

**An Analysis of Diversity Trainings in United States Community Mediation Centers
The Dispute Resolution Center (DRC), Ann Arbor, Michigan**

**Naomi Warren, MSW, JD
University of Michigan
September 2009**

*This project was funded in part by a grant of the Michigan Supreme Court, State Court
Administrative Office, Office of Dispute Resolution.*

For additional information please contact:

**Belinda Dulin, Executive Director
The Dispute Resolution Center
110 N. Fourth Ave., Ann Arbor, MI, 48104
(734) 222-3788
dulinb@ewashtenaw.org
www.thedisputeresolutioncenter.org**

An Analysis of Diversity Trainings in United States Community Mediation Centers The Dispute Resolution Center (DRC), Ann Arbor, Michigan

INTRODUCTION

Cultural identity is not always understood and addressed effectively in the field of mediation. Race, gender, sexual orientation, age (both older adulthood and adolescence), socio-economic disparity, and disability are often the "elephant in the room" when people are attempting to resolve a conflict.

Many community mediators lack the life experiences or professional skills to be effective mediators in conflicts involving cultural identity. The Dispute Resolution Center in Ann Arbor, Michigan conducted a basic 40-hour mediator training in November, 2007, in which all invited participants were individuals from minority communities. A subsequent evaluation suggested ways in which the training could be improved, particularly with regard to structure, role plays, exercises and class make-up. To build upon this evaluation, the DRC embarked upon a further study to examine other community mediation centers' training curricula and practices with a specific focus on issues of diversity and cultural competence.

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW OF DIVERSITY TRAINING PROJECT

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of this study that looked at diversity trainings at community mediation centers across the country. The study was initiated as a cooperative effort between The Dispute Resolution Center (DRC) in Ann Arbor, Michigan and the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) of Michigan. The study began in March of 2009 and was completed 6 months later.

The purpose of the project was:

- (1) To research best practices used in community mediation centers across the country to determine what efforts centers have made to build competence, overcome apprehensions and unconscious behavior, and reach out to diverse communities to expand services, enlarge mediator pools, and serve multi-cultural constituents more effectively;
- (2) To identify useful curricula and, when possible, secure permission to utilize those curricula in Michigan's 20 community mediation centers (CDRP);
- (3) To gather information in preparation for a plan in Michigan designed to increase the level of awareness among Community Dispute Resolution Program (CDRP) center board members, staff, and volunteer mediators' personal sensitivities and cultural competence, increase the skills of mediators in dealing with cases involving conflicts of cultural identity, and increase the skills of mediators in conflicts in which the parties come from different cultural backgrounds.

In this study, the DRC used a mixed method quantitative and qualitative methodological approach. The quantitative element consisted of an online survey and the qualitative element included phone interviews with both respondents and key non-respondents.

Quantitative

The project began by identifying community mediation centers across the country. This list of centers was generated by adding to a list developed by the President of the DRC's board of directors. From this list, an excel document was created that included the centers' name, address, website, and contact person. The final document included a total of 297 centers across all but 4 states and the District of Columbia (no centers were identified in Idaho, Louisiana, South Dakota, or West Virginia). Two centers had co-program managers, so 299 e-mails were sent out inviting respondents to participate in a brief, online survey (see attached Appendix I). The survey was administered via an online survey tool called surveymonkey.

Next, an online survey was created with questions developed in cooperation with this study's advisory committee. The advisory committee consisted of professors, lawyers, judges, social scientists, community members, mediators, mediation trainers, and administrators from diverse backgrounds and cultures (see attached Appendix II). The advisory committee met initially to discuss the scope and purpose of the study, and committee members also provided feedback on the online survey questions and format. In addition, the Executive Director of the DRC administered a "test run" among area community mediation center directors in order to get their feedback on the flow and clarity of the online survey. Ultimately, the survey was distributed to all 299 contact people. The target response number was 30 centers; 44 completed the survey.

