As part of a groundbreaking research study about the effectiveness of ADR, C-DRUM authored the “ADR Landscape: An Overview of ADR in the Maryland Court System” (Landscape). Based on extensive research and interviews conducted by Managing Director Toby Guerin, the report provides a comprehensive description of all 70+ court-affiliated ADR programs in Maryland. The Landscape describes the complexities and nuances of individual programs as well as broad themes. The information is designed to educate the Maryland Judiciary and its ADR practitioners on the current role of ADR in Maryland’s courts and lay the foundation for continued informed innovation.

While some states have eliminated or reduced funding for ADR programs, the Maryland Judiciary has remained a national leader and innovator in promoting a variety of conflict resolution processes in the courts and community. In 1998, Chief Judge Robert M. Bell created and chaired the Maryland ADR Commission and then established the Maryland Mediation and Conflict Resolution Office (“MACRO”), led by Maryland Carey Law Alumna Rachel Wohl ’88.

In 2010, the Maryland Administrative Office of the Courts received support from the State Justice Institute to research court-affiliated ADR programs and practices across the state. The project includes three distinct components:

- a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of ADR in several Maryland settings (both in Maryland’s state court of general jurisdiction (the circuit court) and limited jurisdiction small claims court (the district court);
- an assessment of the effectiveness of various ADR approaches and systems to understand what approaches are most effective in which settings; and
- an understanding of the role of ADR in promoting access to justice for all Marylanders.

The study brings together a partnership of researchers, including C-DRUM, the Bosserman Center for Conflict Resolution at Salisbury University, Community Mediation Maryland, the University of Maryland Institute for Governmental Science and Research, and the Court Operations Department of the Maryland Judiciary. The research team has worked with court staff, consumers, practitioners, and attorneys to obtain vital information regarding ADR use, practices, and perceptions.

According to the ADR Landscape, ADR exists in all of Maryland’s 23 counties and Baltimore City (“24 counties”). All 24 counties offer mediation for child access cases and 18 counties also offer mediation for marital property cases. In the early 1990’s general civil circuit court mediation began in Baltimore City and has since expanded to 13 additional counties. Only two of the state’s Orphans’ Courts
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We are honored to announce the establishment of the Honorable Paul A. Dorf Memorial Fellowship Endowment. This permanent fund was created through the generosity of his beloved wife, Mrs. Helene Penn Dorf, and will provide endowed support for annual fellowships at the Center for Dispute Resolution, that promotes the effective resolution of conflict to empower and transform. This fellowship is a great opportunity for a student to learn first hand while working directly with the director and other faculty. Judge Paul Dorf, graduate of the class of 1951, was a former State Senator and Baltimore City Circuit Court judge who championed the use of arbitration and mediation as alternatives to an overcrowded court system. Judge Dorf was a respected jurist and accomplished lawyer who joined the firm of Adelberg, Rudow, Dorf & Hendler after retiring from the bench in 1983. During his time at the firm, he devoted much of his practice to family law, litigation and alternative dispute resolution. Through the generous gift of Mrs. Dorf, this fellowship will continue Judge Dorf’s legacy at Maryland Carey School of Law as well as highlight his commitment to dispute resolution.
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provide mediation options for probate matters.

For matters involving juvenile offenders, 10 jurisdictions offer ADR for specific charges. The most common process available for juvenile matters is community conferencing. In addition to community conferencing, the practices of collaborative law and parent coordination represent two emerging ADR practices for family law matters in Maryland.

Maryland’s lowest level trial court, the District Court of Maryland, offers civil ADR in 15 counties through the court’s ADR Office. In 11 of the 15 locations, litigants may engage in pre-trial mediation in addition to day of trial ADR services. Through partnerships with the county State’s Attorney’s Offices, 12 counties offer ADR for certain misdemeanor crimes.

