Bulletin of the Maine Association of Mediators
July 2010

Professionals Committed to Cooperative Conflict Resolution

Volume XIII, Issue II www.mainemediators.org **May 2010**

The President's Message

By Peter J. Malia, Jr.

These are busy times for those of us interested in the field of mediation. On a national level, the events leading up to the passage of the Senate Health Reform Bill on March 22, 2010 were fascinating, as President Obama engaged in negotiations right up until minutes before the vote to secure the much publicized 216 votes needed to pass the measure. On a local level, the negotiations and gamesmanship involved in the threatened move to Albany, New York by the Portland Pirates garnered headlines as well. Skills that we learn as mediators are useful in a variety of contexts – not just in a formal mediation between two parties.

The Maine Association of Mediators is pleased to announce an exciting opportunity for you to hone your negotiation and mediation skills by attending a keynote address to be delivered at the University of Southern Maine's Abramson Center on Monday, October 4, 2010, by Robert Mnookin, Chair of the Harvard Law School Program on Negotiation. The keynote address will be in the evening (exact time to be determined) and will follow a social hour at the Abramson Center which will give us all an opportunity to reconnect and network. Professor Mnookin has recently published a book entitled "Bargaining with the Devil." He is in very high demand, and we are lucky to be able to bring him to Portland in the fall. Please mark your calendars. You can preview (and purchase) his book at www.bargainingwiththedevil.com. Also see Professor Mnookin's article in this bulletin.

Also, our program committee has scheduled another interesting and informative discussion on the topic of Elder Law Mediation. This program will take place at Verrill Dana on June 3, 2010, from 8:30 to 10:00. The panel will include Cumberland County Probate Judge Joseph Mazziotti, Attorney Bob Raftice of Ainsworth, Thelin and Raftice, and Dennis Culley, Senior Staff Attorney for Maine Legal Services for the elderly. CLE credits have been applied for. If you deal with elder law mediation issues in any context, you will benefit from attending this 90 minute seminar. We hope to see you there.

Certainly our services are in high demand, and our field is growing, which may be one reason why there are a couple of different 40 hour mediation certificate courses being offered in the near future. Jacqui Clark and Debbie Mattson of Mediation & Facilitation Resources, located in Augusta, have scheduled a 40 hour training program for the week of June 21, 2010. A brochure is available on the web at mediateresources.com. Nancy Markowitz, Director of Community Mediation Services, is offering a 40 hour course as well. Nancy's course will take place during the week of May 5, 2010 at the Westrum House located in Topsham. Contact Nancy at 207-441-3076 for more information.

The University of Southern Maine just completed a 40 hour mediation program on March 19, 2010. This program was taught by Diane Kenty and Jonathan Reitman. At the conclusion of the program, I was invited by Diane and Jonathan to speak to the program participants about the Maine Association of Mediators, and about my experience with mediation in general. It was an interesting panel discussion that included the aforementioned Nancy Markowitz, as well as Jack Montgomery, a lawyer at Bernstein Shur, and Karen Groat, Director of Youth Alternatives and a new member of the Maine Association of Mediators Board of Governors.

In other news, we held an informative and well attended program on March 4, 2010 at Verrill Dana in Portland to address Maine's new rules pertaining to the admissibility and confidentiality of mediation conduct and mediation statements (Rules 408 and 514 to the Maine Rules of Evidence). We had over 30 participants, and a number of interesting questions arose as a result of the discussion led by myself, James Cohen (a lawyer at Verrill Dana and a member of the Maine Association of Mediators Board of Governors), and Jonathan Reitman.

In other mediation news, the Due Process Office of the Special Services Team at the Maine Department of Education is looking to expand its roster of mediators (their primary areas of need are in Penobscot, Piscataquis, Aroostook, Washington and Hancock counties). If interested, you can e-mail Pauline Lamontagne, Due Process Coordinator, at Pauline.lamontagne@maine.gov (or call 624-6647).

The Maine Supreme Court recently issued a decision which discusses Maine's new Rules of Evidence (408 and 514) pertaining to mediation statements and conduct (the subject of our March 4th program). The case is State of Maine v. Deane Tracy. You can read it at the following website: www.courts.state.me.us/court_info/opinions/supreme/index.shtml. The decision was issued on March 25, 2010. I will have more to say about this important and well reasoned decision in our next bulletin.