The online survey included questions about both the centers' training(s) around issues of diversity as well as their organizational structure. The survey was estimated to take no longer than 15 minutes to complete and consisted of both closed and open-ended questions. Potential respondents were given one month to answer these questions before the online tool automatically closed the survey.

In analyzing the quantitative data, we entered responses to survey questions into a statistical analysis program (e.g., SPSS) and descriptive statistics were calculated.

Qualitative

Once the online survey tool was automatically closed to respondents, DRC staff, volunteers, and the board president divided up the responses and made follow-up phone calls to those centers where either a) surveys were incomplete or b) surveys indicated potential key findings that warranted further probing. In addition, certain key non-respondents were identified and called. These centers were identified either because they were reputed to have strong diversity training and/or curriculum or because the DRC was aware that they had been doing work in this area.

Each follow-up phone interview lasted an average of 1 hour, with some conversations lasting as long as 3 hours. In addition, some phone conversations led to additional phone interviews with related individuals from other organizations. The phone interviews were largely semi-structured. They followed a general starting format, where respondents were asked to give more information regarding certain questions – particularly names of trainers, types of diversity initiatives, and whether they had curricula they were willing to share. A specific emphasis was placed on increasing general understanding about the centers’ programs and experiences that might inform the DRC in terms of increasing skills regarding diversity and training DRC mediators to be more effective.

These follow up interviews allowed us both to clarify some of the respondents’ answers to the online survey as well as to explore their answers more deeply.

In analyzing the qualitative data, we identified key themes and examples that might be used in assisting the interpretation of our findings.

The final results of both the quantitative and qualitative data will be, in aggregate form, presented to DRC and SCAO staff, made available to all study participants, and shared at future national meetings and conferences.

RESULTS OF ONLINE SURVEYS

Location within the United States. The 44 respondents came from a total of 12 states, with the largest number (ten) coming from Michigan. In addition, six of the respondents were from California, one was from Georgia, one was from Iowa, two were from Massachusetts, two were from Maryland, one was from Missouri, two were from New York, five were from North Carolina, four were from Tennessee, four were from Virginia, and six were from Washington state. Thus, every region was represented in some capacity with the exception of the Southwest.

Training/Workshops. Respondents were asked eight questions about diversity trainings and workshops with which they and/or members of their organization might be familiar. First, they were asked whether their organization offered diversity training to mediators (community, attorney, or volunteer), board/staff, and other organizations. Nearly half of the respondents (20) indicated that they offered diversity training to mediators. Slightly fewer (15) stated they offered such training to their board/staff, and less than a quarter (10) offered diversity training to other organizations. (See Table 1)

Table 1: Diversity Trainings Offered

	Does your organization offer diversity training to:
Mediators (community/attorney/volunteer)	20
Board/staff	15
Other organizations	10

Next, respondents were asked who conducts these trainings – internal or staff trainers or independent/contract trainers. Of those organizations that indicated they offered diversity trainings, seventeen indicated that the trainers were internal or staff and twelve stated that the trainers were independent/contract trainers. (See Table 2) A few organizations then noted the trainers’ names, affiliations, and type/title of training. Most of these trainings had to do with issues of culture, with some trainings particularly noting issues of identity and power with regard to cultural conflict. A few trainings had to do with particular identity groups (e.g., gender, sexual orientation) but many were general “diversity” trainings.

Table 2: Who Conducts Trainings

	Who conducts these trainings?
Internal or staff trainers	17
Independent/contract trainers	12

Respondents were then asked whether they offer other diversity initiatives, such as brown bag meetings, lectures, movies, or dialogue groups. About a third of the respondents (15) answered that they did offer such initiatives. (See Table 3) The types of initiatives these respondents listed included, but are not limited to: film screenings, continuing education workshops, wine and cheese gatherings, outside speakers, lunch and learn meetings/brown bags, and dialogue groups.