Maryland is often described as “America in miniature” because the demographics and geography of the state mirror the national diversity at all levels. In turn, the court-affiliated ADR programs provide a representation of the diverse policies and practices within the ADR field. No two programs are exactly the same; each program has adopted a slightly different model. In addition to program-specific details, the report highlights several trends and themes among the diverse programs. Programs differ in characteristics such as program evaluation and quality control practices including neutral qualifications, continuing education requirements, ADR practitioner removal policies, and participant and practitioner evaluation tools. The document details the availability of free and reduced-fee ADR services by program and program funding sources. The forthcoming cost-benefit and efficiency and effectiveness research will hopefully provide some insight into the impacts of the various models.

According to the Honorable Thomas G. Ross, Chair of the ADR Committee of the Conference of Circuit Court Judges, “We have a wide variety of strong ADR programs in Maryland. It is readily apparent that ADR benefits both the court and the participants, but we don’t have any hard evidence on which to base decisions about what types of strategies work best with various case types. With the findings from this major research endeavor, we will be able to tailor efforts to bring the most effective techniques to the ADR process, as well as quantify how courts benefit in terms of cost-savings and efficiencies.”

As the research continues, C-DRUM’s Managing Director Toby Guerin, Associate Professor Deborah Eisenberg, and Law Professor Emeritus Roger Wolf remain involved as members of the ADR Research Advisory Committee. There is much anticipation on the national level for the results of Maryland’s study. Within the next two years several reports are scheduled for release. For updates on the research and access to all reports, visit the research webpage at www.marylandadrresearch.org.
Responsive regulation (engaging those who are regulated by the state in deciding what form that regulation should take) and restorative justice (bringing together all of those who are affected by an offense to decide collectively what the response to that offense be) offer a radically different way to think about achieving justice for people subjected to abuse. First, restorative justice and responsive regulation provide an alternative to the ineffective criminal justice sanctions, without jettisoning the criminal justice system altogether. The criminal justice system is the most developed and best funded response to domestic violence in the United States. Nonetheless, in the domestic violence community, there is an ongoing conversation about the efficacy of criminal justice interventions, in part because the social science evidence does not support the idea that criminal justice intervention deters or decreases intimate partner abuse. It’s also because advocates are concerned that the system does more harm than good, particularly to the most vulnerable communities—women of color, immigrant women, low income women, and LGBT people subjected to abuse.

Advocates are searching for alternatives to criminalization while acknowledging that there are some people who are so abusive that they must be incapacitated. The difficulty lies in figuring out when someone’s behavior is so abusive or dangerous that there is no choice but to incarcerate. John Braithwaite and Kathleen Daly use the regulatory pyramid structure to suggest an answer to this question, escalating interventions from self-sanctioning and social disapproval through confrontation with family and the threat of incarceration, to three levels of community conferencing, to arrest with intensive probation, to imprisonment. The idea is to marry the big stick of serious, certain criminal justice intervention with moral suasion, leading people to refrain from intimate partner abuse not because it’s a crime, but because it’s morally wrong. Whether the promise of certain and serious criminal sanctions would deter violence in ways that the current system does not is an open question.

Few advocates would be completely happy with the pyramid. Some argue that the failure to immediately invoke the power of the state fails to send the message that intimate partner abuse will not be tolerated; others dislike the multiple chances given to the abuser to change his behavior; and still others (very few, but they exist) seek the removal of incarceration as an option at all. But maybe that’s the sign that Braithwaite and Daly have gotten it right—a solution that addresses many of the concerns of most of the people. Accountability is not achieved through the criminal justice system; a system that requires an abuser to face those he has harmed may provide the kind of accountability many seek.

