

**A CADRE Webinar**  
**Inclusive Listening: Building Understanding, Supporting Collaboration**  
**Lorig Charkoudian & Erricka Bridgeford**  
**December 18, 2013**  
**Transcript**

MARSHALL PETER: ...be here attending to those throughout the webinar. So after a slightly inauspicious beginning, I'm Marshall Peter and I want to welcome and thank you for joining CADRE's webinar on *Inclusive Listening: Building Understanding, Supporting Collaboration*. Today's webinar is part one of a two parts presentation, so we'll have details about the second part later on in the presentation. Our presenters today, Lorig Charkoudian and Erricka Bridgeford come to us from Community Mediation Maryland. Lorig Charkoudian, a Ph.D. is the Executive Director of Community Mediation Maryland. Her work includes developing partnerships with state agencies including the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Service, Maryland State Department of Education, family court Administration and others to bring collaborative conflict resolution to new and unique forums. Lorig serves as a trainer and provides technical assistance to the 17 community-based mediation programs that serve Maryland. Lorig's research examines the impact of specific aspects of the mediation process on experiences for participants as well as broader cost benefit analysis of community mediation. Joining Lorig today is Erricka Bridgeford who is the Director of Training for Community Mediation Maryland. In this capacity, she provides training to the 18 community mediation centers in Maryland as well as the state agencies and organizations. She has provided advanced skills training to mediators at the Maryland Human Relations Commission, for federal EEOC mediators, for the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and many national conferences. Prior to coming to CMM, Erricka was a case manager at Community Mediation in Baltimore City giving her a unique insight into the challenges of working with people in conflict from the beginning of a referral through the completion of the mediation. Erricka was promoted to Director of Training and Volunteer Development. She has trained, mentored and evaluated and supervised both new and experienced mediators. So we are really delighted to have Erricka and Lorig with us today. So I'm going to just, with that, hand it over to them.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Great. Thank you. This is Lorig and it's an honor to be with everybody.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Hi, this is Erricka. I'm happy to be here.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: We'll talk a little bit about what we're going to be doing today. Give a quick overview and then we'll get started. Today is part one, as Marshall said, and in general, when we train we use experiential learning, and so the idea of doing this with people scattered all over the country and trying to find a way to make it experiential for folks created a little bit of a challenge, but what we ultimately decided to do is that today we would focus on the basic concepts. And then we would give you all a month to practice these concepts and we figure the holiday ought to give you good opportunities. You can practice these concepts on your family. And then when you come back to part two of the webinar in January sometime, we'll be providing that date and information at the end of this one. We'll be practicing together as a group and you'll have a chance both to practice with all of us and you'll also have a chance to share your stories about how effectively these strategies works for family holiday concepts. So the basic idea that we're focusing on today is a process we call Inclusive Listening. We call it deep listening. We call it listening to understand. And it's the fundamental skill that we use in inclusive mediation. And the basic idea of it is that we are going to accept that people are going to act however they act in conflict, that all of us misbehave in our own conflicts. That people need to express themselves however they need to express themselves. And that when we're serving as mediators or conflict interveners, it's our job to listen deeply to what it is that people are talking about and expressing and work on understanding that and not to judge how people choose to express themselves. I think those concepts are pretty well known and I think a lot of folks would talk about that is--what their goal is. When they mediate, that's what they're trying to do. And what we've tried to do with inclusive listening formalizing it the way listening to folks and organizing what it is people are saying is provide mediators with skills and tools that help us sort out when it is that we're listening. And our judgments are getting in the way of hearing what someone's actually trying to express and helping us to pull those judgments out and really to listen deeply to what it is that somebody is trying to say. So before we start talking about the inclusive listening skill, we're just going to back up a little bit and talk a little more about the philosophy of inclusive mediation. And while we're not training people to be inclusive mediators today, that, of course as with any approach is a 50-hour training. We do

want you to have some understanding of the philosophical grounding that we're coming from when we talk about the inclusive listening skill which can be used, of course, in the context of inclusive mediation, but also in the context of other mediation approaches or other conflict resolution interventions. So, Erricka is going to jump in here and talk a little bit about the inclusive mediation philosophy.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Good afternoon or morning everybody. So [inaudible] process [inaudible] the skill that we're going to be teaching you today are the fundamental skills that mediators use. We talk about non-judgment and everybody wants to be non-judgmental, but how to actually do that is a big -- that's a big question. How are you nonjudgmental?

MARSHALL PETER: Erricka?

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: And so inclusive listening is a big piece of that and our philosophy...

MARSHALL PETER: Hey, Erricka?

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: ...is the reason we listen in the way we do. So we want participants to be able to have authentic conversations in an authentic way whatever that looks like for them.

MARSHALL PETER: Erricka, it's Marshall. You are -- the audio is a little bit fuzzy when you're speaking. It's -- you're coming in and out.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Is this better? Is this better?

MARSHALL PETER: Not a lot. Are you on a speaker phone?

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: I'm not on speaker phone. Is that better?

MARSHALL PETER: Okay. That's better now, yes.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. My phone was turned off okay.