Table 3: Other Diversity Initiatives

	Do you offer other diversity initiatives?
Yes	15
No	14
No response	15

Next, respondents were asked what they believe are core components of an effective diversity training program for mediators. Slightly fewer than half the respondents stated examples of core components, with many of the responses centering on some element of self-awareness. Such responses included: “self-reflection on biases, prejudices;” “intense self-reflection and constant evolution;” “recognizing your own biases;” “self-awareness of own prejudices;” “becoming aware of their own thoughts, biases, assumptions.” Respondents also spoke about understanding cultural differences and the role of power in conflict, as well as helping mediators gain understanding about “where people are coming from.” They mentioned, too, the importance of respect and listening ability, cultural competence, and the ability to connect concepts of inclusion, cultural sensitivity, and awareness of biases. A few respondents indicated that this was an issue they were unsure about, and/or they were in the process of formulating an answer to that question as an agency.

Respondents were then asked whether they have an effective diversity module in their basic mediator training and, if so, whether they would be willing to share that curriculum. Over a third of respondents (17) indicated that they had an effective diversity module. Of those respondents, ten stated that they would be willing to share their curricula. Respondents were also asked whether they have an effective advanced or stand alone diversity training and, if so, whether they would be willing to share that curriculum. Only a quarter of respondents (11) indicated they had an effective advanced/stand alone diversity training and, of those, only six stated they would be willing to share it. (See Tables 4 and 5) However, it should be noted that concerns arose in sharing the curricula when this issue was addressed in the follow-up phone interviews. Although the respondents indicated a willingness to share curricula in the online survey, implementing this became an issue because of proprietary concerns.

Table 4: Effective Modules

	Do you have an effective:
Diversity module in your basic mediator training	17
Advanced or stand alone diversity training	11

Table 5: Willing to Share Curricula

	Would you be willing to share your curricula?
Diversity module in your basic mediator training	10
Advanced or stand alone diversity training	6

Next, respondents were asked whether their staff and/or mediators attended independent conferences and/or trainings related to diversity and mediation which they felt were of particularly high quality. Only eight of the respondents indicated that they had. (See Table 6) Although respondents were then asked to note the trainer’s name, affiliation, and type/title of training, only one did. Four respondents did comment on the follow-up question which asked them to describe what distinguished these programs from other programs. These comments included length, depth, exercises, class discussion, and content that was well-prepared and relevant to their community.

Table 6: Independent Diversity and Mediation Conferences/Trainings

	Have your staff and/or mediators attended independent conferences and/or trainings related to diversity and mediation which they felt were of particularly high quality?
Yes	8
No	18
No response	18

Finally, respondents were asked whether they had met with resistance when introducing diversity training and, if so, from whom. Only six respondents indicated that they had met such resistance. This resistance came from trainees (5), the community (4), trainers (2), mediators (2), staff and board (2), and other sources (1). (See Table 7)

Table 7: Resistance to Diversity Training

	Have you met with resistance when introducing diversity training?
Trainees	5
Community	4
Trainers	2
Mediators	2
Staff and board	2
Other sources	1

The Organizations. Respondents were asked an additional seven questions specifically about their organizations (board, staff, mediators, etc.). First, they were asked whether their organization had assessed the multi-cultural needs of their community. Over a third of the respondents (17) indicated that they had addressed this need. (See Table 8) They did this in a variety of ways – through meetings with community leaders and agency heads; demographic analyses; focus groups and questionnaires; surveys and relationship building activities; community dialogues and cross cultural inventories; as well as videotaped interviews with cultural groups’ leadership. These methods varied in terms of their format and formality, but all appeared to involve some level of depth and preparation.

Table 8: Assessed Multi-Cultural Community Needs

	Have you assessed the multi-cultural needs of your community?
Yes	17
No	13
No response	14

Respondents were next asked to indicate what diverse groups are primarily represented in their service areas. As examples of what was meant by “diverse groups,” the following identities were included as a non-exhaustive list: gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, age, and disability. Respondents primarily listed diversity with regard to race/ethnicity, but they also mentioned sexual orientation, Native American tribes, and immigrants as important groups. In addition, a few respondents noted gender, religion, age, and ability status. Two respondents listed “all of the above” as groups in their service areas.