Second, restorative justice and responsive regulation could help to change community norms around intimate partner abuse. The early battered women’s movement believed that passing laws declaring domestic violence a crime would begin to create this change. But such laws have existed in most states for at least the last thirty years without significant change to community norms. Although rates of domestic violence have fallen since 2000, the reduction mirrors the decline in the crime rates overall; and from 2010-2013, rates of domestic violence fell less than the overall crime rate. As Ian Ayres and John Braithwaite observed in their book, “Responsive Regulation: Transcending the Deregulation Debate”, the build-up of oppressive crime control efforts in the United States can be traced largely to the community’s failure to effectively control crime. This reliance on the state has created belief that the state is responsible for dealing with intimate partner abuse.

In responsive regulation, the community plays a role in enforcing self-regulation. This notion of community responsibility taken from responsive regulation could reinvigorate community efforts to “police” abuse and could fundamentally transform how communities understand intimate partner abuse. Moreover, the carceral system models violence. But, as John Braithwaite notes in “Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation”, using non-violent forms of justice could help change community norms around the acceptability of violence. He writes, “If we want a world with less violence and less dominating abuse of others, we need to take seriously rituals that encourage approval of caring behavior so that citizens will acquire pride in being caring and nondominating.”
This has truly been an exceptional year for the ADR Team, advancing to the national round in two ABA-sponsored competitions, hosting the Regional ABA Dispute Resolution Section’s Representation in Mediation Competition, and participating in two new competitions. The team owes a great deal of appreciation to the adjunct faculty, coach, alumni, and volunteers for the ADR Team’s continued successes.

**Negotiation**
- ABA Law Student Division Negotiation Competition- Regional Champions, National Participants
- Liberty University School of Law National Negotiation Tournament
- Merhige National Environmental Negotiation Competition (new)

**Mediation**
- ABA Dispute Resolution Section Representation in Mediation Competition- Regional Hosts, Regional Champions, National Semi-finalists
- International ADR Mediation Tournament (new) - Outstanding ADR Team

**Congratulations** to the recipients of the Maryland Carey Law Litigation and Advocacy Award. The award is provided annually to graduating students selected by the faculty for their contribution to the School’s achievements in intra- and inter-school advocacy.

- Joshua Chazen
- Ian Clark
- Claire Costantino
- Denalee DeRosa
- Michael Goldberg
- Laurie Holmes
- Patrick Kyhos
- Mallory Montgomery
- Megan Nathan
- Cindy Nguyen
- Crystal Schroeder

---
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Repeatedly, legal employers say they are looking for “practice ready” law graduates. Maryland Carey Law has a long tradition of offering practice-based courses on a variety of topics, including negotiation. Whether negotiating a plea bargain, a real-estate contract, or a retainer agreement, effective negotiation skills are essential to the practice of law. Having taught negotiation for two years, Professor Dawna Cobb was searching for a new way to bring more of the “real-world” into her negotiation simulations. Looking across town to the Johns Hopkins Carey School of Business, Professor Cobb connected with Professor Brian Gunia and his MBA negotiation class.

Using a scenario based upon a public negotiation that occurred years ago in New York City, 24 Carey law students played the role of a senior partner at a leading real estate firm. To complicate things, their client was a corporation owned by a blind Bahamian trust that was controlled in turn by a large, publicly held chain of luxury hotels. Prior to the in-class negotiation, the law students met with their client—the chief operating officer (COO) of the hotel chain, who was played by a MBA student.

The buyer’s side was represented by the law students. The client was eager to buy a row of more than 50, once grand but now dilapidated townhouses and transform them into a large, high-rise hotel with restaurants and bars. On the seller’s side of the transaction, a MBA student played the role of the realtor. The realtor represented a closely held corporation owned by several elderly members of the same prominent family, all of whom had grown up in the townhouses.

Each side had its stipulations for the negotiation: the law student representatives could not disclose the buyer’s full identity nor its development plans and the sellers wanted a buyer who would restore the property to its former elegance as luxurious private residences. The simulation included realistic scenarios including sellers who were unreachable during the negotiation and who had already received prior offers.

