Message from the Chair

Where Is Our Place at the Table?

By Deborah Wood Blevins, deborah.blevins@workcomp.virginia.gov

The Joint ADR Committee’s Symposium on Monday, September 25, 2017, in Richmond was a rousing success by any objective measure. Attendance, content, finances and evaluations were all outstanding.

“A Place at the Table: A Symposium on Attracting 21st Century Clients and Efficiently Solving Their Problems” focused on how lawyers can use ADR skills to give them a competitive advantage in practicing law.

As the shine of the day dims with time, I ask myself: What did I learn? What will stay with me in my future work? And where do we as a committee go from here?

First, I learned that we are not alone. There are many of us who think about the broader potential for lawyers to serve clients and our legal system. I heard creative thinking about the big picture; I saw camaraderie forming among people with a common intellectual curiosity; I felt the excitement of those who did not want to leave at
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News and Notes

The next Joint ADR Committee Council meeting will be Wednesday, Feb. 7, at 10 a.m. at VBA on Main in Richmond, 1111 E. Main St., Suite 905. Committee members are welcome to attend. Public parking is available in the Bank of America Center (enter on East Cary Street, between 10th and 12th). Two-hour street parking is available where posted.

The Virginia Bar Association’s 128th Annual Meeting will be Jan. 18-20 at the Williamsburg Lodge. “What Neuroscience Teaches About Managing Conflict” will be presented by Professor Larry Bridgesmith of the Vanderbilt University School of Law. See vba.org/vbaannual2018

Our committee will co-present a CLE at the Virginia State Bar Annual Meeting in Virginia Beach, tentatively set for June 13-17.
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the end of the day.

Second, and this is no surprise, these people are team players. All day long, people came up to me and offered to help in the ongoing work of the Joint ADR Committee. Almost every member of Council helped in some way in putting on the Symposium – from sponsorship to recruiting speakers to buying index cards – we were pulling the oar together.

Third, from the small group discussion responses, I learned that collectively we agree with Justice Millette’s assessment of what lawyers should be doing. It is critical to listen, really listen, to clients so that we understand what their needs, goals and interests are. Early intervention and problem-solving very often result in the best outcomes for people across a broad spectrum of subject matter disputes: corporate, commercial, securities, family and domestic relations, labor and employment. The best “legal” outcome may not be the “best” outcome for the person.

And where do we go from here? Again, I give credit to the comments that came from the small group discussions at the Symposium.

There are real, systemic impediments to problem-solving and the use of ADR techniques in the everyday practice of law. Some of these are cultural, like the “muscle memory” of trial preparation. Some of them are personal, like the “type A, competitive adversarial attorneys who get in the way of settlement.” Some are financial, like the cost and time involved in pursuing formal mediation.

Overcoming these barriers is our future. I believe we start by continuing to talk, and continuing to support each other. The Council of the Joint ADR Committee is exploring ways in which we can raise awareness through educational programs, and also provide social connections among those of us who are interested in these issues. In the short term, we are sponsoring a CLE at the VBA Annual Meeting. “What Neuroscience Teaches About Managing Conflict” is going to be presented by Professor Larry Bridge-smith of the Vanderbilt University School of Law. At the VSB Annual Meeting in Virginia Beach next summer, we are partnering with the Family Law Section to present “The Lawyer as Problem-Solver: Respectful Dispute Resolution for People Who Think They Hate Each Other” (alternatively “Formulating Good Questions & Finding Common Cause”).

Do you have ideas? Are you willing to help? It’s not too late – in fact, we’ve only just begun. Contact me or any member of Council. Please also, use our blog to contribute information about how you are following up to spread the messages conveyed during our wonderful September symposium.

It’s all good,

Debbie

New Year's Volunteer Opportunities - Be Involved!

1. Bring at least one new member into our Committee
2. Read our blog All Things ADR and post comments to share your ideas and build its impact
3. Join our Young Lawyer ADR Pro Bono project to benefit schools and communities
4. Join our Young Lawyer ADR Mentoring project to prepare the new wave of lawyers in ADR
5. Help us develop a statewide law school ADR tournament
6. Submit a brief article to our newsletter, Virginia ADR
7. Join a subcommittee
8. Tell us how’re we doing and what you’d like from your Joint ADR Committee

Let’s Connect! Email Debbie Blevins, Chair; or Jim Cosby, Vice Chair
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A Great Day's Recap: ADR Symposium

By Claudia Farr and Marina Mayes, Joint ADR Communications subcommittee

On September 25, 2017, the Joint ADR Committee brought together lawyers, mediators, arbitrators and other dispute resolution professionals for a full day of presentations and discussion on attracting 21st century clients and efficiently solving their problems.