Respondents were then asked whether their organization reflects the diversity of their service area. Most of the responses indicated that at least some part of the organization

(board, staff, mediators, clients) reflected the diversity of their service area. (See Table 9) However, there was a technical problem with this particular question on the online survey tool; respondents were not able to choose any of the responses (strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, strongly agree) more than once for any given indicator. Thus, these responses are potentially inaccurate and incomplete.

Table 9: Organization Reflection of Service Area Diversity

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Board	3	3	5	4
Staff	1	6	5	5
Mediators	1	5	8	4
Clients	0	2	6	9
Total	5	16	24	22

When respondents were asked whether they were concerned that their organizations do not reflect the diversity in their service area, only a quarter (11) of respondents said they were. (See Table 10) Many of those who responded that they were concerned then answered the follow-up question of what plans they had to address their concern. Some of these plans included: recruiting from diverse areas; targeting specific communities; identifying and implementing a diversity training as a form of recruitment; electing more people from diverse backgrounds to serve on the board; and outreach efforts.

Table 10: Concern about Organization not Reflecting Service Area Diversity

	Are you concerned that your organization does not reflect the diversity in your service area?
Yes	11
No	15
No response	18

Next, respondents were asked whether they use non-English speaking mediators or translators as an organization. Nearly half of the respondents (19) indicated that they did. (See Table 11)

Table 11: Non-English Mediators or Translators

	Do you use non-English speaking mediators or translators?
Yes	19
No	9
No response	16

Finally, respondents were asked whether they felt they had successfully addressed issues of diversity in terms of their organization, recruiting volunteers, mediator skills, and providing services in multiple locations. Respondents noted more successes than failures in their responses. (See Table 12) As noted above, however, this was one question where there were technical difficulties with the online survey tool, so the responses may not be thorough and/or accurate.

Table 12: Success in Addressing Diversity Issues

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Your organization	0	6	6	3
Recruiting volunteers	0	4	8	1
Mediator skills	1	1	4	3
Services in multiple locations	3	2	2	10
Total	4	13	20	17

RESULTS OF PHONE INTERVIEWS

The phone conversations with respondents varied according to where the respondents were in the process of addressing issues of diversity at their own centers. Some respondents were “thirsty” to learn more about what others were doing and were excited to make connections with other centers in order to move forward on the often challenging process of addressing diversity issues in mediation. Other respondents had been addressing these issues for years – some for as many as 40 years – but were still excited to share what they knew and help centers that were just venturing into this area.

Among those respondents with experience in addressing issues of diversity, the following themes emerged as potential components of a “best practices” model.

Skilled/Self-Aware Trainers. Several respondents could not over-state the importance of trainers who were skilled in talking about – and facilitating conversations about – diversity. One respondent noted that “there seem to be some trainings out there that can open up people’s vulnerabilities and then leave them. It is pretty tender stuff sometimes.” Another respondent suggested that one particularly powerful way of successfully handling these vulnerabilities is for the trainers themselves to engage in self-exposure. This requires trainers not only to know themselves, but be willing to share the challenges they may have faced when working through these issues. Several respondents also spoke about the importance of “doing one’s homework” in terms of researching the demographics of the communities in the centers’ service areas. Indeed, it appeared important that trainings be tailored so that issues faced by the centers’ particular communities be addressed. Respondents also spoke about the importance of trainers drawing from their personal experiences when speaking to issues of diversity. Indeed, trainers’ own keen self-awareness appeared to be a major contributing factor to the success of trainings on issues of diversity in mediation. The opposite was also true;

respondents that expressed frustration with their diversity trainings noted that their trainers did not have the level of self-awareness necessary to be effective.

Trainer Diversity. In addition to having skilled and self-aware trainers, a few respondents noted the importance of having diversity among the trainers themselves. In one respondent's words, "We have found that bringing in presenters with a variety of backgrounds and expertise works well by exposing our mediators, board and staff to other presenters, strengthens collaboration and partnerships, and overall makes for a richer program."