Staying true to the facts and the clients’ wishes resulted in only three possible solutions:

1. The seller’s representative could accept the chain’s offer—which would probably be below market for that kind of use—and ignore the client’s objections to commercial development and their desire to know the seller’s full identity; or
2. The buyer’s representatives could ignore their client’s instructions and disclose the planned hotel development to the seller’s representative, who would, again, accept the proposed high-rise development in spite of the client’s preferences; or
3. The buyer’s representatives could simply lie about their client’s planned use.

None of the options were good. If the competing negotiators were faithful to their respective clients’ wishes, it was impossible to make a deal—an outcome that was surprising to students and counter to most of their simulation-based experiences.

After an hour of negotiating, some weren’t able to reach an agreement. Others did, however, largely by evading the issue of the buyer’s plans for the property or by stretching the truth. The two classes engaged in a post-negotiation discussion. For law students, the exercise highlighted the definition of a material fact and the competing interests of a happy client, professional responsibility, and a resolution.

According to one student, the experience “was especially helpful as a way of learning how to reconcile the issues of concealing information from the opposing side with zealously representing a client.”
From the Courtroom to the Classroom

This past year the Mediation Clinic at UM Carey Law — one of the most innovative mediation clinics in the nation— continued to break new ground. Since its inception, the clinic has trained law students to mediate in a variety of settings including day of trial and pre-trial small claims cases and administrative claims against federal agencies. Clinic students also support conflict resolution education programs in K-12 schools. With the support of two returning clinic students, Emily Miller ’14 and Kimberly Schindel ’14, a record number, 16 students enrolled in the year-long clinic.

A highlight of the spring semester involved an expanded unit on representation in mediation. The students embraced roles as attorneys and clients with assistance from highly experienced mediators. The Clinic is grateful to Roger Wolf, Donzell Robinson, Brian Harvey and Barbara Williams for sharing their expertise with our students.

Courts

More students meant more mediation referrals were needed. In particular, referrals from the District Court ADR program more than doubled over the prior year. Pre-trial mediations rose to 28, a 65% increase from the prior year; and 12 additional pre-trial referrals agreed to mediation on the day of trial. Clinic students continued to volunteer twice a week for the District Court for Baltimore City day of trial program, resulting in 40 mediated cases.

Schools

For the past 11 years, Clinic students have stepped outside of the traditional mediator role to assist schools seeking to implement conflict resolution education programs as part of the collaborative partnership between C-DRUM, the Maryland State Department of Education, and the Maryland Judiciary’s Mediation and Conflict Resolution Office.

Maryland teachers and school administrators are embracing conflict management tools designed to engage students and address problems in the classroom before they escalate into full-blown conflicts. UM Carey Law Mediation Clinic students with formal mediation and conflict resolution training provide regular support to K-12 students by collaborating with schools on practices such as mediation, dialogue circles, and peer mediation training.

The Clinic’s novel conflict resolution work in schools also caught the attention of the media. The work of Barbara Grochal and two Mediation Clinic students, Courtney Amelung and Kendall Clise, at Holabird Academy in Baltimore City was featured on Baltimore’s local NBC affiliate, WBAL (http://baltimore.cbslocal.com/2014/02/06/baltimore-city-school-solving-bully-problem-with-words-not-fists/). According to Anthony Ruby, principal of Holabird Academy, a K-8 school, the school has seen suspensions drop from nearly 100 to just two in the three years since a conflict resolution program has been implemented. In addition to the work done by the teachers and administration of the school, Mediation Clinic students have visited the school almost weekly to meet with students and conduct mediations. “With kids you see a lot of issues around gossip,” says UM Carey Law alumna Kendall Clise, who mediated with students in conflict at Holabird Academy. “It’s challenging; kids are impacted by the behavior of their peers, and that can influence their behavior.”

In February, two other students, Megan Hindle and Nina Gleiberman were featured with Barbara Grochal on Washington, D.C.’s WAMU for their weekly dialogue circles at Sligo Creek Middle School Montgomery County (available at http://bit.ly/1bIHKEI).