MARSHALL PETER: Oh, okay. Great, thank you.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So what I was saying was in the inclusive mediation, the process we talk about -- you know, most mediators, we talk about being nonjudgmental. And that sounds really awesome on paper, but there's always a big question about how are you actually

non-judgmental? How does that show up at a mediation table? And so inclusive listening is the way that we -- one way that we're able to do that, but it's based in our philosophy in the inclusive mediation process. So the process aims to be able to help people have difficult conversations in an authentic way. And so authentic means however it is they have conflict. However it is they need to have those difficult conversations. And sometimes conflict shows up being really, you know, nice and passive-aggressive or just quiet and shut down. Sometimes conflict shows up with yelling and screaming and being offensive on purpose to try to win. And so mediators in the inclusive model are trying to make sure that people are able to have that conversation in the way that they authentically have it. And when they're able to be authentic and feel heard at the same time that helps people to understand themselves and their conflict, but also to understand each other. And also after being able to do that, if they're going to make solutions about how to move forward, they're able to do that in a way that's much more collaborative because they've had the conversation in a way that is real and authentic based on whatever the situation was. So the mediator's going to be supporting the dialogue but the content decisions are going to be made by the participants. And so that takes us back to what this authentic conversation might look like. So we've talked a little bit -- it might be yelling, screaming, cursing, name-calling, standing, stomping, crying, chair pushing, whatever it is, talking one at a time and in the midst of that, the increase of mediator's mindset is really important. And so you are always focused on your role is to work on understanding without judgment, that you're going to respect that it takes a lot of courage for participants to have this difficult conversation. A lot of times, people are saying things that they said to other people as they are venting about the conflict, but maybe promise themselves they weren't going to act a certain way today right now at this mediation in front of this person and suddenly they may find themselves saying and doing things they didn't expect to say or hearing new information. So that takes courage just to actually sit in a -- in a heavier conflict. And in the midst of that, the mediator's role is to help people feel heard and understood. All while not giving advice, not giving opinions or suggestions, and so that's really hard. The way that we normally listen in everyday life, when people tell you something the first thing you think of is advice or what you, you know, what you think they should do, what you would do if it happens to you, what you

have done, all of that kind of thing. And so inclusive listening helps us to push our judgments aside and just work on understanding. And so the reason that an inclusive mediator is going to stick to their role is because we really understand that if we are working on understanding, one of the side effects is that participants begin to understand themselves better. And then they may understand the other person better. And then if they're going to make solutions, they can understand what kinds of solutions are actually going to be helpful in this situation. Yeah.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So just to reinforce the piece about the mediator's job working on understanding, one of the things I think mediators talk a lot about is, you know, ultimately does it matter if a mediator understands or not. And our philosophy is in the end it doesn't matter. I could walk out and have no clue what actually went on. It doesn't matter if I understand, but if every single intervention that I make is coming from a place of working on understanding, then those interventions are going to have the effect of helping people understand themselves better, helping people get clearer about what's important to them and have the effect of people understanding each other better. And so that idea of -- as I'm considering this intervention, where is it coming from, and if it's coming from a place of working on understanding, then it's going to move understanding forward for the whole process. And if it's coming from a place of my fear about where the conflict is going or if it's coming from a place of my discomfort with how people are expressing themselves, then it's probably going to have an effect of shutting the conversation down and making people feel judged. So the -- so what we're going to focus on is this idea of inclusive listening. And the inclusive listening is what frame - what it is that we are going to choose to reflect back. So there's always this question, you know, all mediators use reflective listening in some way. And so the question comes up, well, what it is that we reflect back to folks when we're reflecting? And so this is sort of judgment call on deciding what we're going to say unless we're going to be 'paras' and verbatim to say actually everything that comes out of folks mouth. So inclusive listening kind of creates the framework for what we're listening for and then that's going to affect what it is that we reflect and then that's also going to affect how we frame the questions as we move forward into collaborative problem solving. So that's really what where we're focused on today is this the idea of inclusive listening and how we're organizing what it is we're hearing. So the -- in a

nutshell, inclusive listening is listening to what somebody's saying and listening for feelings, topics and what's important. So the -- what we're going to do is we're going to break this down and talk about what is it that we're listening for in terms of feelings, what is it that we're listening for in terms of topics, and what is it that we're listening for in terms of what's important, but what we like to sort of frame this as is we think about if you've ever experienced someone doing sort of simultaneous translation, they're hearing what it is that is being said in one language and they're simultaneously -- they're simultaneously translating it into another language. So they're not analyzing it, they're not putting in their thoughts about it, they're not really changing in any way, they're just putting it into a different language. And so in some way, that's what we're doing. We're hearing what it is that someone's saying however it is they choose to present it. And our brains are doing the simultaneous translation into what were the feelings they were expressing into what were the topics that they feel like need to be resolved, and into what are they saying is important to them. And when we focus on those things, when we listen for those things and we do that simultaneous translation in our brain, then it creates this context that helps keep us from bringing our judgment into the conversation. So people generally speak in positional statements. We're pretty familiar with this. I think if you're -- if you're familiar with and generally work with people in conflict then you're familiar with, and if you've ever had a conflict yourself, you've probably heard positional statements come out of your own mouth, but the idea behind a positional statement is that sort of the I'm right and you're wrong. So they're sometimes insults and threats, sometimes they're solutions, sometimes they're angry statements. They generally focus on the past. They blame someone for the problem. And so you'll see on your screen some of these examples of positional statements. And we'll move on from to the next piece, I think. So what we're doing when we're looking at the positional statement is we're going to listen for, in that position that's being expressed, what are the feelings that the person is expressing? And so the keys are the feelings are the emotional words. They should reflect the degree of intensity that participants are expressing. And so just a few things about that that a lot of times mediators feel nervous about saying feeling words that are intense like betrayed and violated and devastated and horrified, but if you were sitting at the table and they're expressing betrayed and devastated

and violated and horrified and mediators are reflecting back, "Sounds like you're a little upset." Then really that is our judgment about how they're feeling. It becomes our judgment when we try to tone down what is it that people are saying. And ultimately, our judgment makes people sort of shut down and feel like they can't really go to those hard places. So in general, we want to be listening for the feelings and we want to make sure that the feelings that we're articulating reflect the degree of intensity that the participants articulated in their positional statement. We also want to make sure that it's what they're actually expressing and not what we think. So not the stuff about, well, jeez, if someone had just, you know, said those kinds of things to my daughter, I would be feeling XYZ. But what did they actually say they were feeling about it, and so that again becomes this place where we have to be very careful about can we hear what they're saying and not what we think about what they're saying. And then the last piece again is making sure it's not our analysis, that it's actually what it is they're saying and not our analysis of what their saying. So you want to go ahead?