Trainee Diversity. Respondents also spoke about the importance of having diversity in the room when conducting mediation trainings. One respondent stated, "The diversity of the class... was very beneficial to everyone, including the trainers." Several centers emphasized the importance of using community connections to advertise/post notices of Basic Mediator Trainings to draw a more diverse group of trainees. One respondent noted that in order to work toward their goal of diversifying their mediator pool, the center's staff was meeting with groups of community leaders to determine what outsiders think is the need in the community with regard to conflict resolution and diversity.

Facilitator Outreach. Several centers provide facilitation services using facilitators (distinct from mediators) who are trained to work with agencies dealing with poverty, drug abuse, youth, housing, and other social service issues. The facilitators are trained primarily in leading dialogue groups with these agencies. A secondary effect of having facilitators work with these agencies is that the centers are then able to outreach to these same agencies by way of list-serves to advertise for mediator trainings. Thus, the mediator pool comes from individuals who already are dealing with issues of diversity and are familiar with some of the challenges marginalized communities are facing. Moreover, the social service agencies become more familiar with the community mediation centers and become major sources of volunteers and referrals to the centers.

Role Plays. Several respondents mentioned role plays as a potentially powerful way to illuminate issues of diversity in mediation. These role plays, which use diverse characters and situations, often touch on themes such as power and culture, and they lead to follow-up conversations reflecting self-awareness. Although some centers were willing to share their role plays with the DRC and other centers, they cautioned that it is important to tailor role plays so they are appropriate for the communities with which each center works. Moreover, at least one center noted the importance of not "playing into stereotypes" when designing role plays.

Exercises. Respondents noted that in addition to role plays, other exercises were often useful in helping to explore biases, assumptions, and prejudices. A "social identity profile" was one such exercise, in which individuals identify the particular lenses through which they see the world. Another involved participating in a "Theatre of the Oppressed" activity or singing a song related to one's own culture at the beginning of training sessions. These exercises could be used both internally, among board and staff, as well as during mediation trainings. Some centers noted that the most successful way

of addressing diversity issues was to weave these kinds of exercises – as well as role plays – throughout the entire diversity training, rather than having one distinct segment of the training be devoted to diversity. In the opinion of one respondent, this latter approach may “soften” people but is not effective in sending the message that diversity often underlies all of our interactions and is not easily confined to a single component.

Diversity Ombudsperson. Because conversations about diversity often engender strong emotional reactions, centers noted the importance of being prepared to deal with these emotions when they surface. More than one center talked about having the trainer, a staff person, or a volunteer designated to follow up with people who might be having difficulties dealing with sensitive issues. These individuals ask questions such as, “What came up for you?” or “What was challenging about naming that ‘elephant’ in the room?” during trainings and workshops.

Non-English Speaking Mediators. Several centers emphasized an importance in having non-English speaking mediators as a way to address issues of diversity in their communities. In particular, there was a common theme of a desire to train Spanish-speaking mediators. Some centers teach the Basic Training in English with Spanish-speaking translators and materials in Spanish. Others have outreached to Latino groups in order to draw more Spanish-speaking mediators into their pool.

Agency Commitment. Several respondents who have been working in this area for years noted that it was only possible to be successful in this venture if the agency itself had a commitment to do the preparation work: work that includes preparing staff, board, and mediators to learn potentially new ways of training and working, to be uncomfortable, to share personal experiences, and to commit as individuals and to each other to do this challenging work. One respondent had a single piece of important advice for centers beginning to work on issues of diversity: “Have *lots* of internal conversations within your organization.” This respondent felt strongly that the success of their center was firmly rooted in the fact that a commitment to addressing diversity issues “came from the ground up.” In other words, the center staff and board were committed early on to making diversity a priority. It became integrated into the agency, but only through ongoing internal conversations is it possible to remain successful in this commitment. This requires, according to one respondent, the agency creating a “safe space” where staff, board, and mediators can learn about how our own cultural experiences affect our views in working with one another and with clients. It also requires, in the words of one agency, a willingness to pledge to “sit in the fire” to work with difficult issues such as race.

LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Several important lessons were learned from the pilot project and the evaluation results reported above. These lessons are summarized below.

The DRC learned:

- 1) Community mediation centers across the country are in a range of different places in terms of addressing issues of diversity in their communities. Some centers have been addressing these issues for years, while others are just beginning to do so. The centers that have been addressing these issues seemed very willing to share their information and experiences, and the centers who didn't feel they had much to offer were eager to learn from other centers' experiences.
- 2) Nearly all of the centers seemed excited about the idea of connecting one another - particularly on the issues at the root of this study. They seemed interested to learn about what other centers were doing to address diversity and cultural issues, and how those experiences could be shared and adapted to help other centers do the same.
- 3) There does not appear to be a single effective model for addressing issues of diversity in mediation. Rather, centers are engaging in many different effective strategies, such as outreach into various cultural communities and local agencies, agency introspection and self-awareness, diversity trainings, and dialogues. The key seems to be engaging in strategies that are tailored to one's own community.
- 4) There are at least some centers that indicated they are willing to share their curricula around diversity trainings - either a module in the basic mediator training or an advanced training in diversity issues in mediation. However, these centers have proprietary concerns and are willing to share the curricula only at a fee.
- 5) A few centers are willing to share the names of trainers, agencies, and/or materials. Although some information was already offered and given to the DRC, issues of recommending and using proprietary information must be addressed before distribution.
- 6) Not all agencies addressing these issues are community mediation centers per se. Some state organizations and governmental agencies are taking responsibility for helping community mediation centers address these issues as well.

Based on the findings of the project, several recommendations are warranted. These recommendations emerged as a direct result of engaging in this study. Although the purpose of this survey was to elicit information primarily about diversity and mediation training curricula, it is evident that formal education alone may not be adequate in addressing the effectiveness of agencies and their mediators in serving diverse populations in conflict.

- 1) Encourage community mediation centers to hold internal dialogues with board, staff, and volunteers to begin personal and institutional self awareness and "where are we" assessments on issues of diversity. In dealing with sensitive issues, these discussions should occur in a "safe place" using trained facilitators and tools and exercises that have been thought through well.
- 2) Encourage community mediation centers to address the diversity of their client populations and needs through informal internal discussions as well as through meeting with community leaders.

- 3) Encourage community mediation centers' board, staff, and volunteers to outreach into diverse communities in their service area by attending community-based events and local gatherings.
- 4) Encourage community mediation centers to make the diversification of staff, trainers, trainees, and board members a priority.
- 5) Expand into diverse communities by engaging in outreach presentations to social service agencies, internet marketing of trainings, newsletters for faith-based organizations, etc.
- 6) Offer diversity trainings to agency board, staff, and mediators. Independent trainers and diversity organizations exist in most cities.
- 7) Encourage community mediation centers to incorporate role plays and exercises in all mediator trainings that include situations and character parts reflecting different cultural backgrounds and highlighting personalities representing various social identities, such as gender, race, ethnic identity, sexual orientation, religion, age and disability.
- 8) Determine which materials can be made available for further distribution to Michigan's community mediation centers. This may include, among other things, role plays and exercises, reading lists, and multi-media references that the centers can tailor to their own communities.
- 9) Consider ways of increasing the number of non-English speaking mediators, providing support to the community mediation centers in Michigan so they can begin training and using facilitators to connect with outside agencies in the community.
- 10) Encourage the centers to use an ombudsperson during trainings to ensure a more effective training process in dealing with sensitive cultural topics.
- 11) Work to maintain and strengthen the important connections that have been made through this study with centers and organizations across the country. One potential way of doing this is hosting an annual conference for center representatives to share with one another what they have learned and where they are in the process of addressing diversity issues in mediation.
- 12) Encourage the Michigan State Court Administrative Office to implement standards of excellence in diversity, including, for example, designing and offering diversity workshops and encouraging Michigan's community mediation centers to reflect the demography and diversity of their service areas.