Here’s a look at the sessions that day.

Here and Now in Dispute Resolution

MARK E. RUBIN: Executive Director, Virginia Center for Consensus Building at Virginia Commonwealth University, providing public policy mediation and training in mediation and negotiation

LAWRIE PARKER: Founder and Executive Director, Piedmont Dispute Resolution Center, providing mediation, restorative justice, multi-party facilitation and related training

BRYAN HANSON: Graduate Student Ombudsman, Virginia Tech; Board President, Association for Conflict Resolution, a national professional association of ADR practitioners

Moderator Mark Rubin, along with panelists Lawrie Parker and Bryan Hanson, introduced the audience to resources that can support lawyers in solving their clients’ problems.

Parker discussed the high-quality and low-cost services provided by the not-for-profit community conflict resolution centers in Virginia for individuals, families and organizations. Taking a systemic, networking approach, the centers also help communities address problematic issues through public dialog facilitation and consensus building.

Hanson described how non-lawyer dispute resolution experts can help lawyers understand ADR and shift focus from win/lose approaches to appropriate, interest-based outcomes. He noted that events such as the symposium are increasing nationwide, encouraging the exchange of expertise among professionals.

Rubin discussed the work of the Virginia Center for Consensus Building at Virginia Commonwealth University. Through mediation and related conflict resolution training, the center helps stakeholders reach consensus solutions to public policy conflicts. In many cases, legislation can then be crafted by the stakeholders themselves, and progress through the General Assembly smoothly and efficiently.

The message for lawyers? Think about these resources as you consider increasing your ADR skill levels and helping your clients solve their problems.
The Value of Having Good Problem-Solving Skills

THE HONORABLE LEROY F. MILLETTE JR.: Retired Justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia, now providing mediation and other dispute resolution services with The McCammon Group

The Honorable LeRoy F. Millette Jr. provided a jurist’s perspective on problem-solving during lunch. By sharing stories of his experiences as a lawyer, jurist and now mediator, his remarks encouraged each person in the audience to answer this important question: “Why be a lawyer?” Is the answer to be a gladiator or to be a problem-solver?

He recounted a homebuilding trial from his early law practice, noting that his client was not fascinated about the legal analysis, or even winning the case. What his client really wanted was to solve the problem and get on with his business. The principle here? Focus on the real-world needs of your client.

As a circuit court judge presiding over many family law cases, he noticed two kinds of lawyers: those who simply prepared their cases for trial, and those who worked with their clients ahead of time to help them prepare for a life-changing process. The lesson learned? Take the time early on to talk with your client and look at the big picture. Also, think creatively in considering resolutions that might benefit your clients more through cooperation than litigation.

Especially in family law cases, he realized that the people who knew the case best were the parties and their counsel. He related that he started talking to the lawyers and their clients early on, asking, “Who better to solve the case than you? If you make the decision, you’ll believe in it more than if I do, and there will be no need for a show cause hearing.” The take-away? Tailored solutions negotiated by the parties and their counsel can work better than court-ordered solutions.

He also emphasized the value throughout litigation of joint problem-solving by attorneys, noting as examples that e-discovery is especially appropriate for a shared give and take, and that parties may create their own scheduling orders.

Panelists Sam Jackson, Melinda Biancuzzo and Julia Morelli discussed the ADR models and tools to which public and private sectors are shifting as a means to prevent, manage and resolve internal and external disputes.

Jackson led a discussion on early collaborative intervention, to include individually tailoring ADR dispute clauses in business contracts, proactively assessing cases, and using customized, post-dispute processes designed by the parties. The touchstones he conveyed to us — focusing on the client’s real-world needs, seeing the big picture, working together with professionalism, cooperation and creativity — continue to resonate.

The Changing Face of Problem-Solving

SAMUEL JACKSON: Mediator; adjunct professor of negotiation and ADR, University of North Carolina School of Law; Co-chair, Committee of Mediator Ethical Guidance, American Bar Association, Dispute Resolution Section

JULIA MORELLI: President, Holistic Solutions, Inc., providing mediation, facilitation, coaching, online dispute resolution and training in mind-body awareness for a variety of clients

MELINDA BIANCUZZO: Attorney at Gibson Dunn focusing on government contracts, cybersecurity and data privacy; professional background in Certified Project Management

Panelists Sam Jackson, Melinda Biancuzzo and Julia Morelli discussed the ADR models and tools to which public and private sectors are shifting as a means to prevent, manage and resolve internal and external disputes.
and counsel with the help of a neutral consultant.