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Yeah. Okay. Okay. I'm going to sound like the commercial. Can you hear me now? I'll stop talking and I'll be looking at the chat box to see if people can hear.

MARSHALL PETER: That's much better, Erricka.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So it's my phone. Okay. Thanks, Constance. Okay. So in this vent, this -- what we're going to do is have an vent -- people are having conflict from both sides of the conflict -- conflicts, so there's going to be a parent and a principal. And we'll take each piece. So we're starting at working on understanding feelings first. So if the parent is saying, "So it seems to me that since I started advocating for healthier food in this school, my son is getting picked on. It's retaliation, is what it is, plain and simple. I was getting nowhere working with the cafeteria staff and the administration, so I took the issue to the press and you better believe we've gotten healthier meals, but ever since then, my son is the only one of all the kids he hangs out with, who gets in trouble. I've even seen him in the cafeteria when I'm volunteering. All the kids are talking and goofing around and he's the one who gets movee to the red zone, which means I get a call home asking me to reinforce the 'consequences'. He does not need those ridiculous consequences. What he needs is staff members who don't

harass him." So immediately when you're hearing this and everybody applauds for my wonderful role playing ability. What you -- immediately, when you hear someone vent this way, you have an analysis of what she might be feeling. So something that I remind myself inside of my mediator brain when I hear someone talk, if I'm thinking she must be feeling or she's probably feeling, then I'll remind myself that I must be adding my opinion and I'm probably analyzing what she said instead of working on understanding what she actually said. So what we want to do is avoid those things that might be not a clean translation, like Lorig was talking about, a translation from a statement that was made into what was that equal in feeling language. If it's not a clean translation, if you have to explain to yourself, well, for instance I think she's bitter because -- if you have to go into a because and make an explanation and build the case, then she probably didn't express it, you probably listened and said, oh, she is bitter. She's defensive, et cetera. But what a clean translation would look like is for instance the word -- the word protective is clearly expressed [inaudible] my son is being picked on, and he needed a staff who isn't going to be harassing him. Proud is a clean translation. That's right. I was getting nowhere and I went to the press and I was doing a good job in the things that I was doing, advocating for healthier food. And then feeling punished that because I did that, now there's retaliation against my son. And so those are feelings that are -- you don't have to really think too hard to hear where the mom is expressing that she feels proud. There are clear statements that equal proud and feeling language and punished and protective. So, if we -- move into the next slide.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So, I get to be the principal. "The two issues have absolutely nothing to do with each other. We have always welcomed your volunteer work at the school. We appreciated the feedback you had about the food and we were in the process of changing it when you went to the press. There was really no need to try to make the school look bad like that. No need. But your son is treated with the same respect and expectations we have for all students in this school. Perhaps now that he has seen his mother disrespect the school in such a public way, he feels empowered to disrespect the staff. Mark is consistently disruptive in the cafeteria and in the classroom. He tries to get others to join him in the disruption and he sometimes succeeds. We will not be bullied into allowing him to create disruptions in our



school community. He will receive the same consequences as all the other students.” So again, looking at feelings, right, we have the feelings the speaker expressed. We've got appreciative, we've got disrespected, and we've got determined. And so one of the things that I want to highlight is if you're looking at this and you're saying, well, she's saying we welcome your volunteer work and we appreciate your feedback but you're sitting there and you're going, "Yeah, well, does she really or does she just feel like she has to say that?" It's not our job to figure out if she really does or if she just feels like she has to say it. She may genuinely appreciate it or she may feel like she has to say it. As mediators, what we want to do is listen to the feelings that are being expressed and honor and reflect those. And as people start to feel heard in what they are saying, they may choose to go deeper or they may choose to get more subtle or complex in how they're expressing themselves but it's our job to listen and reflect what they are saying. In this case appreciative, disrespected, and determined and not worry about if she really meant it or she just, you know, felt like she -- she felt like she had to say that. So for these two, a lot of times when I work with schools, especially with school staff, I'll have mediators or facilitators, IEP facilitators say to me, "Yeah, but, you know, when you're having a professional conversation, sometimes it's not clear that there's feelings in there." My experience is there may not be a lot. You may not find as much in a professional conversation at a -- you know, in a school meeting that you might find in a custody visitation dispute where people are shouting at each other but almost always people are expressing feelings in some kind of a way. And so you really want to hold yourself accountable as a mediator to listening for what is expressed as feelings even if it doesn't feel like an emotionally latent conversation. So start with the feelings. We've got those two sets of feelings. And we're going to move on now to thinking about what would be the topics. How would we listen for the topics, and we're going to go through these things. We're going to listen to these same vents because the idea is that you would listen to these vents from the perspective of -- within this vent, what are the feelings, within this positional statement, what are the topics, and within this positional statement, what are the values, what's important to this person? So we've taken a look at them in terms of what the feelings are. Now, we're going to take a look at what are we listening for when we listen for topics? And then we're going to come back to those two