Finally, in addition to welcoming Karen Groat to our Board of Governors at our March Board of Governors meeting, we welcomed Paula Craighead, Esq. to the Board at our April meeting. Paula currently participates as a mediator in the Foreclosure Diversion Program. Her legal work is primarily focused on federal administrative law. She has also served as a neutral in environmental conflict settings, and is pursuing an interest in mediation in the context of healthcare compliance. We are excited to have Karen and Paula "on board."

As always, feel free to contact me with questions or comments at pmalia@hastings-law.com, or at 207-935-2061.

Don't forget to renew your membership!

Should you do business with the enemy?

It's tempting to refuse to negotiate with those you consider to be evil. Yet a closer analysis may reveal unexpected opportunities for collaboration and growth.

Imagine that the only way you can achieve a set of important goals is to negotiate with a person or organization you consider to be evil. Negotiating with this party would violate your moral principles, yet refusing to negotiate would prevent you from moving forward. What should you do?

Here's how two well-known political prisoners approached this dilemma, as described by Program on Negotiation Chair Robert Mnookin in his new book, *Bargaining with the Devil: When to Negotiate, When to Fight* (Simon & Schuster, 2010):

After being imprisoned by the KGB in 1977 on bogus espionage charges, Anatoli Sharansky, a central figure in the Soviet Zionist movement, categorically refused to negotiate with his captors. During his nine years in Soviet prisons and labor camps, Sharansky's KGB interrogators alternately threatened him with death and promised to release him in their efforts to get him to cooperate with their demands. Having conducted a cost-benefit analysis that ignored his own self-interest, Sharansky, a game theorist and chess master, stuck to his chosen course of noncooperation in support of his cause. In 1986, Sharansky, having sacrificed none of his principles, was released to East Berlin.

During 23 years of imprisonment for alleged terrorist activities, African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela refused on principle to negotiate with the South African government, a regime he considered to be evil. But in 1985, aware that the ruling party was under intense pressure to end apartheid, Mandela initiated secret talks with a group of senior government officials on a variety of issues important to both sides. When offered early release from prison, Mandela refused to leave unless certain conditions were met. Ultimately, Mandela met with South African President F. W. de Klerk, who in 1990 announced a set of decisions that met Mandela's conditions, led to his release, and opened up negotiations for a post-apartheid South Africa.

Few of us will ever have to deal with monolithic and oppressive regimes like those of the Soviet Union and South Africa during the previous century. But at one time or another, most of us have faced the prospect of negotiating with a sworn enemy—whether a "greedy" sibling, an "evil" ex-spouse, or an "immoral" company. As these two stories of bravery suggest, there is no right or wrong answer to the question of whether to negotiate with a person or group you consider to be your enemy. Both men achieved their goals, one by refusing to negotiate and the other by negotiating.

In general, however, most people decide too hastily to walk away from such talks or to turn their dispute over to the courts, writes Mnookin. Our emotions cause us to err on the side of not negotiating.

By contrast, wise negotiators like Sharansky and Mandela carefully analyze whether to negotiate with their enemies. Here we summarize some of the key points from *Bargaining with the Devil* with the goal of helping you determine when to engage the enemy and when to resist.

What do we mean by evil?

Negotiators often use words such as *evil* loosely. To make sure we're all on the same page, Mnookin offers a definition: "An act is evil when it involves the intentional infliction of grievous harm on another human being in circumstances where there is no adequate justification." According to this definition, an evil act must be deliberate rather than careless, and it must cause serious harm that cannot be justified or excused.

Note that this definition refers to evil *acts,* not evil *people.* Mnookin notes that most of us tend to condemn others as evil on the basis of a single action, such as taking advantage of a weaker party. By contrast, we are far more likely to let ourselves off the hook for a similar action. In your business and personal lives, one of the most important mental shifts you can make as a negotiator is to assume that your counterpart, just like you, wants to behave morally but makes mistakes on occasion.

In fact, Mnookin has observed that negotiators face three obstacles to wise decision making when contemplating whether to do business with an enemy: (1) they fall into emotional traps that lead to knee-jerk decisions, (2) they fail to analyze the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action, and (3) they have trouble coping with the ethical and moral issues that arise. As we shall see, all these difficulties tend to result from overreliance on intuition at the expense of reasoned analysis.

1. Avoid emotional traps.

All of us are susceptible to various emotional traps, both positive and negative, that can steer us toward or away from negotiation with the enemy.

