



Maryland Collaborative Practice Council

resolving disputes respectfully

Message from the Board

The 2014-2015 year has been both fruitful and eventful with the unanimous passage of the UCLA by the Maryland Legislature together with the strides that MCPC has made in its continued growth. I am pleased to announce that the MCPC Endowment Committee raised \$7500 in donated funds to support the causes and interests of MCPC. Much thanks to Margie Hofberg and the members of the Endowment Committee for their efforts.

On March 26, 2015, MCPC board members and practice group representatives will convene for a mini strategic planning session to evaluate our progress since our initial strategic planning session in 2011. Our plan is to reflect and evaluate where we have been and to chart the future of our organization.

I am also excited to announce that MCPC and the ADR Section of the Maryland State Bar Association have teamed up for spring training and dinner with renowned mediator and collaborative practitioner, Forrest "Woody" Mosten, on April 9, 2015. The title of the event: "47 Things Every Mediator and Collaborative Professional Should Know."

Finally and fortuitously, the 2015 IACP Networking and Education Forum will be held in Washington, D.C. on October 15th through 18th. As always, please feel free to reach out with your questions and interests to sea@staceyandersenlaw.com. *

Stacy Andersen

Passage of Maryland Collaborative Law Act Offers Privacy Protections to Divorcing Couples

by Anne (Jan) W. White

In May Governor Martin O'Malley signed the Maryland Uniform Collaborative Law Act, which passed both houses of the Maryland Legislature without objection. Effective October 1, 2014, this law allows divorcing couples to craft their own agreement to protect their confidential information during the Collaborative Process. In contrast, if the parties seek a court resolution, it can be an uphill battle to protect financial information from public access. The Collaborative Process is a voluntary process that bypasses the court system to reach dispute resolution. The parties commit to working for settlement only, without threatening court action. A collaboratively trained attorney assists each party throughout the process. In contrast to the court system, the parties and attorneys meet together to find solutions that work for both parties and their family. As needed, the group brings in other professionals to meet with them, in particular, financial experts and mental health experts to help with financial and parenting issues.

Begun in 1990 as a newcomer to the array of Alternative Dispute Resolution processes, the Collaborative Process is now practiced throughout the United States, England, France, Germany, Canada and twelve other countries. Attorneys in Maryland began using the process in the mid 2000s. Approximately 400 Maryland lawyers have now been trained to handle collaborative cases.

(continued on page 9)

INSIDE

the role of social workers in collaborative divorce cases [page 2](#) // the promise of collaborative practice for low-income families [page 3](#) // separation agreements and the survival of the collaborative participation agreement [page 6](#) // your collaborative tool belt - your practice group [page 6](#) // mcpc endowment fund [page 7](#) // guidelines for successful co-parenting [page 8](#) // spring event training [page 10](#)

marylandcollaborativepractice.com

The Role of Social Workers in Collaborative Divorce Cases

by Colette Brunell, LCSW-C and Sue Soler, LCSW-C

As social workers, we are dedicated to helping others and making life easier for those in need. As social workers focused on working with people experiencing separation and divorce, we have found a process, collaborative divorce, that allows us to do just that in a way that is supportive of couples and families who are in such a transition. Collaborative divorce, a process started in the 1990s in Minnesota, is based on a team approach designed to find shared solutions outside of the Courtroom. It is an alternative approach to the traditional adversarial divorce process (which many of us have seen clients go through with terrible results in the short and long-term). Collaborative divorce promotes respectful communications, allows spouses to maintain control of decisions and acknowledges that divorce is an emotional process as well as a legal and financial process. Clients in a collaborative divorce sign a participation agreement in which they commit with their attorneys to avoid litigation, share information in a transparent way, continue the financial status quo until mutual decisions are made, protect their children, and work together with support from the professional team to find win-win solutions. It is a process, which allows each couple and family to bring their own unique issues, needs and concerns to an open, supportive forum and to get expert advice and information from professionals to resolve the issues in front of them.

As social workers in the collaborative divorce process, we can serve in two roles—that of a divorce coach or that of a child specialist. The training that a clinical social worker receives and the resulting clinical experience is a perfect match for the criteria of a collaborative divorce coach. We have extensive training in family and marital systems, we understand the developmental stages of children and the dynamics involved with a family going through a separation and divorce, and we are experts in identifying pathological behaviors (although we are not therapists in this process). We assist in improving communication skills and helping the co-parents as well as the team members utilize the most effective communication style. We use these skills to educate, support and facilitate our clients in achieving their goals in the divorce process.