statements that we just looked at and we're going to -- we're going to see if we can pull out what the topics were that we heard in there. So generally with topics, what we want to do is we're listening for and naming the things that people are in conflict about. And we're naming it in a way that avoids judgments or placing blame. And that's the difference from naming it in a way that sort of whitewashes the issue. We absolutely want to name what the issue is, what is the thing that they are fighting about without downplaying what it is, and we want to do that in a way that everyone can hear and consider the possibility of being part of solving. And so we have here the Topics Grinder, makes -- what makes it a topic? It's a topic if someone has talked about having a conflict around this thing. So, surely if someone has not talked about it themselves, then we shouldn't bring it up, right? So this is not the sort of scenario where we think which -- you know what, if they had a business plan, they probably wouldn't have this conflict. Maybe I'll mention business plan as a -- as a possible topic. No. Someone has to have brought it up themselves. It's got to be specific or concrete. So jumping ahead a little bit, respect is never going to be a topic. Respect is going to be a value. It's what's important to somebody but it's a very general kind of an idea and so it's not specific or concrete enough that people can make a plan about it. So you want to make sure that it's specific or concrete, we want to make sure it doesn't blame anyone. So if we go back to this comment from the parent and we were to say that the topic was staff harassment, clearly that blames somebody and so that wouldn't be the topic but even in -- when we think about one of the classic sort of types of mediation is worthless checks, right? So worthless checks inherently blames somebody for what it is that brought folks to the table. And so we're even looking at the language used in what it is that even in the -- in something sort of more standardized like a certain type of mediation or, you know, if it's a kid in a bike and there's an accusation about theft. And if we were to make the stolen bicycle the topic then someone is inherently blamed in that as opposed to making bicycle the topic. It doesn't take anyone's side and then it doesn't set up somebody should or shouldn't be doing something. So, there's a couple of examples of topics there; parking, housekeeping, communication, trash, the alley, clothing, schedule, dog. But I would also add just coming back a minute to this idea about -- this idea that we're still talking about the specific thing. We're not whitewashing an issue. Sometimes the topic is alcohol or

the topic is drugs or the topic is sex. So, sometimes the topic is something that is hard to talk about or it's embarrassing to talk about or it raises a lot of emotions, as long as we're framing it in a way that doesn't blame anyone, alcohol in and of itself doesn't blame anybody. Sex in and of itself doesn't blame anybody. It could be a difficult topic to talk about but that frame doesn't blame anyone. Frame it in a way that doesn't blame anyone. It could be a difficult thing to talk about but we just want to make sure the frame of it doesn't blame and doesn't take anyone's side. So now we'll take a look at these two vents and we'll think about -- the same vents we looked at before because we're now breaking these same comments into the feelings, the values, the topics. And then we'll look at what the topic is back with the parent.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So looking at the topics, we're not going to take the speaker's side. So again, if you're listening to a conflict and you're wondering, well, what are the things that they have a conflict about? What would be the topic? You don't really have to have a whole debate inside of your head about it. You can just use that Topics Grinder and run the word through the grinder. So if you take the word fairness, for example, although this would pass at the point where the person is expressing something about something not being fair, it's okay, great. That's it right there. It's kind of getting what, you know, wishy-washy around it. It's not really specifically or concretely a thing but it is -- definitely it is blaming someone for not being fair and it's going to take the speaker's side because fairness is what they want. So although you hear someone talking about something, you're still paying attention to is it -- is that a word that's going to take their side and so is that most helpful way to name this thing in a way that everybody says yes, that's the thing I'm talking about. Also we want to avoid what you think the problem is based on the speaker's blame language. So, a big piece of what we're doing is we're working on understanding, we know that -- oh, we know that when people are in conflict, they're mostly in a fight or flight kind of mindset. And so when we are thinking that way, it is mostly blame-based. And a blame-based mindset is not a great place for problem solving. And so the mediators are only listening to the blame and framing things as blank. So you would say, oh, the staff is the thing that they need to make a plan about. Well, the principal is going to feel very blamed by that because it's saying that the staff is the problem and so that's taking the parent's side. So we want to name the things that people are talking

about, where their feelings about these things may be very different, what they want around these things may be very different but they're talking about the same thing. So in this case, discipline is just what we call it when there are consequences set up, there are rules that are broken, and something needs to happen as a consequence. We call that discipline in our society. And guess what, when people eat things, we call it food and so, the simpler we can be, the better. I often hear mediators hear conversations about food and they start asking their brain, what do you call that? What is that? Is that diet? Is that nutrition? And so diet has a way different connotation about, you know, the kinds of food you should or shouldn't be eating. And nutrition, of course, is about healthy food and so that will probably take someone's side and definitely in this case, it will. So also, you want to be keeping things simply what we -- what we would call it and so one of the things that they're talking about here is going to be the food. And so looking at the same vent from the principal, we're not going to take the principal's side saying, "Well, respect is what this is all about." And we're going to avoid what the principal thinks the problem is because it's going to the press. So again, when you run going to the press through the grinder, that also is going to set up a yes, someone should or no, someone shouldn't. And so going to the press was one person's idea and solution to what they thought the problem was and going to the press was what the principal thought should not had been happening at all. And so that's not going to be a very helpful way to work on understanding what both people are talking about. So again, it's sort of about the discipline and the food as well.

MARSHALL PETER: So Erricka and Lorig, we -- someone has expressed an interest in asking a question or making a comment. Would you prefer that we held those to the end or do you want to try to field a question or comment now?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: We can take a question now.