Demonization, or the tendency to see the other side as evil to the core, is one of the most common negative emotional traps, according to Mnookin. The more you demonize your counterpart, the less willing you will be to interact with him. The positive side of demonization, *contextual rationalization,* is a less common trap. When you easily (and perhaps naively) forgive others for their transgressions, you are engaging in contextual rationalization.

In addition to demonization, common negative traps that can lead you astray include *tribalism,* or the tendency to view your

Enemy, continued on page 5.

Food for Thought: *Can these theories be applied to our mediation practice?*

-from *Sway*, by Ori Brafman and Rom Brafman

by Doris Luther

According to this book, our behavior and decision-making are influenced by a variety of psychological undercurrents that are much more powerful than we realize. They are pervasive and, like a stream, they converge and become even more powerful. They "sway" our behavior. The first is "loss aversion" which is when we overreact to perceived losses and will go to great lengths to avoid possible losses.

The authors used as an example a professor at Harvard Business School. On the first day of his negotiation class, he offers up a $20.00 bill for auction. The rules are that anyone can bid; each bid is to be made in $1.00 increments; the winner wins the bill, but the runner-up must also pay his/her bid although losing the bill. Inevitably, the pattern is fast bidding up to $12.00 - $16.00, when it dawns on the bidders that the "price" is too high. At this point, everyone drops out except the two high bidders. So now, the two bidders are committed to not losing (loss aversion.) Bidding has reached as high as $204.00! "The deeper the hole they dig themselves into, the more they continue to dig." (page 32)

Another example in the book is a study of egg sales by Professor Daniel Putler, former researcher at the U.S. Department of Agriculture He found that when egg prices went down, people bought more eggs, but when egg prices went *up*, purchases went down by 2 + ½ times. In other words, the pain associated with loss is much more potent than the joys associated with gain. So much so, that in order to reduce loss, we engage in faulty thinking.

I think about mediation clients who are entrenched in their own positions even though the position makes no sense – the dad who wants shared residency, but travels a lot for work, or the small claims plaintiff who wants more money than her claim is worth.

The second "sway" the book presents is "value attribution." This is our inclination to instill a person or thing with certain qualities based on initial perceived values. The authors recount a true story that took place in the Washington D.C. subway in January of 2007. A young man dressed in jeans and a baseball cap took out his $3.5 million Stradivarius violin and started playing. He was Joshua Bell, a world-renowned violinist who plays to sold-out concerts around the globe. As part of an undercover field study conducted by the Washington Post, 1097 people were counted walking by. Only one man stopped to liste for a few minutes. Some kids stared. One woman acntually recognized Joshua. Because of his appearance and the location, he was not given value – even though his music was beautiful.

This, the authors say, is an example of value attribution, which "acts as a quick mental shortcut to determine what's worthy of our attention. When we encounter a new object, person, or situation, the value we assign to it shapes our further perception of it and subsequent information related to it." (page 50) As mediators, we're not supposed to make these kinds of snap judgments, but how often do we fall into this trap?

The value we attribute to something basically changes how we view it. This is "diagnosis bias." We become sightless to any evidence that contradicts the first impression. Inherent in diagnosis bias are 3 "traps." The first is that we ignore data by rejecting facts. In family mediation, clients often ignore information that is being presented because it doesn't fit the position they are holding (the children have special needs that the dad doesn't know how to provide and won't be able to provide if he is traveling a lot on business.) The second is giving too much value to irrelevant facts. (A client tries to tell a story that has nothing to do with the issues in mediation.) And third, we often ignore evidence that disagrees with what we want to have happen. (The value of the damage to a plaintiff's vehicle is less than the plaintiff was hoping to be awarded in Small Claims Court.)

A fourth trap is "arbitrarily assigning labels." I think most people are familiar with the story of the teacher who, in 1968 divided her class into the blued-eyed group and the brown-eyed group. She told the students that the blued-eyed children were superior. Very quickly the "superior" students began to oppress the brown-eyed "inferior" students, who exhibited negative feelings of self-hatred, fear, etc. The next day, she reversed the exercise, and the oppressed became the oppressors. When labeled, people take on the characteristics of the label, both positive and negative. That client we see as a demon may well become "demonic" to us!

Food for Thought , continued on page 4.

Food for Thought, continued from page 3.

The book also talks about "procedural justice" and perceived fairness. It cites a study of felons showing that someone who got off with a light sentence thought the trial was fairer than someone who got a harsh sentence. (Obvious, right?) But, surprisingly, the felons placed almost as much weight on the process as they did the outcome. One factor was how much time their lawyer gave them – the more time, the more satisfied they were with the outcome. "In other words, although the outcome might be exactly the same, when we don't get to voice our concerns, we perceive the overall fairness of the experience quite differently." (page 121) Sound familiar? We know from studies of mediation outcomes that people are happier with a mediated agreement, in which they had input, than they are with a judge's mandate.