Biancuzzo elaborated on how the long-successful practices in legal project management can apply to the design of dispute resolution systems. Before or after a dispute arises, we can collaboratively map and manage a desired pathway toward resolution with all parties.

Morelli discussed ways to cultivate “eustress,” a positive, healthy response in the body and mind to the stress of pressure and demands. In her presentation, she gave an overview of conflict coaching, along with practical tips on cultivating self-awareness, understanding the mind/body connection, and taking a holistic approach to problem-solving.

**Symposium Recap**  
*Continued from page 4*

**Return of the Counsellor at Law**

JACK W. (JB) BURTCH: Attorney at Burtch Law, PLLC, practicing labor and employment law, including alternative dispute resolution and mediation; adjunct professor of law at the University of Richmond School of Law

JB Burtch, using real-life examples, discussed with the audience what it means to be an attorney and counsellor at law – a dual role for lawyers. His in-depth look at the fundamental principles of legal counselling and the related rules of professional conduct provided an engaging end to the Symposium’s sessions, and a great segue to conversations and networking at the reception.

**Revisions to Mediator Recertification Guidelines Now in Effect**

The Judicial Council of Virginia recently approved significant revisions to mediator recertification guidelines, effective Nov. 1, 2017.

Dispute Resolution Services Manager Sally Campbell and her staff have worked steadily over the past year on proposed revisions and soliciting mediator feedback and concerns.

Many mediator suggestions made their way into the new guidelines (starting on page 10). The major changes:

- Eliminate the continuing education distinction between “general” and “family” courses
- Reduce the number of continuing education hours required for dually certified mediators
- Allow “core” course training (courses needed to become certified in the first place) to count as continuing education
- Eliminate the case requirement
- Increase the continuing education requirement
- Eliminate the requirement for non-ethics courses
- Allow 8 hours of continuing education credit carryover for one certification cycle
- Allow continuing education credit for thorough and thoughtful mediator self-reflection after a co-mediation

Questions? Contact Dispute Resolution Services.
Managing Forgiveness Issues in Mediation

By David T. Deal

Among the ancients, forgiveness was not a virtue, but over the ages, for various religious and social reasons, forgiveness has emerged as a popular topic relevant to conflicts and their resolution. Once associated mostly with elimination of debt obligations, forgiveness has come to be associated more with reconciliation and healing in the wake of hurtful behavior affecting individuals personally. While the topic often has a religion-based component or is associated with policy-based initiatives to address large-scale efforts at reconciliation, such as South Africa’s landmark Truth and Reconciliation Commission, this short article focuses solely on mediating conflicts involving interpersonal forgiveness.

Mediators are no strangers to forgiveness-related issues. Domestic relations is a particularly fertile area for addressing forgiveness: domestic violence, spouse-spouse, parent-child, sibling-sibling, and extended-family conflicts. However, forgiveness-type issues can also surface in conflicts triggered by other matters: theft, desecration of property, personal injury, estate planning, fraud, workplace tensions and partnership disagreements, to name a few.

Given the ethical need for neutrality and respect for self-determination, mediators should not, of course, presume to make forgiveness an objective of any case they are handling. On the other hand, forgiveness does arise, and mediators should be prepared to handle the matter if presented. Drawing mostly, but not exclusively, on my restorative justice experience, here are some thoughts that might put the mediator at ease.

First, the term forgiveness means quite different things to different parties. For the party seeking forgiveness for offending behavior, forgiveness may offer personal relief for regretted actions and a pathway to re-establish an important personal or business relationship. However, seeking forgiveness can be awkward and is not risk-free; an offender’s efforts can be rejected. For the aggrieved party, the term forgiveness may imply something far deeper: offering forgiveness, whether sought or not, may feel like shorthand for excusing the offending behavior, swallowing what for them may have been emotionally deep pain, and a response to a simplistic, demanding, intrusive and self-serving request for relief, much of which may lead to what restorative justice practitioners call “revictimizing.”

