced Mediators?</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Caucus: Using Neuroscience to Adapt Community and Family Mediation Models</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating the Muslim Couples' Marriage and Divorce</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories Mediators Tell Around The World</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impact of Employment Arbitration and Increasing Legalisn on Traditional Labor Arbitration</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>11:15 AM - 12:15 PM</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td>General 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>CLE Hours</td>
<td>Practice Hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New Way of Thinking About Mediation and Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Intelligent Mediation: What’s Emotion Got to Do With It? Managing Positive and Negative Emotions To Reach Resolution</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Problems That Arise In Arbitrations And Strategies For Dealing With Them</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly on the Wall: Videos of Diverse Mediator Styles</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Make Your Mediation Advocacy More Effective</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Negotiation Theory More Helpful for Practitioners</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Confidentiality Reconsidered: What’s on the Horizon Here in California and Nationwide?</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways to Success: How to Avoid Mistakes and Create A Thriving Practice</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Law Practice Management 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolving Technology and IP Disputes with Online Dispute Resolution Technology</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>01:45 PM</td>
<td>03:00 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Law Practice Management 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing Cost Effective and Productive Expert Solutions to Maximize Settlement</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Restorative Practices In Mediation of Civil Rights Cases</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring the Expertise in Expert Opinion</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Ethics</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Every Mediator Needs to Know About Psychology</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>General 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When &quot;Yes&quot; Means &quot;No&quot;: Rethinking Informed Consent to Dispute Resolution Procedures</td>
<td>Apr 21, 2017</td>
<td>03:15 PM</td>
<td>04:30 PM</td>
<td>75 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating Research-Based Skills into Your Regular Mediation Practice</td>
<td>Apr 22, 2017</td>
<td>09:30 AM</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>Skills 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Credit Hours**

- Elimination of Bias
- Ethics/Professionalism
- General
- Law Practice Management
- Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLE Hours</th>
<th>Practice Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Law Practice Management 2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Skills 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Ethics/Professionalism 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>Law Practice Management 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>Skills 11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fostering Alternative Dispute Resolution Around the World

The AAA-ICDR Foundation® is fulfilling its critical mission to support the use and improvement of dispute resolution processes in the USA and internationally. The Foundation supports conflict management and resolution, research and education, increasing access to justice and sharing expertise across groups and cultures.

2016 GRANT RECIPIENTS INCLUDE THESE IMPORTANT PROGRAMS:

**Prison of Peace**
2016 Valley State Prison
Prisoner Mediation Training Program
www.prisonofpeace.org

**Minnesota State Office for Collaboration and Dispute Resolution and Dispute Resolution Institute at Mitchell Hamline School of Law**
2016 Talk with Purpose: Using Dispute Resolution to Engage Communities in Conflict and Foster Relationships for Constructive Change
www.mn.gov/admin/bms/ocdr

**Mediators Beyond Borders International**
Women in Peacebuilding: Enhancing Skills and Practice Training
www.mediatorsbeyondborders.org

**Consensus Building Institute**
Collaborative ADR in Disputes Concerning Natural Resources
www.cbuilding.org

**American Bar Association Young Lawyers Division**
Annual Law Student Arbitration Competition
www.americanbar.org

**Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution Pepperdine University School of Law**
Global Summit for Innovation in Conflict Management, September 2016
www.law.pepperdine.edu/straus

Learn more, donate or apply for grants at aaaicdrfoundation.org.
10th Annual Arbitration Training Institute  
A Comprehensive Training in Commercial Arbitration  
Chicago, IL  |  June 15–16, 2017  |  American Bar Association Offices  
This two-day training will be presented by a panel of nationally recognized arbitrators and arbitration advocates. Let the panel of experts walk you through the arbitration process from start to finish. This limited capacity training will provide you with a unique learning environment and industry contacts you will sustain throughout your career.

This program will be accredited for MCLE and is eligible for ACE credit (for AAA Arbitrators).

Practice Development Institute  
Chicago, IL  |  July 14–15, 2017  |  American Bar Association Offices  
This two-day workshop led by Forrest “Woody” Mosten, provides a practical model for implementing client-centered peacemaking strategies in your profession, including unbundled legal services and innovative dispute resolution tools. Participants will learn new ways to help clients while staying out of court, and explore the personal and ethical dimensions of collaborative problem solving. Interdisciplinary practitioners will benefit from this training, including lawyers, mediators, mental health professionals, paralegals and financial professionals.

Please join us for this unique, energetic, and rewarding training to learn:
• Ideas and resources to help you make the transition to satisfying and income-generating peacemaking work
• Important issues to consider before establishing a neutral and/or collaborative practice
• Proven models and methods of practice that Mosten and his colleague David Hoffman have developed over a combined 60 years in mediation

Advanced Mediation and Advocacy Training Institute  
Malibu, CA  |  October 19–20, 2017  |  Pepperdine School of Law  
This two-day interactive institute features rare opportunities to learn from some of the leading mediators and advocates in North America. Each plenary session panel features an expert mediator, in-house counsel, and a skilled outside attorney, discussing each phase of the mediation process. Small group discussions led by experts in the field follow the plenary session panels. The opportunity for mediators and advocates to interact in small facilitated groups provides a unique environment to enhance your skill, knowledge and understanding of the mediation process.

For more information and to register, visit www.americanbar.org/dispute
Educational Programs on all topics related to dispute resolution

Multiple Networking Opportunities

Symposium on ADR in the Courts

Legal Educators Colloquium

70+ Concurrent Programs (includes CLE and non-CLE educational programs)

APRIL 4-7, 2018
WASHINGTON HILTON

DEVELOP YOUR SKILLS AND LEARN FROM EXPERTS

The conference agenda will include excellent programming on mediation, arbitration, negotiation, and specialty practice areas. Whether you are new to dispute resolution practice or have been practicing for decades, the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution Spring Conference has something for you.