"Group sway" is another way that can cause people to behave irrationally. In a study where one member of the group was an unknowing participant and the rest were hired actors, participants were asked to point out which lines on a page were the same length. The one participant correctly pointed out the lines that were equal, but when the rest of the group (incorrectly) pointed out two other lines, the first person changed his mind.

The point of that story was that we should pay attention to dissenters. They might be right! The Supreme Court Justices routinely write dissents to opinions of the majority of the court. The result is healthy open discussion that presents different points of view and leads to better-informed decision-making. Parties can learn from someone they disagree with!

In conclusion:

While looking at long-term future outcomes helps us avoid faulty decision-making due to loss aversion, letting go of a project or decision that is obviously not working requires the ability to let go of the past. There are times when it's better to change than to dig a deeper hole.

To be able to avoid value attribution requires the willingness to accept that your initial impressions might be wrong. To combat diagnosis bias, the authors suggest "propositional thinking." "It's all about keeping evaluations tentative instead of certain, learning to be comfortable with complex, sometimes contradictory information, and taking your time and considering things from different angles before coming to a conclusion." (page 178)

The fairness sway can be addressed by keeping those who will be affected by the decision *involved* in the decision.

And for group sway, give voice to the dissenter!

Doris Luther, mediator, consultant, trainer and guardian ad litem, owns Mediation & Conflict Resolution Services. E-mail her at dsluther53@adelphia.net

New Rules Sheltering Mediators Explained

Craig W. Friedrich

Changes to the Maine Rules of Evidence affecting mediators and their work product were the subject of a continuing legal education program put on by the Maine Association of Mediators on the morning of March 4. Some two dozen people attended the meeting in person, at Verrill Dana, LLP in Portland, and several others participated by tele-conference. The audience proved quite active in contributing to the program.

The program had a decidedly practical cast. The changes addressed were amended Rule 408 and newly created Rule 514. Rule 408 addresses the admissibility into evidence settlement talks -- conduct and statements -- made in mediation by parties and their mediator. Rule 514 embodies a specific legal privilege for mediators.

Program chair Peter J. Malia provided useful context for understanding the new rules, which he noted became effective January 1, 2010. The new rules emerged after a proposed narrower expansion to Rule 408 never came into effect and after an effort, by the Association and others, to enact the Uniform Mediation Act in Maine failed last year. One recurring theme of the program was the possibility of clarifying the status of the mediator and the work product from the mediator in a written mediation agreement among the mediator and the parties.

Malia was joined on the panel by James I. Cohen and Jonathan W. Reitman. Malia practices with Hastings Law Office, P.A. in Fryeburg, Cohen with Verrill Dana, LLP, Malia practices with Hastings Law Office , P.A.

New Rules, continued on page 7.

Enemy, continued from page 4.
group as good and the other side as evil, and *self-righteousness,* or the tendency to blame your counterpart entirely for a problem and let yourself off the hook.

Sharansky's and Mandela's different stances toward their captors directly correlate to these traps. Sharansky actively worked to demonize his KGB captors, lest he find himself softening toward them as individuals. Viewing the KGB as a monolithic force of repression was essential to Sharansky's goal of resisting negotiation. By contrast, Mandela was willing to view his captors as individuals capable of kindness and sympathy. Approaching them with an open mind—and actively resisting the temptation to demonize—helped him during negotiation. Government officials found him to be a warm, respectful counterpart with whom they could make progress.

Both negative and positive emotional traps can cloud your judgment in negotiation. How can you avoid them? Recognizing and acknowledging them is a crucial first step. In addition, consulting trusted advisers can help you consider different perspectives on the problem.

2. Analyze costs and benefits.

Imagine that three siblings—Gloria, Albert, and Jane—get into a dispute over an inheritance from their father. He stipulated that the money be left in a trust for 40 years after his death, at which time it would be distributed to any of his remaining children and their heirs. Gloria, who is a registered CPA, offers to manage the trust and its investments for a small annual fee. Jane insists that they hire a bank to manage the trust. Gloria accuses Jane of not respecting her abilities; Jane accuses Gloria of being controlling, and soon the two aren't speaking. Albert, who is concerned about paying hefty bank fees, sides with Gloria, and the issue remains unresolved.