Initially we assist the co-parents to identify and craft a mission statement, which reflects the parents' goals and desires

(continued on page 5)



Maryland Collaborative Practice Council

Mission Statement

The purpose of the MCPC is to support collaborative practice groups, advocate state-wide on legislative, executive, and judicial initiatives, and to advance the use of the Collaborative Process as a method of dispute resolution.

Vision

The vision for MCPC is to be the hub of the collaborative wheel that supports, connects, and unites practice groups, and is the foundation for advocacy and expanded use of the Collaborative Process in Maryland.

MCPC Board Members

Full Board Members

Stacey Andersen, President
Amy Mazer, Vice Present
Steven Weisbaum, Past President
Kathleen Wobber, Secretary/Newsletter Editor
Sue Soler, Treasurer
Margie Hofberg, At-Large Member
Suzy Eckstein, At-Large Member

Practice Group Representatives

Nancy Weller, AACP (Anne Arundel)
Kathleen Wobber, BCDP (Baltimore)
Jac Knust, CPB (Baltimore)
Karen Robbins, ACP (Frederick)
Colby Hall, HCCP (Howard)
Debora May, CDRP (Montgomery)
Stephanie Fink, CDA (Montgomery)
Kristen Hagood (Prince Georges)
Brian Kane, CCWM (Washington)

The Promise of Collaborative Practice for Low-Income Families

by Jane Murphy and Ashley Jones

A few years ago the faculty and some students from the University of Baltimore School of Law's Mediation Clinic for Families were trained in collaborative practice courtesy of the Administrative Office of the Courts. The Mediation Clinic for Families, one of ten clinics in our law school's clinical program, partners with the court system and a variety of legal organizations to provide students with opportunities to practice law under the student practice rule representing clients in mediation. Students are also trained as mediators. Students provide mediation or client representation in child access cases, divorce, foreclosure of the family home, wills, and school conflicts. Students also engage in projects designed to educate communities about what alternative dispute resolution and the advantages it may offer in resolving disputes. Although we've had a primary focus on mediation, we thought it was time our students were exposed to this exciting and expanding area of collaborative practice.

Although we normally have a long waiting list to provide representation in family law litigation in our clinical program, we were surprised by how challenging it was to find clients for collaborative representation. We screened many prospective clients and decided, for a range of reasons, that collaborative would not work. Cases were screened out for a range of reasons—the presence of domestic violence, severe distrust between the parties, and active substance abuse. Even when we found a client who was interested and appropriate, the other party was either unwilling, did not have an attorney or had an attorney who was untrained and unfamiliar with collaborative practice. Despite some frustration, these interviews in which our students explained dispute resolution options to clients and helped them make good choices were rich learning experiences and helped students understand that counseling clients about dispute resolution options is both ethically required and good practice.

Finally, in September, 2014 we began representing a client under a collaborative agreement. The client was screened by the Collaborative Law Project of Maryland; both she and her husband had preliminarily agreed to pursue their divorce with collaborative attorneys. Because this would be the first collaborative case for faculty or students in the clinic, we requested that Meg Oliver, an experienced collaborative practitioner, interview the other party for

possible representation. Having an attorney we both trusted and deeply respected representing the other party was critical in becoming comfortable and confident in this new world of collaborative practice. Meg met that criteria and made it possible for us to “take the leap.”

We are just concluding the case and have the following observations:

Challenges to Collaborative Practice in Low Income Families

Informed Consent. Among the first steps with any potential collaborative client is a conversation in which the attorney describes the collaborative process and makes certain the client understands how it works as well as the benefits and risks of this process as compared to others, including litigation. Our client had contacted the Legal Aid Bureau and other sources of free legal services before she got to the Collaborative Law Project (CLP). Because the CLP was the first and only offer of free legal assistance, we were never certain her decision to proceed with collaborative was a real “choice.” Of course, this is true of many clients who are eligible for free legal services and never really experience the process of interviewing several attorneys and choosing one among many options.