Whether in the classroom or the courtroom, Mediation Clinic students create opportunities for people to resolve conflicts on their own terms. As a 13-year-old student stated after participating in a dialogue circle, one of the many facilitated by Mediation Clinic students throughout the school year, “I’ve learned that talking to people is the right choice. I’ve learned perspective-how to put myself in someone else’s shoes.”
In Fall 2013, I participated in an externship with the Federal Labor Relations Authority’s (FLRA) Collaboration & Alternative Dispute Resolution Office (CADRO). Through this hands-on externship, I gained a deeper understanding of mediation in the collective bargaining context, effective ways of engaging with aggrieved parties and their attorneys, Unfair Labor Practice (ULP) appellate procedure, administrative law judge settlement conference process, and managing stubborn parties.

The CADRO program was established in 1996, and implements one of the FLRA’s primary strategic goals to reduce litigation and its attendant costs by helping the parties resolve disputes by using collaboration, alternative dispute resolution, and labor-management cooperation activities. CADRO offers dispute resolution services to help resolve pending ULP complaints, negotiability petitions, arbitration exceptions, and other related matters.

In addition to delivering ADR services, CADRO also provides facilitation and interest-based bargaining training. Within the past year, CADRO has seen a greater emphasis on providing external training to the FLRA clients within the realm of alternative dispute resolution, interest-based bargaining, and labor-management cooperation initiatives. CADRO is also working towards a more proactive approach to interested parties through written materials; on-site briefings with federal sector agencies, unions, neutrals and professional organizations; and participation in seminars, conferences and meetings.

Prior to serving as an extern, I worked as a CADRO administrative intern. My primary duty was to schedule and attend mediations, facilitations, and trainings. As a prior intern and current law student, I had the opportunity to actively participate in all phases of the mediation program, from scheduling cases, to preparing case law to present parties, to closing cases in the CADRO online database.

My primary responsibility involved inviting parties to utilize our ADR services and explaining the mediation process. I also learned how to deal with various personalities and communicate with disgruntled parties. These experiences taught me how to address parties needs and concerns and help them to resolve the matter without litigation. In over 80 percent of the cases, the interventions result in either the full resolution of the underlying disputes or withdrawal of the pending case.

But the highlight of the externship for me was participating actual mediations—something that is typically only possible for the CADRO mediator, parties, and attorneys. By participating, I was able to practice using different mediation styles and explore which styles were most effective. For example, I often used the technique of “reality checking” by taking clients through a laborious litigation timeline and the ADR timeline, which was generally shorter. By reminding the parties that they could resolve their issues more quickly by actively participating in the decision making process using ADR, the parties were more inclined to reach mutually agreeable solutions.

In addition, comparing and contrasting different styles of mediation helped me determine which style worked best for me and I was able to practice co-mediation techniques with my supervisor. For example, my supervisor and I would often use a facilitative approach to keep the process moving, while a different FLRA staff attorney would use a more evaluative approach to put things in perspective for the parties. This experience made me realize that mediation techniques are not “one-size fits all,” and that a mediator must use different styles based on the needs of the parties and the situation.

Kerishe Allen is currently serving as an Intern in the Collaboration & Alternative Dispute Resolution Office (CADRO) at the FLRA, and hopes to work there upon graduation.
Professional Trainings

This year C-DRUM has provided a variety of conflict resolution, mediation, and negotiation trainings, including the following:


- Mediation Ethics, Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, Annapolis, MD, Jun., 13, 2014

- STAR: Systemic Approach to Mediation Strategies, East Coast Professional Skills Program with the Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution at Pepperdine University, Baltimore, MD, Mar. 20-22, 2014

- Basic Mediation Training, Department of Defense, Linthicum, MD, Oct. & Dec. 2013

Through C-DRUM’s conflict resolution education program, trainings were provided to grantees and public schools throughout the state.