In conclusion, this pilot study illuminated a broad range of practices and experiences from which the DRC and SCAO can continue working to enhance the effectiveness of community mediation centers. Information was gained and relationships were built. Although this was simply another step in the process of addressing issues of diversity in mediation, the step was an important one. The ongoing success of both the DRC and SCAO's efforts in this area will depend upon their continued commitment to implement necessary changes agency- and state-wide. Michigan is positioned to move forward in this field, but in order to do this it must continue along in the process and use this study as a springboard for follow-up actions in this area.

Appendix I: Cover Letter Inviting Centers to Participate in Study

What diversity trainings are offered by other community mediation centers?

How do community mediation centers address increasingly diverse clientele?

Respond to this brief online survey and we will send you the results.

By responding to this brief online survey, you can join other community mediation centers in learning more about how they address issues of diversity in mediation! The survey consists of 15 questions and should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

PLEASE RESPOND BY JULY 31st*

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=nkIM9nMo9cLLie6rgQCmWA_3d_3d
(click here or paste into web browser to access survey)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Cultural identity is not always understood and addressed effectively in the field of mediation. Race, gender, sexual orientation, age (both older adulthood and adolescence), socio-economic disparity, and disability are often the "elephant in the room" when people are attempting to resolve a conflict.

The Dispute Resolution Center in Ann Arbor, Michigan is conducting a study of diversity trainings and initiatives used by community mediation centers across the country. This project is funded in part by the Office of Dispute Resolution, Michigan Supreme Court, which also financially supports Michigan's network of 20 Community Dispute Resolution Program centers.

Our goal is to research best practices used in Community Mediation Centers, especially in regard to diversity training. We are interested in discovering what efforts, if any, have been made by centers to enhance mediator skills, overcome apprehension and unconscious behavior, enlarge mediator pools and serve multi-cultural constituents more effectively.

For more information about this project, please contact:

Belinda Dulin, Executive Director
The Dispute Resolution Center, 110 N. Fourth Ave., Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48104
(734) 222-3788
dulinb@ewashtenaw.org
www.mimmediation.org

Please reference "Community Mediation Diversity Scoping Study" in the subject line of your e-mail.

***Identifying information by respondents will be confidential to The Dispute Resolution Center and all data will be released in aggregate form.**

Important: This email message may contain confidential, privileged information. It is intended exclusively for the party addressed. If you receive this message in error, please notify the above sender by telephone IMMEDIATELY. Any disclosure of the information to individuals other than the addressee may be governed by law.

Appendix II: List of Advisory Committee Members

Susan Butterwick, J.D.

Betty Brown-Chappell, Ph.D.
Professor, Dept. of Social Work
Director, McNair Scholars Program
Eastern Michigan University

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
CENTER:

Belinda Dulin, MADR
Executive Director

Michael Chappell, MBA

Mark Chesler, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
University of Michigan

Joan Binkow
President

Dale Iverson, J.D.
Co-facilitator, Task Force on Diversity
in ADR, State Bar of Michigan
JustMediation PLC

Sally Brush
Mediation Services Administrator

Naomi Warren, MSW, J.D.
Research Assistant

Loraleigh Keashley, Ph.D.
Master of Arts in Dispute Resolution,
Academic Director
Associate Professor, Department of
Communication
Wayne State University

STATE COURT ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICE

Doug Van Epps, Director
Office of Dispute Resolution
State Court Administrative Office

Susan Lebold, J.D., MSW

Howard Lischeron, Executive Director
Wayne Mediation Center

Huda Karaman Rosen, MS, RRT

DIVERSITY STUDY RESEARCH
ASSISTANTS

The Honorable J. Cedric Simpson

Michael S. Spencer
Associate Professor
University of Michigan School of
Social Work

Peggy Cavanaugh

Layla Garcia-Brown

The Honorable Betty Widgeon

Jessie Kirchner

Zena Zumeta, J.D.
Mediation Training and Consultation
Institute