Demands of the Collaborative Process. One of the many benefits of collaborative is the central role played by the clients in leading the effort to reach agreement with the support of their lawyers and other members of the team. This requires the client to devote substantial time, both in meetings with the team and outside the meetings, gathering documents and completing other “homework” between meetings. Time is a precious commodity for all of us but for our clients, hourly wage-earners, each hour away from work during meetings or completing other tasks challenged their ability to pay rent, buy food and otherwise continue to stay afloat. This presented a burden to our client and made us wonder, from time to time, whether traditional lawyer-driven representation would not have served her better. We also knew that getting a divorce judgment as soon as possible was critical to her effort to prevent foreclosure and avoid incurring more debt from her husband's various activities. Our efforts to deal with the myriad of issues raised by both parties probably resulted in a longer process than one in which our client was limited to the issues a court would address.

(continued on page 4)

Limited Client Resources. Although both lawyers and other members of our team (a child specialist for early sessions and a financial neutral throughout) participated in this case pro bono, we did find that our clients' lack of resources limited our ability to "problem solve" to reach solutions. It was clear to all of us that our clients were unable to pay fines, purchase insurance, conduct appraisals, and pay child support arrearages. They greatly benefitted from the insights of our financial specialist, Don Paris, but he and they were limited by the lack of resources in developing options to resolve problems. Not surprisingly, poverty makes everything very difficult, including reaching an agreement on financial issues in divorce.

Benefits. Despite these challenges, we believe the collaborative process was ultimately a better choice than litigation for our client. She experienced many of the benefits typically experienced by clients in the Collaborative Process: a sense of empowerment from her direct participation in resolving longstanding conflicts with her husband; the insights and advice from legal and non-legal experts; the ability to address a broad range of issues beyond those that a court would address; and ultimately strengthening her relationship with her husband as they continue to co-parent after divorce.

Apart from this general assessment, we offer each of our perspectives on the Collaborative Process:

Ashley: I believe that the Collaborative Process benefits clients like ours because it gives them flexibility, both in time and in resolution. In addition, it affords an opportunity, not available in court, for parties to actually air their grievances with each other and have those grievances addressed. This permits some closure and helps the parties begin the process of moving on. For example, one issue in our case involving a car was extremely important to our client but would likely have not been addressed in court. Our client also worked with her husband instead of against him. This likely would not have happened in a litigation setting, especially given our client's longstanding frustrations with her husband.

For me, as a law student, having a collaborative case was a great learning experience. It was like seeing the divorce process in slow motion. I got the benefit of learning from Meg with her experience and wisdom whereas in a litigation setting we would have been adversaries. We really got to get to what was going to be best for the family in the long run instead of what was going to be best for our respective clients in court.

The presence of shared neutral experts like Don Paris also added a lot. In my opinion the Collaborative Process did more than just settle a divorce between the participants; it resolved long standing issues in their marriage.

Jane: As a long time litigator and more recent mediator, I came to collaborative practice with a good deal of skepticism. I was the one in the training who asked the annoying questions: Isn't this just client centeredness and problem solving—approaches that all good lawyers take? Aren't the ethical issues just too great to overcome? How can you agree to share information? Refuse to litigate if that's what your client wants? And what about the low income families—where do they fit in what looks like a very expensive process?

But I could see that collaborative was here to stay and that many of my former students were leading the way. I also sensed a strong interest in the topic from students when we discussed it in Family Law. Members of various collaborative practice groups had visited an ADR Seminar I teach inspiring students to research and write topics related to collaborative practice. And I had come to see the value of mediation which shared many of the same core values with collaborative practice. So I welcomed the opportunity to work with my student and this client in our first collaborative case.

We definitely benefitted from working with Meg Oliver and Don Paris, two experienced and very skilled collaborative practitioners. And I was struck each time we met with the power of a team of experts working with our clients toward a common goal—resolving problems they had identified together as the critical issues in, not only getting a divorce, but strengthening this family. Most of the families we represent in the clinic have never had the opportunity to work with child specialists or financial experts; these experts can provide valuable support to our clients experiencing severe emotional and financial difficulties at the time of family breakup. I am excited about training a new generation of lawyers in this approach and making it available as an option to low income families who, as much as anyone, will benefit from the promise of this process

Jane C. Murphy is the Laurence M. Katz Professor of Law and Co-Director of the Mediation Clinic for Families at the University of Baltimore School of Law. Ashley Jones is a third year law student at the University of Baltimore and will graduate in May, 2015 ✨

(social workers continued from page 2)

for the best interests of the children and the future of the newly constructed family. Later in the process, both coaches help the co-parents develop a parenting plan, which covers the access schedule as well as decision-making, holidays, vacations, communication protocols, and other areas, which specifically detail how they will co-parent their children.