MARSHALL PETER: Okay. So Karen W. if, if you press star six, it will unmute your phone. Karen W., are you there? I think we're going to just go ahead. Karen W., if you're there and if you have a question or a comment, you could also type it into the box but I think we're going to keep it moving. And then there will also be sometimes for questions at the end.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So -- Karen -- oh, okay. So the one thing that I just wanted to sort of reiterate that Erricka sort of said just a second ago is often the simplest language is the most effective. And I think food is a really good example of that but really looking -- if we go back for a second and look at these topics, the parking, housekeeping, trash, clothing, schedule, dog, I think that we have a tendency to try to get fancy when we're mediators. And one of the things that I found my work on topic language improved tremendously when I was working with teenagers. And so I kind of went into doing parent-teen mediations with much more formal language and I was like, I need to simplify my language, so it's more accessible and especially the topic language. And, you know, they weren't buying the quasi value convoluted stuff. You know, so, really making it as simple as possible and then as I started doing that work with teenagers to make it as accessible as possible, I realized that for all of us making it as simple as possible is most likely to be stripping the blame from it. It's most likely to not be taking someone's side. It's most likely not to be setting somebody up for a should do something. And so really looking at the simplest language often is the language that's going to be the most effective when we frame our topic. So we've got our topics and what I want to highlight is in this particular scenario that we set up, the -- both the parent and the teacher and the principal are engaged in this conflict. And the topics end up being the same. They do happen to be the same in this scenario that we set up. So both of them, they are discipline and food. It is entirely possible though that you would hear from one person a topic that the other person hasn't raised. The fact that the other person hasn't raised it doesn't mean that you can't reflect it in a way that's still neutral. So even before we knew what the principal was going to say in response, we could have heard what the parent said and we could have heard that the neutral way to reflect these topics were going to be discipline and food. As it turns out the response and often the response does respond to the same topics and so you end up with the -- with the -- with the topic being more or less the same for everybody. But I just want to be careful that no one misunderstands what we're saying and thinks that we're saying, we can only name it as a topic if everyone says -- if everyone raised it. In fact, you'll hear different people raising different topics at different times. One person can be very invested in dealing with an issue and the other person totally not invested, still as we reflect the topic, we're just going to do it in a

way that doesn't blame anybody even if it's not that person's vested interest to resolve it. So now we're going to move on. So again, what we're doing is we're listening to the comments. We're hearing in our head. We're doing the simultaneous translation. We're getting the feeling. We got the topic and then we're going to go to what's important. So what's important, we used to -- we used to call it feelings topics and values and so you'll see we got these flashes in here but what's important piece of it, you could also think of it as value, sometimes I think of it as goals. It's the thing that I want out of this situation. Generally framed as one or two key -- usually considered positive words but it's getting at -- needs, goals, values that the participant is expressing. And the trick is to listen for it in terms of -- when we're hearing usually people blaming other people or insulting other people behind that insult or that blame is something that I want. Right. So if I'm saying, you're a slob and you crap's all over the place then probably what I want is cleanliness. If I'm saying, you're lying to me all the time. I never know if I can believe what's coming out of your mouth, what I want is honesty. If I'm saying, you're changing your mind all the time, I never know what to expect then what I want is consistency. So generally in articulating what's wrong with somebody else and how they're acting, there's a -- there's a -- it's possible to identify what it is that I'm looking for out of this relationship or out of this scenario. Again, then there's warning about listening for values that focus on what I want and not what I don't like about the other person, right? So if I'm saying, you're lying to me all the time. I never know if I can -- if I can understand -- if I can believe what's coming out of your mouth and -- to say -- so it sounds like, Lorig, people not lying is important to you. Well, I mean yeah, that's true but that hasn't brought us a step closer to me articulating what values or what goals I have for this -- for this -- for this conflict. The other thing, this gets at this idea of empowerment and the clarity that comes out of mediation. If I frame -- if I'm in a conflict and I frame my perspective on the conflict as what's wrong with other people then I stay a victim to other people. So if I want you -- if what I want is for you to stop changing your mind all the time and the mediator reflects back to me, "Lorig, it sounds like you want people to stop changing their mind all the time." I'd be like, "Yeah, I do." And that's other people who need to stop changing their mind all the time. My ability to get my needs met are wholly dependent on other people, whereas if the mediator reflects back, "It sounds like you're looking for

consistency." I say, "Yes, I'm looking for consistency." Now, there's many ways that I could find consistency. So we could talk about how I can find consistency from these other people in my life, and we can also talk about what I can do to build consistency into my life. And so when we articulate the value or the goal or the need in this, you know, one or two word, value-based language, it opens up the possibilities in a new way. That's not to say that there's not going to be the possibility for other people to change how it is they're acting in relation to me but my articulation or my values and my needs are no longer dependent on or victim to other people in the process. And so what we're doing is we're listening to what is it that people say and we're listening -- however they choose to express it and we're listening for what it is that is important to them. So let's come back now to our parent and our principal and we'll take a look at what it is that they're saying their values are. What's important to them.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So since we want to be avoiding what the person thinks is wrong with the other person. We're not going to be listening for they should not target children. So yes, that's something that the person talks about and they don't want their child to be targeted and if that's all we're listening for then we reinforce this place of blame and victim -- victimize where they are instead of helping them think about what is it that I want, what would it look like, what are the things that will need to happen for us to move toward those things and so listening to what's actually important to the speaker in a way that empowers them to take ownership of what they want. It is about equal treatment. It is about health, it is about responsiveness. And so again, we're not just pulling these things out of the sky. What we're doing is we're listening to what the person is actually saying and we're removing a judgment and also we're removing the automatic ideas that we have about what would provably fix it based on what they want and we're just working on understanding what is it they're saying they want. And so that would be the equal treatment health and responsiveness for the parent. And then looking at the principal, the principal's blame of others is that, "Well, you need to control your child." So -- and here's the thing, it's also harder to hear what's important to someone. We think that it's hard when someone is saying something that we totally disagree with but oftentimes, it's really difficult to hear what's important when we agree with the person's point of view. And so if you are bringing that yes, the child should not be rallying