Let's look at the dilemma from Jane's perspective. As the youngest child in the family, Jane is tired of being bossed around by her older sister. She is tempted to maintain an icy silence with Gloria and turn the matter over to the courts.

Though this story is not from Mnookin's book, his framework can be applied. Before Jane sues her sister, Mnookin would advise her to take a deep breath and answer the following five sets of questions:

1. What are my *interests* in this dispute? What are my enemy's interests?

2. What are my *alternatives* to this negotiation? What are my enemy's alternatives?

3. Can I envision a *potential deal* that could satisfy both sides' interests better than our alternatives to negotiation?

4. What will this negotiation *cost* me, in money and time? How will it affect my reputation and relationships? Will it set a bad precedent?

5. If we reach a deal, how likely will we be to *implement* it successfully?

Regular readers of *Negotiation* will be familiar with these questions, which we encourage you to study before engaging in any important deal. It's especially critical to analyze the costs and benefits of negotiating when your judgment is distorted by contempt and anger. Though not an exact science, this type of risk analysis can help you make more rational decisions. Your analysis may lead you to believe that you have a promising alternative to the current negotiation, or it may convince you that your best course is to try to work out a deal with the enemy.

In Jane's case, her cost-benefit analysis might help her to decide that she would be better off negotiating directly with Gloria and Albert rather than allowing the courts to take over. With the help of a mediator, the three siblings could possibly air their grievances, including a frank discussion of old family wounds. Ultimately, Jane and Albert might agree to let Gloria manage the trust on two conditions: first, that she completes a class on trust management, and second, that an outside auditor examine the books each year.

3. Address ethical and moral issues.

Wait a minute, you might be saying. Yes, it often makes sense to hammer out differences with family members and other important people in our lives. But what about those counterparts you simply can't abide—a customer who has stolen your company's ideas, for example, or a firm that you believe sells dangerous products? Shouldn't you be able to avoid a negotiation that would go against your values?

In *Bargaining with the Devil,* Mnookin acknowledges that honor, integrity, and identity can and should be significant factors when deciding whether to negotiate with an enemy. But he cautions that our moral judgments tend to arise from the intuitive side of the brain. If you use these judgments as an excuse to avoid analyzing a situation, they could become dangerous traps. The key, according to Mnookin, is to recognize that your moral judgments should "involve an interaction between intuition and analysis."

Take the case of a self-employed marketing consultant who happens to be an ardent vegetarian. On principle, he might decide that he doesn't want to take on a meat purveyor as a client. But what if this is the only potential client he has in the midst of a recession? If he and his family are having trouble making ends meet, he might decide to put aside his moral qualms for the time being and accept the work. Then again, he might decide to redouble his efforts to find other clients, or take on a second job.

This example is ours, not Mnookin's, but it illustrates the moral dilemma. Not negotiating with the enemy for ethical reasons is a perfectly legitimate decision, provided you've thought through two factors, writes Mnookin. First, to ensure you aren't overly swayed by emotional traps, you must be

Enemy, continued on page 6.

Enemy, continued from page 5.

willing to probe your moral intuitions by conducting the type of cost-benefit analysis described above. Second, if you are acting solely on your own behalf, you have every right to allow your personal values to trump reasoned analysis. If, on the other hand, deciding not to negotiate might indirectly harm those you represent, such as your family or coworkers, you may have a greater moral obligation to negotiate.

Choosing to negotiate with someone who has hurt you or others in the past can be a painful decision. You may feel torn between wanting to seek justice for past wrongs and the need for resolution. Yet the desire for vengeance can be an emotional trap that will keep you from meeting your primary goals, according to Mnookin. That's why it's so important to balance your intuition with rational analysis.

Should you or shouldn't you?

These four guidelines sum up Robert Mnookin's advice on whether to negotiate with an enemy:

1. Analyze. Systematically compare the expected costs and benefits of negotiating by answering the series of questions presented (see Step 2).

2. Ask for help. Because you can't avoid being biased, ask a trusted adviser to help you analyze your alternatives.

3. When in doubt, negotiate. If your careful analysis leaves you feeling torn, proceed with the negotiation. A presumption in favor of negotiation will help you avoid negative emotional traps, such as demonization.

4. Take responsibility. Whenever you are representing others (such as your organization or your family) in a negotiation, it would be a mistake to allow your personal values to override a rational analysis in favor of negotiation.