The coaches help the co-parents focus on effective communication, which makes the process easier for both the parents and the children and helps the co-parents parent effectively after the settlement (and helps to preserve the integrity of the family. We also focus on managing reactivity to stress: we help the clients gain awareness of and manage difficult emotions including their reactivity to their spouse and stress. Overall, this increases effectiveness throughout the divorce process.

Coaching is not therapy; it is helping the client to become separate, autonomous, emotionally independent, more assertive, competent and confident to move forward in life. We help equalize power imbalances so that both clients can bring their voice into the room, and work to construct a new vision for the future. The coaching is time-limited, present and future oriented, client centered, and goal driven. We do not diagnose or treat pathology, and this process is not eligible for insurance reimbursement. We assume the client is healthy and competent, so our focus is on developing skills and self-mastery with guidance rather than on treatment. Maladaptive behaviors are treated only if they impede the process and are not a focus in and of themselves. The coach educates and motivates the client to re-focus the energy and power within the client to achieve their goals.

There are two schools of thought regarding the number of divorce coaches in a collaborative divorce. One is that there are two coaches, each working with a client to help actualize the above mentioned issues. The other model is a one-coach model which utilizes the coach more as a facilitator to help achieve the above mentioned goals. Traditionally, the two-coach model works more effectively in facilitating the self-empowerment and growth, which is necessary to help with the separation and divorce process.

The role of the child specialist is unique in a divorce process and one of the many benefits of the collaborative divorce process. The child specialist is a mental health professional with expertise in the impact of separation and divorce on children, child development, age appropriate ways to speak to children and family dynamics. The child specialist is commonly referred to as the voice of the child. It is a neutral role that gives children an opportunity to voice their

concerns, ask questions and discuss their adjustment to the new family situation with someone who is experienced and focused only on their needs and interests.

The child specialist is NOT a therapist as he/she does not meet with the child in an on-going way, does not have a confidential relationship with the child, is focused only on the divorce process, and is an integral part of the collaborative divorce team. Many children who talk to a child specialist are also in therapy. Many children who are experiencing the changes that go along with separation and divorce need both therapy to process the entire situation and a child specialist who can focus on their needs and interests related to the decisions his/her parents need to make about co-parenting. The child specialist is also NOT a custody evaluator. He/she does not make any recommendations regarding custody, evaluate for mental illness, or determine appropriateness of parenting. The child specialist is also NOT a divorce coach. As was described above, the divorce coach does not meet the children, and instead is helping the parents manage emotions through the divorce process so that a co-parenting plan can be developed.

The role of the child specialist is incredibly important and valuable in the collaborative divorce process. Talking directly with children about how they are dealing with the changes in their lives gives parents the opportunity to hear information obtained by an experienced, objective person. Having this information helps parents to keep their conversations child focused and future oriented. The information from the child specialist also assists parents in separating out their own experience of the divorce from that of their children. Often children have different experiences from parents and it is almost impossible for parents to see and understand that without support from professionals. It is, in fact, remarkable how powerful it can be when parents learn from the child specialist how the children are experiencing the divorce.

The child specialist is a limited role, focused on gathering information on the needs and interests of the children so that information can be provided to the parents and the team. The goal is for maximum information to be available to allow the parents to create a parenting plan and develop a co-parenting relationship that best meets the needs of the children.

Many social workers are actively engaged in collaborative divorce cases. This process and the roles of the divorce coach and child specialist are valuable and essential for clients as they move through this difficult life transition. ❄️

Separation Agreements and the Survival of the Collaborative Participation Agreement

By Kathleen Wobber, Esq.

It is in the best interest of all parties that the Collaborative Participation Agreement be durable and that it survives the divorce proceedings. Yet many attorneys place a paragraph in the parties' separation agreement which states "This Agreement contains the entire understanding between the Parties. This Agreement replaces any prior negotiations or agreement of the Parties."

The legal effect of this language is to nullify previously executed collaborative agreements, thus also technically nullifying the attorney disqualification provision. While this issue may seem theoretical, the MCPC has received word that this issue has arisen in a Florida Court, where a judge has ruled that the Collaborative Participation Agreement was no longer in effect, and that the attorney who participated in the Collaborative Process was not barred from participating in post-judgment litigation.