Second, for addressing a specific conflict, careful attention to language is imperative: forgiveness might not be the term of choice. For example, most mediators have experienced situations where terms like apology or acknowledgement, if deemed genuine, can reset the conflict and become the foundation for a satisfying meeting of the minds. In restorative justice, where resolution of the conflict often involves personal harm and the need for real healing, careful accounts of cases in the literature ironically reveal that the term forgiveness is rarely used, even though outside the conflict the term is closely associated with healing. What the cases show is that the term forgiveness is so loaded that injured parties respond much better if the perpetrator uses less value-laden terms like apologize and couples it with expressions of empathy and efforts to understand how the
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offended party feels. In addition, the mediator should make sure a party seeking forgiveness does not assume that upon apologizing they are entitled to something that sounds like forgiveness; forgiveness is a gift and cannot itself be transmuted into a debt.

Third, meetings with the parties separately beforehand offer a good opportunity to explore the matters and concerns described above. If, however, forgiveness surfaces without warning during the mediation, a caucus would be a simple way to discuss the topic and, if desired, stay on the path of discussing forgiveness but in a way that averts any misunderstandings that could derail the mediation.

Fourth, for the party contemplating forgiveness of another, mediators should also be mindful that religion-based prescriptions bearing on the application of forgiveness vary appreciably. If the party has a religious view, does that view deem forgiveness to be a moral duty, a conditional moral duty depending on some form of repentance, or a moral virtue to be applied on a case-by-case basis? If, instead, the party has a more secular or humanistic view, that offers the mediator more leeway. Either way, the mediator should tread carefully in this domain and seek a respectful understanding of the party’s bounds.

Fifth, for the party contemplating forgiveness, mediators should also be mindful of a huge body of social science research examining the myriad factors that bear on the wisdom of offering forgiveness: the nature of the offense, relationship of the parties, cultural norms, religious affiliations, and many others. Mediators interested in understanding this research should consult the highly regarded Handbook of Forgiveness, edited by a Virginia Commonwealth University professor of counseling psychology. While not a mediator’s cookbook, the book’s contributors do explain the significance of these factors for a wide range of situations, and position the mediator to understand and convey to the parties that forgiveness is best viewed not as an event or a decision but as a process that often takes time.

Endnotes


Virginia Association for Community Conflict Resolution: Here for Lawyers Serving Clients and Community

Lawyers may not know what VACCR is and why its work is important and relevant to lawyers. Jeanne Franklin recently interviewed Christine Poulson, executive director of VACCR, and VACCR Board member Lawrie Parker, who is also executive director of the Piedmont Dispute Resolution Center.

VACCR, the Virginia Association for Community Conflict Resolution, is a consortium of nine community-based conflict resolution centers in Virginia. What do VACCR members do?

LAWRIE: The short answer, the mission, is that the not-for-profit centers promote and facilitate positive dialogue and decision-making across Virginia so that more conflicts are resolved constructively or even prevented. Each center is a little different but generally is staffed by a small paid professional staff and assisted by a panel of professionals who provide mediation, training, facilitation and related services to individuals or to larger groups and communities. Community education and co-parenting workshops are also center initiatives that strengthen families and communities.

What does VACCR do?

CHRISTINE: VACCR supports the work of its member centers by creating opportunities for information-sharing, networking and collaboration. We work to develop and share resources efficiently among members and to promote the use of ADR.

Your speaking with us seems an example of your networking and interest in possible collaborations. What are some messages that you’d like to convey to lawyers about VACCR and the work of the centers?

LAWRIE: First, we’ve been around a long time. We pre-date the Virginia statutes that authorized court-referred ADR, and have been credited in good part with the early growth of ADR. Second, centers provide an array of conflict resolution and dialogue services including training, strategic planning, mediation, facilitation and restorative justice services.

Since we’ve been around so long, we’ve acquired legitimacy and a record of consistently high-quality services.

We’d like lawyers to know that VACCR member centers are ready to help lawyers serve their clients. We

Continued on page 9
accept direct lawyer referrals and otherwise work with attorneys. In some cases, we are able to assist their clients who cannot afford additional services.

Lawyers have always served on center boards and as neutrals on the panels. We also recruit lawyers to conduct some of our trainings.

What else do you think lawyers should know?

CHRISTINE: V ACCR centers offer a variety of training and mentoring opportunities. Whether a lawyer wants to become a certified mediator or to enhance dispute resolution skills, the centers are available. We suggest lawyers connect with the center within their geographic areas to keep abreast of offerings.