When the "devil" comes calling

1. Recognize the tendency to demonize others based on little information.

2. Balance your intuitive judgments with a rational cost-benefit analysis.

3. Don't let personal values cloud a careful consideration of the issue.

This article first appeared in ***Negotiation***, a monthly newsletter, published by the **Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School.** To download free ***Negotiation*** **special reports** and learn how to subscribe to this award-winning newsletter**, please visit: www.pon.harvard.edu**

INVITATION TO SUBMIT ARTICLES TO THE BULLETIN

YOUR OPPORTUNITY TO BE INTERNATIONALLY PUBLISHED !

The *Bulletin* of the Maine Association of Mediators needs articles related to mediation and mediation in Maine in particular. Topics might include:

- Reports of actual mediations, successful or not, while maintaining the confidentiality.
- Training and career development opportunities.
- History of mediation in Maine in and out of the judicial system.
- Mediation techniques and perspectives.
- Program opportunities for mediation, where disputes are now resolved in different ways.
- Mediation in other states, the Federal Government and other countries.
- Resources for mediators, mediating parties.
- Stories and biographies of successful, current and past, Maine mediators and how they work (ed) their magic.
- The role of mediation in the continuum of techniques of alternate dispute resolution.
- Other relevant topics.

Publishing an article in the Bulletin is an opportunity for new mediators to become known to potential clients! Don't miss this opportunity!

Please send proposed articles to:

jalfano1@maine.rr.com

New Rules, from page 4

in Fryeburg, Cohen with Verrill Dana, LLP, and Reitman with Gosline & Reitman Dispute Resolution Services in Brunswick.

Rule 408(b) has been significantly expanded. It now generally denies admissibility into evidence of "conduct or statements by any party or mediator" in any of five classes of mediations: those mandated by statute, court rule, agency rule, those where the parties have been referred by a court, agency, or abitrator, and those where the parties have formally agreed to mediation "with an expectation of confidentiality." The bar to admissibility reaches "the proceeding with respect to which the mediation was held or in any other proceeding between the parties to the mediation that involves the subject matter of the mediation." There are three exceptions to the general rule of non-admissibility: proof of "fraud, duress, or other cause to invalidate the mediation result . . . ." Rule 408(a) has been extended to preclude use of settlement negotiations, including mediations, "to impeach a witness through a prior inconsistent statement or contradiction."

Because the rule only speaks to admissibility at trial, it does not prevent discovery. Nor does the rule provide protection to statements by third persons present at a mediation who are neither a party nor a mediator. Further, there is no general requirement of confidentiality.

New Rule 514, the privilege rule, seems broader. Unlike Rule 408(b), the privilege granted to mediators extends to discovery. It also covers the activities of mediators before and after the actual mediation proceeding. Further, the mediator may waive the privilege. However, the rule only reaches subsequent proceedings to which the Maine Rules of Evidence apply.

New Rule 514 lists seven items to which the new privilege does not apply: (1) any signed mediated agreement, (2) a crime/fraud exception, (3) future bodily harm or a crime, (4) mediator misconduct, (5) party/counsel misconduct, (6) welfare of a child/adult, and (7) "manifest injustice." Concern was expressed over the possibility that the balancing test inherent in the manifest injustice test could be applied to defeat expectations of confidentiality if the exception is not given limited scope.

Editor's Note: The new rules emerged after a proposed narrower expansion of Rule 514, not Rule 408, as referenced in the third paragraph.

Email Craig W. Friedrich at
craig@mainelawyersreview.com

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

OFFICERS

Peter Malia, President

Vacancy, Vice President

Anita Jones, Secretary

Sheila Mayberry, Treasurer

BOARD MEMBERS

John Alfano, Debbie Belanger, Christopher Causey, Paula Craighead, Maria Fox, Karen Groat, Eileen Maguire, Evan Weston, Vacancy

MISSION:

MAINE ASSOCIATION OF MEDIATORS

The Association is a non-profit organization of diverse professional interests seeking to broaden public understanding and acceptance of alternative forms of dispute resolution. The Association strives to enhance professional skills and qualifications of mediators, arbitrators, and other neutrals through training, educational development and promotion of standards of professional conduct.

2010 Calendar of Events

May 6, Board of Governors Meeting 9:00—10:30 a.m.

June 3, Membership Meeting, *Elder Law Mediation Program at Verrill Dana,* Portland, 8:30-10:00 a.m.

ANNUAL MEETING, October 4, 2010, Portland

Save the date!

Board of Governors meets the first Thursday of the month.