these other children to be disrespectful and so the parent instead of fussing with the staff, the parent needs to be focusing on parenting and being a good parent and controlling your child. When you're listening in that way, then all of your reflections are going to be siding with one person and also making the other person feel unheard. And when people feel unheard, what they do is lash out. So they're either going to shut down because you're not listening anyway and this is a losing battle or they're going to escalate because clearly you don't understand what I'm saying. You see it all from the other person's perspective. So we want to work on understanding beyond what we even agree with. And so not based in, "All right, you need to control your child," but what the principal is expressing is fairness is important to me and also there's working together. This is an awesome piece because we only just focus on the conflict rather than what this person doesn't like. Well, this principle is expressing that we welcome your volunteer work at the school. We appreciate your feedback. And so this person is expressing that it's important to me that working together is something that I appreciate. And also it's also -- I think mediators panic a lot of times when we hear insults and loaded language. So when the principal is saying, "You really did not have to try to make the school look bad like that. No need." You know, like that is a really tense moment. The principal probably silenced the room in that moment. And so often the mediators panic like, "Oh, no, what do we do now?" And what you do now is just work on understanding. If someone says, "You didn't need to make me look bad," what are they saying they want, what it is important to them? And that's where we get this reputation piece from. So this way of listening helps the mediator not take responsibility for things that they think are loaded language or people be -- having some kind of covert warfare at the table. Instead, we don't have to be responsible for trying to figure out what they're actually saying. You just listen to what they say and work on understanding it in this way. Okay.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: So to pull this together, what we're going to do is -- you know, we put a slide together that showed a little bit about our notes on part two. So I want to pull together on the parent, what you -- what we would have in my -- our notes -- what I would have in my notes if I had listened to the parent. We talked about simultaneous translations. The way that I actually take notes is with the feelings, values and topics. So now, if I had just listened to this



parent, the things on my notepad would be -- under my feelings section, I would have protective, proud, and punished. Under my topic section, I would have food and discipline. And under my what's important section, I would have equal treatment, health, and responsiveness. Now I have this opportunity to do a reflection to the parent. And one of the things that I want to talk about is that it's really important that we do this in a holistic way. Because if we respond to this parent, sort of coming back to this piece about feelings, if this parent just gets through this commentary and we respond by saying, "Hmm, sounds like you feel proud." That by itself is going to be like, "Have you been listening to anything I've been saying?" So while proud is an important piece in there, it's not all of it, right? And so we want to make sure that our response really captures all of the pieces that the parent says and it's grounded in this inclusive listening. So our reflection to this parent now is going to be along the lines of, "So it sounds like you feel really proud of the work you've done around food. That health is really important and you felt good about what you've done to promote healthy food in the -- in the school. And it sounds like, now you're feeling punish. You feel very protective of your son. And in terms of discipline, you're looking for equal treatment. And you're looking for responsiveness as you've raised these issues with the school. Is that right?" And so what we're getting at in that reflection is it's the whole picture of what she said, but it's grounded in each of the feelings, values, and topics that she talked about and it's putting them together. So as our reflection starts to sound like that, it starts to pull people closer and closer to being clear themselves and to understanding each other. Now, one of the things we're not going to go too far into today is that sometimes people may only say one or two words, right? So the parent may only have said -- or so in response to that or so as the conversation goes on, you know, the parent might say, you know, "No one ever listens to me." Okay. So in that, we don't have a lot to go on but we get unheard, right? We hear that she feels unheard. And so the very least we can reflect back, sound like you feel unheard. So it may be that in a particular statement, we only hear a feeling or we only hear a value or we only hear a topic. And then those would be the things that we're going to reflect in those moments. And so this -- so what we've done here is we're giving you sort of a paragraph of the stuff so you could see what it would like when we're pulling out all three of these, but that doesn't mean you have to have all three of these

areas before you can do a reflection. If all you get is one sentence and all you hear is a feeling, then you can reflect the feeling. If all you hear is a value, then you can reflect the value. If you all hear is the topic, then you can reflect the topic. And as you start building that overall system of reflecting back on those values and topics through the process without judging the way the person chooses to express themselves, people start moving towards understanding. The other thing -- let's talk about this last one and then I'll just do a quick [in audible] so do you want to talk about it? Okay.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: One more thing I wanted to say just about the way -- although we aren't teaching doing reflections right now, I want to talk a little bit about the difference in doing a reflection that is just based on the things that we're seeing and we're trying to avoid. So Lorig's reflection, the way you heard it, it had context. It wasn't just a grocery list. It sounds like you're feeling proud, protective, you're looking for responsiveness, and health, and discipline, and food are things you want to talk about, right? So we're not going to give it back as a robot. There was context in there, but also the reflection. You can imagine that the energy of what's going to happen at the mediation table is the speaker is going to feel heard and goes, "Yes, that is exactly what I'm saying." And start thinking about, well what responsiveness look like. "Yup, I really was proud." But also the person hearing that reflection on the other side is going, "Oh, is that what she meant," you know, while she was talking because they've been hearing it in a lot of others ways while you're reflecting what's going on underneath of it. Whereas the energy at the table is going to be very different if the mediator's reflection is sounding like, "So it sounds like your son does not need those consequences. You're irritated when you get those phone calls about consequences and you think they need to stop harassing your child, right?" Those consequences, when both people hear them, they're going to stay just in their corners of the fighting ring and they're going to be defending -- the speaker is going to defending that position. And the person hearing that reflection on the other side is going to be trying to go, "But, but, but," to also defend what they meant in response to that position. So we want to be doing reflections that are reinserting understanding into the conflict that they normally have, but normally there's nobody there who's just working on understanding.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: So the one other thing that we want to highlight about this idea of listening beyond blame. Erricka talked a little bit about sometimes when you're listening to someone and you agree with them, it's hard to frame the feelings, values, topics. Other times when you're listening to someone and you're sort of horrified by what they're saying, it's hard to frame it and so for this example we have here, "Because she slashed my tires, she needed to get what was coming to her. Since I went through to having miss work to get my car fixed, she should have to see what it feels like. So that's right. I put a brick through her windshield." So like there's a part of us that wants to go, "Oh, my God, she just admitted, you know, to what she did." And so we want to almost like hear -- you know, I hear mediators reflect to this kind of a comment like, "So it sounds like you're taking responsibility and you regret what you did." Okay. That's not what she's saying. What she's saying is that she's looking for understanding. She's looking for fairness. She's looking for a sense of justice. Now, for her, that may be doing this retaliatory action. As a mediator, we're trying to pull out our judgment about the way this person goes about getting understanding, justice, and fairness, and listen to what it is they're articulating. So when we hear, she should see what it feels like, we're hearing the person saying understanding -- that's what she's looking for, justice. We're not getting into the content of whether that should have been done or not. We're listening to what they're saying about the reason that they did it. And that's very different to listening to someone say, "I feel so bad. I was so angry. I was so out of control. I'm so sorry. And like I picked up that brick and like before I knew it, I was doing that to your window." That is someone who is saying they feel regretful about it. And so regretful would be the pieces that we -- that we would reflect to that person. But this person is talking about that they felt like it was the right thing to do. So as mediator, our job is to work on understanding that place in this moment because that's what they're saying, and to do that without judging, and to be able to hear understanding, justice, and fairness in there. A little bit that I wanted to sort of just do a little bit of a -- of a tease about where this can eventually go. And then we'll -- then we'll take questions and then we'll talk about the practice in part two. So the first thing that we were trying to do with today's webinar is just to get folks to start thinking about how can we organize our thoughts to simultaneously translate -- simultaneous translation to hearing this information and translating