To ensure your Collaborative Participation Agreement survives the executed separation agreement, it is imperative that attorneys modify their form separation agreements in cases where the matter has been partially or fully resolved utilizing the Collaborative Process. Suzy Eckstein, a family law collaborative practitioner in Montgomery County, has shared the language she utilizes to ensure the separation agreement includes the Collaborative Participation Agreement:

#. Entire Agreement. *On [...insert date participation agreement signed...], the parties executed a Collaborative Participation Agreement. They intend that their obligations set forth in the Collaborative Participation Agreement shall survive after their execution of this Agreement. Apart from the provisions of the Collaborative Participation Agreement, which survive, this Agreement contains the entire understanding of the parties, and there are no representations, warranties, covenants, or undertakings other than those expressly set forth herein. This Agreement supersedes all other prior or contemporaneous agreement between the parties other than the Collaborative Participation Agreement.*

The MCPC will continue to monitor issues which may arise regarding Collaborative Practice. If you have had any experiences with the court system vis-à-vis the Collaborative Process, we would be interested in hearing your thoughts. ❄️

Your Collaborative Tool Belt - Your Practice Group

The Collaborative Tool Belt is a series of articles on tools for collaborative practice. If you have tools which you have found useful, please [send an email](#) and your information will be shared with the collaborative community.

Part of the initial collaborative training is a presentation about practice groups, but really, who has time for yet another meeting? Practice groups are an integral part of your collaborative practice, and making the time for group meetings will enhance your collaborative practice in numerous ways.

The International Academy of Collaborative Practitioners defines a practice group as "an association of two or more professionals who have come together for the purpose of enhancing their skills and understand of collaborative practice, educating the public and promoting the use of the Collaborative Process."

Basic training is just that - basic. While it gives a practitioner the fundamentals necessary to handle a case, the actual execution using a new skill can be tricky. This is where your fellow practice group members can help. The practice group shepherds new practitioners and provides the essential connection to practicing collaborative lawyers, whom a practitioner can use to answer questions.

Although rare in litigated cases, a more experienced collaborative practitioner will assist a less experienced colleague through the process by providing standard documents and helping to move the process forward. Handling cases is much easier if you know and trust your practice group opposing counsel.

A practice group also provides the continuing education which is essential to collaborative practitioners. Recent practice group presentations have included how to comply with the new Maryland collaborative law, compassion fatigue, and structuring a settlement agreement to allow parties to qualify for a mortgage. More importantly, the practice group is a sounding board to discuss the issues which inevitably arise in collaborative cases.

To find a Practice Group in your area, refer to the front page of the newsletter which lists the practice group representatives. New members are always welcomed! ❄️



Maryland Collaborative Practice Council



Friends of Collaborative Practice:

Please consider supporting the MCPC Endowment Fund for our December campaign.

Thank you to our generous contributors:

Your support will help MCPC and the Collaborative Practice Project of Maryland (CPM) continue the important work of supporting Collaborative Practice throughout the state.

Platinum: \$1,000.00

Suzy Eckstein, Oakley & Eckstein
Margie Hofberg, Residential Mortgage
Center

Silver: \$250.00

Darcy Shoop
Stacey Andersen
Debbie May
Sue Soler

Bronze: \$100.00

Andrea Hirsch
Karen Freed
Anna Walsh
Colby Hall

Gold: \$500.00

Pasternak & Fidis -
Vicki Viramontes-LaFree
Jan White
Linda Radvin
Roger Hayden

Steven Weisbaum
Don Paris
Jana Singer
Jac Knust
Meg Oliver

Beth Weisberg, Lerch, Early & Brewer
Eshigo Okasili
Susan Silber
Scott Holzman
Erin Golding

Kathleen Wobber
Feldesman Tucker -
Sarah Zimmerman
Mary Pence

Craig Strent, Apex Home Loans
Amy Mazer
Nancy Weller

Friends: \$50.00

Jonathan Dana
Marina Barannik
Jennifer Davison
Julie Landau

FLAG Family Law -
Sarah Nesbitt
Michael Katz

Leslie Turner
Jan Brito
Moges Abebe
Richard Dodd
Sean Worrall
Jane Stevens

Please go to the website below to the MCPC donation page

www.marylandcollaborativepractice.com

Guidelines for Successful Co-Parenting

By Karen Freed, LCSW-C and Sue Soler, LCSW-C

As couples move from a marital relationship to one of co-parents, there is a significant shift to be made. At times, this shift can be challenging and also emotional. Below are some concrete guidelines to help you make this shift as successfully as possible.