LAWRIE: The success and longevity of ADR has created “generations of neutrals”; some of the original guard is moving on now and we encourage millennial lawyers to take a serious look at becoming neutrals and contributing to their communities by volunteering with a center. It is such valuable service and immensely satisfying.

Are there focus areas or issues that lawyers would particularly value?

CHRISTINE: VACCRR members contribute to increasing access to justice – a special lawyer concern. Through centers’ family mediation services, which feature prompt scheduling of mediations, people in distress can get more timely access in some locations to resolution and relief than through the J&DR courts alone, especially when the court date list is long. Mediators encourage participants to consult with their attorneys and especially before signing mediated agreements. One adviser told us to say that we keep children from crying themselves to sleep at night. We don’t always talk like that, but it is true – in family disputes, time can be of the essence in getting relief and keeping children out of the middle of parental conflicts.

LAWRIE: But VACCRR centers do more than family mediation. We handle an array of civil cases from J&DR and General District courts, from lawyers, from clients looking for help directly, and from community organizations or businesses.

Can you provide some examples of how centers have facilitated dialogue on important community issues?

LAWRIE: Different communities have different conflict resolution needs, some of which seem insurmountable. But there is hope. One issue we’ve worked on is community-police relations. A Virginia police department and the African-American community asked for our help to strengthen their relationship. The resulting dialogue and joint police-citizen conflict resolution trainings were quite beneficial; we can imagine this being replicated elsewhere in Virginia, in communities that feel a need for it.

Another example is how communities handle mental health issues. What does a community need to do to prevent and respond to mental illness and substance use disorders that harm individuals and the common good? We have facilitated such a dialogue. With more outreach and resources (including human) we can help communities face tough questions.

We also work in restorative justice – so powerful in addressing and preventing crime! And we work in the schools in conflict prevention training.

You mentioned legitimacy. How do you ensure the quality of center services?

CHRISTINE: Training and Virginia Supreme Court mediator certifications (GDC, J&DR, and circuit court levels), supervision, mentoring, evaluation forms, and working closely with the neutrals. A benefit of working through a center is peer review, debriefing and continuing education.

LAWRIE: Our neutral panels include persons from all walks of life, including the law. Neutrals bring unique experience and perspectives that are shared through peer support and education.

And you have a new Advisory Council? To what end?

CHRISTINE: VACCRR member centers want to grow their services and amplify their impact by responding to unmet community dispute resolution needs. The
I had a case recently involving significant, life-altering injuries, and serious questions regarding compensability – I mediate for the Virginia Workers’ Compensation Commission. Despite my best efforts, the claimant, his family and his attorney did not seem to appreciate the considerable risks of litigation. The result? Impasse. The claimant later lost his case at hearing and received nothing. His lawyer told me about the outcome, stating that he wished he had listened to me during the mediation. His comment left me wondering what I could have done differently. Ultimately, through reading and self-reflection, I gained a greater understanding of how trust, emotional intelligence, and influence theory can impact mediation for the better.

Trust

In mediation, it is important for the parties and attorneys to trust the mediator. Often, trust may already exist between the attorneys and the mediator by virtue of their reputations and experience with one another. However, establishing trust with the parties takes place each time we mediate. How do we establish trust within the timeline of a mediation?

In The Speed of Trust, Stephen Covey asserts that “[c]ontrary to what most people believe, trust is not some soft, illusive quality that you either have or you don’t; rather, trust is a pragmatic, tangible, actionable asset that you can create.” According to Covey, people can increase trust much faster than we might think, and doing so will have a huge impact on the results we achieve.

What inspires trust in a particular relationship? The answer: communication, character and competence. Clear, open and honest communication is critical. Character comes with making and keeping commitments, engaging in honest interactions, showing respect, having and expressing clear values, and being open to learning. Being conscious of our intent is also important. The intent that inspires the greatest trust is one of seeking mutual benefit.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence is the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, and for managing emotions constructively in ourselves and in our relationships. Mediation requires not merely a cognitive analysis of competing interests or the rational development of a desired outcome, but also an acknowledgment of underlying emotional factors. Often, successful mediation is as much about an emotional resolution as it is about material redistribution.

Thus, mediators should actively listen and take the time to understand the parties’ emotions, needs, and
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concerns. If we can genuinely empathize and help the parties acknowledge and manage their feelings and emotions, we can encourage them to think and perceive differently, and open them up to considering other points of view and options.