it into feelings, values, and topics. The example I gave you just a minute ago showed what it sound like as a mediator reflecting back to somebody. So it's a very key piece of how we use this as mediators, as facilitators, as people stepping into fight from a street trying to deescalate, to use strategic listening to deescalate -- I mean to work on understanding into a reflection. We were actually just laughing here earlier today in the office because yesterday, we were at a fundraiser -- a fundraising event that happened in a bar and someone had way too much to drink and was screaming and yelling and I was in there reflecting back to him his feelings and he was starting to quiet down. And one of our staff people started shouting across the room, "Lorig, are you mediating him?" Like, "Ssh." But it was. I mean even this guy in this -- in this -- at this, you know, drunk at this fundraiser. I was reflecting feelings and he was starting to sort of feel heard and sort of come down from where he was. So reflecting is a big -- reflecting is a big use of this strategic listening. But the other things that we can do with it is we can identify the agenda for what people are going to work on. So when we build agendas for IEP meetings, we work with schools and families. And the agenda topics are often framed in this neutral way so that nobody feels like it's a set up of someone's advocating force sneaking something into the agenda before the conversations even happen. It can build agendas for mediation, you know, like list of topics that we're going to be working on in mediation or agendas for like public policy facilitations that we might be doing. And that's where the topics come in. And then the last piece, when we get to solution, it supports us to do what we call like the -- what we call win-win meeting and the collaborative problem solving. And it allows us to take the value that both folks have articulated and frame the question about the solution in terms of everybody's values. So now that we framed the values in a way that doesn't blame or assume an outcome, we have the ability to say -- so in terms of discipline, what ideas do you have that would provide equal treatment, and fairness, and consistency. So for parent -- so parents talk about equal treatment and the principals talk about consistency and how they're going to administer discipline. And like I said, in terms of discipline you talk about equal treatment is important and you talk about consistency being important. What ideas do you have for discipline that would give you equal treatment and consistency? And so we bring the values back in that everyone has articulated and we ask them how they could meet both of those. And then the last thing --

again, this is a tease. I'm not really teaching you how to do any of this, but just so you can sort of see where these things can go. The last thing is when we reality check in the context of inclusive mediation. The way we reality check is you get feelings that participants themselves have articulated. So we come back to the feelings. And now participants have developed solutions they think will work. We'll go back to their feelings and will say, "Okay. Earlier you talked about feeling disrespected. If you were to implement these solutions, would you still feel disrespected? So earlier you talked about being violated. If you were to implement these solutions, would you still feel violated?" And so it allows us to let them do their reality check based on their intensity of their emotions rather than our ideas about what reality is or isn't. So just kind of highlighting those as places that one can go with this skill and these strategies, but we're starting right now with just kind of staying with context. And then, you know, hopefully you'll have a chance to practice over the holidays. And then when we come back together in January, we'll sort of do a practice together and we'll give you feedback and talk in more detail about where it can go. Do you want to say [inaudible]. All right. So we're looking for questions.

MARSHALL PETER: So if you have questions for Lorig and Erricka, please either enter them into the comment box or if you press star six, it will unmute your phone and you can ask a question live. So Susan Woods is typing. Are there other questions?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Is that because everyone is clear or because everyone is confused? Clear. Thank you, Amanda.

MARSHALL PETER: Well, I wonder a little bit Lorig, while other people are preparing questions about the whole process of kind of notes and paper in front of you, do you typically arrive -- Lorig and Erricka, do you typically arrive at mediations with any amount of paperwork or do you come in with sort of a clear table in front of you? And then are you kind of covert about this whole note taking thing or how does that as a practical matter look?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Yes, so -- oh, the question was about the covertness of the note taking. So I have notepads. I don't come with a lot of paper -- I mean it obviously depends on the context. If I'm facilitating a public policy dialogue, I mean there would be different kinds of