- Winter Conflict Management Training for Schools, Annapolis, MD, Feb. 11, 2014


- Peer Mediation Train-the-Trainer Workshops, Annapolis, MD, Nov. 4-5, 2013


Barbara Grochal continues to provide valuable trainings and presentations to schools and educators on a variety of conflict resolution topics.

- Trainer, “Using Circles Effectively,” Drew Freeman Middle School, Spaulding, MD, Apr. 7, 2014

- Co-Presenter with Mediation Clinic, “Restorative Practices,” Chatsworth School, Reisterstown, MD, Nov. 1, 2013


Publications

Leigh Goodmark

- “Law and Justice Are Not Always the Same: Creating Community-Based Justice Forums for People Subjected to Intimate Partner Abuse,” FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW (forthcoming 2015).

Toby Treem Guerin

Events

As part of the Maryland Public Policy Conflict Resolution Fellows Program, C-DRUM, in collaboration with the Maryland Mediation and Conflict Resolution Office, coordinated a variety of programs.

- Rapid Response Network Facilitation, University of Maryland Carey School of Law, Baltimore, MD, Dec. 16, 2013
- Caravan of Reconciliation, Oct. 24-27, 2013, a series of interreligious events across Maryland organized by Clergy Beyond Borders, Inc.
- Southern Maryland Public Dialogue Series, three public dialogues organized jointly by the Maryland Commission on Civil Rights and the Maryland Humanities Council in Calvert, Charles and St. Mary’s Counties, Oct.-Nov. 2013

Presentations

Leigh Goodmark


Deborah Thompson Eisenberg

- Presenter, “Employment Law,” Learning-at-Lunch Series, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law, Baltimore, MD, Apr. 7, 2014
- Presenter, “Teaching Multi-faceted Lawyering Skills to Meet Community Needs,” The Clinical Law Program at 40, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law, Baltimore, MD, Apr. 4, 2014

Barbara Sugarman Grochal


Transportation for the Caravan of Reconciliation across Maryland from Oct. 24-27, 2013


Toby Treem Guerin

- Panelist, “Making the Most of ADR in the Business Litigation Context: Putting the Counsel into Counselor” and “Building Dispute Resolution into your Small/Solo Law Practice” Maryland State Bar Association 2014 Annual Meeting, Ocean City, MD, Jun. 12-13, 2014
- Panelist, “What the State of Court ADR Means for You,” American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution Annual Spring Conference, Miami, FL, Apr. 2, 2014
Media


Deborah Thompson Eisenberg

- Interviewed (live) WTOP radio, Jul. 14, 2014 on the topic of stereotypes about women in the workplace


Barbara Sugarman Grochal


Awards

Mediation Clinic students Nina Gleiberman and Megan Hindle ’14 received the Anne Barlow Gallagher Prize for Service to Children and Youth in recognition of their work with Sligo Middle School.

Stacy Smith was appointed to a two-year term on the Board of Directors for the Anne Arundel Conflict Resolution Center.

In honor of conflict resolution month, C-DRUM was issued a proclamation on Oct. 17, 2013 from the Chief Executive Officer of the Baltimore City Public School System honoring its contributions to promote conflict resolution in schools across Maryland.

C-DRUM received a grant from the University of Maryland, Baltimore’s Center for Community-Based Engagement and Learning for a pilot “whole school” approach to conflict management at Callaway Elementary School in Baltimore City. C-DRUM will train the teachers and staff in restorative practices and “Second Step” curriculum. Mediation Clinic students will be available to provide mediations between students. The results of the research will be presented at a campus-wide symposium in the fall of 2015.
C-DRUM advances the effective resolution of conflict to empower and transform.

Mediation and Professional Trainings available.
Representative Clients:
The Johns Hopkins University
University of Maryland University College
Department of Transportation’s Surface Transportation Board
Maryland Office of Administrative Hearings
District of Columbia Office of Administrative Hearings
Maryland Department of Budget and Management’s Shared Neutrals Mediation Program
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