As co-parents, the only topic you should be communicating about is the children. We often talk about shifting to a business relationship with the business being the children. The children are your one and only focus together as you move forward. This means limiting your communications to such issues as logistics related to the children or sharing observations about changes in behavior or patterns of the children.

Both of you are capable parents and all interactions and communications need to be based on this understanding. Raising a concern about the other as a parent is serious and should be reserved only for issues that are related to the safety of the children. For example, if a parent feels that the other is leaving the children home alone in ways that puts the children at risk or is letting the children wander in the middle of the street without supervision, you should raise that issue. On the other hand, if a parent feels that the other parent is not playing with the kids as much as you want that parent to or is making day-to-day decisions that you would make differently, that is not an issue to raise with your co-parent.

Each of you is free to manage your parenting responsibilities in your own way. Each of you has the right to parent in your own way and to make your own day-to-day decisions without consultation with each other and without sharing that information with your co-parent. For example, each of you are free to decide what the children wear each day, what they eat, who they play with, how you spend your time at home, how much down time and how much structured time you have with the children, etc. In addition, as those decisions are about day-to-day situations, the decisions are made without informing or consulting with your co-parent.

There are many ways to parent and most are ok. All parents have their own style and methods for parenting. No two parents are alike. Even in families who live in one home, the parents handle things differently. As co-parents, you need to respect that each of you will handle things

differently. You must not judge each other in terms of your parenting style, methods and day-to-day decision-making.

Observe clear boundaries between your homes and in the level of information shared about your own lives. As you make the shift from a couple to co-parents, you will receive much less information about each other and previous questions you may have asked the other parent are no longer appropriate. For example, as co-parents you will no longer share detailed information about your own health, personal relationships, new partners, professional lives, etc. Information should be shared only as it is relevant to the children. For example, if you told the children that a close relative was very sick and this was impacting the children's emotional state, you should share that with your co-parent so they are aware and can support the children. On the other hand, you would not share detailed information with your co-parent about your own health treatments if they did not directly impact the children.

In addition, if the information to be shared, because it directly impacts the children, is about your co-parent's health, work, etc..., that co-parent determines what the children should be told and the method and timing of the telling.

When you communicate with each other, be brief, neutral, focused on the children, and speak only for yourself (and not for your co-parent). Neither of you should make accusations or assumptions about the other. Use "I" statements only and do not convey what you think your co-parent thinks or why your co-parent may or may not be engaging in behavior.

If you feel that your co-parent is not abiding by the above provisions, firmly and respectfully let your co-parent know. Should you feel uncomfortable with your co-parent's requests for information, communication or other behaviors, advise your co-parent that you are observing certain boundaries in terms of sharing information and answering questions. If the conversation continues, let your co-parent know that you are no longer engaging in the dialogue and are taking a break from the communication. This may feel badly at first (both as the person who needs to make the communication and the person who receives the communication). However, it is a necessary step in asserting the above provisions and boundaries so you can make that successful transition from a couple to co-parents. ✨

(privacy protections continued from page 1)

Maryland is the ninth state to enact the Uniform Collaborative Law Act. The District of Columbia passed the Act in 2012. Virginia has yet to consider it.

Although Maryland attorneys have been working with clients in the Collaborative Law Process since the mid 2000s, the new law is an important development. Most important is the privilege for collaborative communications. If either party abandons the Collaborative Process and goes to court, the law protects statements made in the Collaborative Process from being admitted as evidence in court or obtained in court-based discovery. Thus, similar to the statutory protections for communications in mediation, the statutory protection of communications in the Collaborative Process allows the parties to speak freely in the spirit of settlement without fear of being penalized in court.

In another important change, the new law requires voluntary disclosure of all important information for settlement, without use of any of the mandated court procedures for discovery. Usually a financial expert collects information from the parties and meets with them and their attorneys to assist in reaching resolution of the financial issues. In contrast to litigation, in the Collaborative Process the attorney for each party is responsible for his or her client's compliance with this disclosure.

The Collaborative Process ends successfully when the parties reach a settlement agreement. Prior to reaching settlement, each party has the right to end the process and go to court or seek another way to resolve the dispute. If the case ends unsuccessfully, the collaborative attorney, who is hired for settlement only, does not continue to represent the party in court. Statistics collected nationwide by the International Academy of Collaborative Professionals indicate a 90 percent success rate. Even parties who were not successful reported by 80 percent that they were glad they participated in the process.