Influence Theory

How else can mediators create an environment where the parties remain open to new perspectives and options? We can learn a few tips from Robert Cialdini, an authority on the study of influence. Cialdini has identified six fundamental principles of persuasion: liking, authority, scarcity, consistency, reciprocity and consensus. While all six are germane to mediation, the principles of liking, authority and scarcity may be particularly significant.

People are more easily influenced by people they like. Many factors affect how much a person likes another, yet research identifies one as the most powerful and easiest to implement – similarity. Identifying similarities between the parties or between you and the parties can quickly establish trust. Trust then encourages the parties to share with the mediator and each other useful information, perspectives on risk, and possible resolutions.

According to Cialdini, people are also more easily influenced by those they perceive to be legitimate authorities. Mediators have a degree of legitimate authority simply by virtue of our position, and often our subject matter expertise. We must also establish that we are trustworthy sources of information. The parties’ attorneys also possess legitimate authority, most often beneficial to the process, but not always. For example, injured claimants often say, “Whatever my attorney thinks is best,” a sentiment that can compromise party self-determination.

Lastly, opportunities are more desirable when scarce. As Cialdini points out, “[a]n effective mediator should never fail to describe the unique or otherwise unattainable advantages of any recommendation or offer. Moreover … in situations characterized by uncertainty, presenting these unique advantages as what stands to be lost … is more persuasive than emphasizing what stands to be gained ….”

So, what could I have done differently to help the claimant, his family and his attorney appreciate the risks of litigation and reach a mediated resolution? Maybe nothing. After all, the ultimate decision was theirs. Perhaps, though, I could have earned the trust of the injured worker and his family more fully. I could have listened better, asked more questions about their underlying interests. If I had established a more direct, credible relationship with the injured worker and his family, they may have been able to appreciate better the risks of litigation and the benefits of a mediated resolution. Significantly, the injured worker’s family and his attorney focused on what they felt was fair compensation for the injuries – what they sought to gain. Perhaps I should have encouraged more focus on the risks associated with not reaching a settlement – what they stood to lose, and ultimately did lose.

ENDNOTES

4. Ibid., 104-108.
5. Trip Barthel (August 2009), Emotional Intelligence in Mediation, Mediate.com.
6. Robert B. Cialdini, Roselle L. Wissler and Nicholas J. Schweitzer (2002), The Science of Influence, Dispute Resolution Magazine (Fall). The authors also warn on page 22 that influence used inappropriately seldom, if ever, yields long-term positive results, and may present ethical issues, undermine trust, and damage the reputation of the mediator.
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V ACCR Board is made up of member center executive directors whose time is consumed with daily operations. V ACCR formed an Advisory Council to gain other perspectives, guidance and support from community leaders, a number of whom are or have been on the Joint ADR Committee Council. We hope they will help expand the influence of community-based dispute resolution by opening new doors and providing new networking and collaborative opportunities.

LAWRIE: The council is a fresh collaboration that we hope is a foundation for the growth of community-based dispute resolution (ADR). Throughout the commonwealth – and the nation – community organizations, governments, schools and judicial and legal systems are looking beyond traditional methods for addressing dispute resolution in collaborative ways. V ACCR is at the center of building alliances that promise to have a dramatic impact on the quality of life in our communities. Winds of change are blowing through Virginia’s communities, bringing chances for fresh and positive ideas, new cooperation and renewed commitment to a brighter future for all of us. As community leaders, we hope lawyers will join V ACCR centers in such work. Your hope and determination are inspiring. Thank you.

Jeanne Franklin is a member of the Virginia Association for Community Conflict Resolution Advisory Council and former Chair of the Virginia State Bar/Virginia Bar Association Joint ADR Committee Council. Through her business, FranklinSolutions, she offers mediation, facilitation and conflict management services.

We Want to Hear from You!

If you have a point of view or ADR story that you would like to share in an upcoming newsletter, please email Claudia Farr at claudia.farr@workcomp.virginia.gov with your ideas.

Have a Question About Your Joint ADR Membership Status?

Contact membership coordinator Jennifer Strader at The Virginia Bar Association. Call 804-644-0041, Ext. 116, email jenniferstrader@vba.org or sign on to your member profile at www.vba.org.

Who better to help you?

Who better to help you with your insurance needs than an agency created by attorneys? We understand your challenges and now offer group and individual benefits and professional liability and business coverage.

To experience our personal service, call us at 1-800-358-7987 or visit www.virginiaarristersalliance.com.

Register now!
128th VBA Annual Meeting
Jan. 18-20, 2018
vba.org/vbaannual2018