To date the Collaborative Process has been used primarily in divorce and family law cases, although it is also well suited to many civil law disputes such as business disputes, employment discrimination claims, and probate or estate matters. Across the board, the Collaborative Process appeals to clients who want privacy about their finances and personal matters and who want to control the pacing and time demands of resolving their dispute. Among divorcing clients, the Collaborative Process particularly appeals to spouses who want an amicable divorce; spouses who want to integrate financial planning into their divorce;

spouses who want to be better informed about their finances; spouses who want to maintain a respectful relationship with each other and the other's extended family; couples who have had a lengthy marriage; and clients who want specialized tax, business, trust and other expert advice as part of their divorce.

In a divorce or family law situation, there are two groups that are particularly well-served by the process: 1) high net worth individuals and business owners who seek a private resolution and a process they can control; and 2) parents who seek a process that protects their children. The first group, who have important financial interests at stake, can protect their financial information from disclosure to others outside the process. At the same time, if one party is less financially sophisticated, the neutral financial expert hired by the parties can help educate that person about the family finances. The parties can also control the timing of the process by deciding when they will meet and how fast they will proceed. When they reach resolution in the process, their finances will be protected from public access.

The second group, parents of minor children, are able to set protecting their children as their goal for the Collaborative Process. Instead of the attorneys' negotiating a custody schedule, mental health experts trained as coaches meet with the parties to develop a schedule and decision-making plan that protects the children. Participants interviewed after the Collaborative Process reported the greatest benefits to be their improved ability to co-parent and the protection of their children during the divorce process.

At Pasternak & Fidis, all the family law attorneys are trained in the process. Roger A. Hayden of the Business, Real Estate, and Litigation Group is trained as well. Please call Jan White, Vicki Viramontes-LaFree, Roger Hayden, Linda Ravdin, Morriah Horani or Mary Katherine Hayburn at 301-656-8850 if you would like to find out if the Collaborative Process is a good choice for you. ✨

Jan White is a founding member of Collaborative Practice Training Institute and has trained Maryland attorneys in the Collaborative Process for the Administrative Office of the Maryland Courts. She has served as head of the District of Columbia Academy of Collaborative Professionals and the Collaborative Professionals of Northern Virginia, as well as on the Board of the Montgomery County, Maryland Collaborative Group, Collaborative Dispute Resolution Professionals. She is currently Chair of the D.C. Metro Protocols Committee and Co-Chair of the Ethics Committee of the Maryland Collaborative Practice Council.

THE ADR SECTION OF THE MSBA
AND MARYLAND COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE COUNCIL
present

**47 THINGS EVERY MEDIATOR
AND COLLABORATIVE PRACTITIONER SHOULD KNOW**
Spring Event Training & Dinner

sponsored by the Maryland State Bar Association

DAY TRAINING EVENT

Presentation on "47 Things Every Mediator and Collaborative Professional Should Know" Presented by Forrest "Woody" Mosten,

Trainer in mediation and collaborative practice

9:00 am - 5:00 pm (includes breakfast and lunch)

WHAT YOU WILL LEARN

- The top things that many mediators and collaborative professionals don't do
- The most common places where settlement discussions go wrong and how to fix them

*For more information please contact: jgw@wsfamily.com,
ceecee@paizslaw.com, or sea@stacyandersenlaw.com*

SPRING DINNER PRESENTATION

Feature Speaker:

Judge Lynne A. Battaglia, Maryland Court of Appeals

BELL AWARD PRESENTATION

By Retired Chief Judge Robert M. Bell

DATE

Thursday, April 9, 2015

Registration 8:00 am - 9:00 am

Program 9:00 am - 5:00 pm

Cocktails* 5:30 pm - 6:30 pm

Dinner

Presentation 6:30 pm - 8:30 pm

Location

Turf Valley
2700 Turf Valley Road
Ellicott City, MD 21042

Registration

Register by March 15, 2015 for
Early Bird Discount

*No refunds after March 25, 2015
Credit can be applied to next year's training*

**cash bar*

FEES FOR ATTENDEES

	Seminar	Dinner	Seminar & Dinner
Member early fee	\$150.00	\$75.00	\$225.00
Member late fee	\$180.00	\$85.00	\$265.00
Non-member early fee	\$180.00	\$85.00	\$265.00