prep work. And, you know, I'm using the same basic strategy, but I'm doing a whole bunch of stuff in advance and materials might be going out. But if it's just really a standard mediation, I mean, I'm sitting at the table starting with a blank piece of paper in front of me and I take my notes with a grid that just -- a place for feelings, a place for values, and a place for topics. And actually it's right in front of me and I have -- if I see people interested in it or looking at it, I will just pass it over to them and I'll I tell them exactly what I'm doing and I'll say, you know, "I'm working on understanding and specifically what I'm doing is I'm trying to see if I can get how you're feeling about this and what's important to you and what are the things you want to talk about. So that's what I'm tracking right here." So, it's sort of the flip of covertness. I mean I'm being really -- I don't tell them if they don't ask. I mean, half the time no one cares what I'm writing down, but if people look like they're interested, I'll be very transparent about it and I'll share it rather than trying to like pull it back so nobody can see because there's nothing I'm doing that--I mean joking aside about, you know, the guy last night and saying, "Sshh, don't telling what I'm trying to mediate him." You know, there's not really a secret in what I'm doing. So, I'll be very clear with participants about what strategies I'm using if they seem to be asking or interested in it. I see a bunch of questions here. Should I start to go into them? This first one -- there was one about facilitative. Yes. So the process we use, we consider -- we actually call it inclusive mediation. For a while, we considered it to be a type of facilitative mediation. As we refined it further and further, we realized it was sort of different and so we started setting up our qualifications for our trainers and we actually have a performance-based certification for mediators. We started doing that and really honing in what it is that we think we want to be evaluating people on and what are the core skills we want people to be able to do. We realized it didn't fit well into any of the areas. And so, we call it inclusive mediation. But there are people who do facilitative mediation and transformative mediation who find some of these same skills or strategy that we are teaching today to be useful. And so we're sort of sharing it in this way today that even if you're not doing everything as an inclusive mediator, you know, there are some strategies that might, might be helpful. Examples, we will give more if there's time today and if not, well, that's part of what we're going to do in part two and go through examples more. This next one, can you give us an example of what a solution to this

scenario might be. So I think, you know, the reason I'm actually not going to give an example of what the solution might be because I don't have any idea. So like I would -- what I would come back to is I would say so the way that it would look is if I was -- if I was mediating with the principal and the parent, I would be asking that question. I would be saying to them, "Okay. So, in terms of discipline, what are all the possibilities -- you know, going forward, what are all the possibilities that could give you the consistency of how you're saying you want with school's discipline and policy implemented and will give you the equal treatment you're looking for?" And then they would do a brainstorm together. And I would continue to come back to the values and the feelings they had articulated and ask them, you know, "Earlier you said felt punished, what ideas would make you not feel punished?" And then brainstorm from there, so coming back to their values and feelings then asking them to consider all the possibilities. Same with food, right? "So in terms of food, it sounds like you're saying you're looking to protect the school's reputation and it sounds like you're saying you're committed to healthy food, what ideas do you have that could protect the school's reputation and meet your goals for healthy food?" And then, you know, work with both of them for brainstorming. Quite frankly, this is an issue that we're in the middle of in our public schools here. So I haven't figured out what the food solution is yet. But that idea of bringing people together and articulating the values and asking them to think about how they could come up with solutions that meet those values is how people come up with those creative solutions that they haven't thought of before.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So, I see this question. I got bumped out. So it looks like I'm not a presenter anymore. But I see this question about if there's profanity and people are really hot, how do we get them to the point where they're actually ready to problem solve? And so one thing is in the -- in the inclusive mediator's mindset, we don't have a goal of getting them to agreement. So, it's not an agreement focused process. Getting an agreement is one piece of the process and that's one reason people might use the process and so I'll go just to look for an understanding. So, what we're very aware of is that generally when people are having conflict nobody involved in the conflict is only working on understanding. And so a part of the gift that we're giving them is they're able to have their conflict authentically even if that involves being really hot and using profanity, a big thing in the way that -- in our training model is, you know,

we had permission to push people's buttons as we're training mediators in our examples, in our role plays, we're using some offensive language, we're showing different levels of intensity and it's not for shock value but we know that most people when we're listening and someone starts saying things that are offensive where people get really escalated that's the time that often mediators feel uncomfortable, they want to take a break, they want to instill some guidelines and some rules, and we purposely don't start our mediations with guidelines because we know that those are based in someone's cultural belief that speaking one at a time is the best way to talk. And both Lorig and -- Lorig's house and my house, you know, like about 55% of the people are all talking at the same time and so in our conflict, that kind of thing wouldn't even work towards problem solving. So we don't set any guidelines or ground rules. What we do is when people get hot, we insert understanding. When there's profanity, we ask them open-ended questions to help people talk about what they mean by whatever those words are. We work on understanding what it is they're saying. And you'd just be amazed that when people feel heard and understood, they make authentic shift. Well, the shift is very different if I was yelling and screaming and I really feel heard and I hear the other person differently now because their feeling understood and I start shifting to thinking about what I want to do in the future. That looks very different than if a mediator is constantly saying things like, "Well, I'm not sure if that's helpful language. Let's focus on what we could do [inaudible] like that's not pushing them towards resolutions. Those resolutions are going to result in different [inaudible] in real time the way that [inaudible] if it happened and [inaudible] were I was able to really [inaudible] the way that I want to [inaudible]. And so, we're not likely trying to push them towards problem solving. We're working on understanding. I'm hearing a lot of static and feedbacks. I don't know if that is me. And now it's gone. And now it's back when I talk. Maybe it's just me.

MARSHALL PETER: Well, I wonder whether -- we had someone raise their hand. I believe that something happened that someone either unmuted their phone or turned up their computer speakers or someone did something at the moment that that introduced itself so if you unmuted your phone to speak, would you please re-mute your phone and we'll just use the chat box for questions? So, I saw a question from James Lakehomer, which is how you adjust this if one or more participants are cognitively impaired? And I'm not sure whether we should



continue. We're having such substantial sound problems. How do you -- how do you feel Lorig and Erricka? I'm really sorry. This is a new problem for us. I think what I'm going to do is I'm going to go ahead -- so, it's gone. So, do you -- shall we try this again? I really apologize for all the audio problems we're having. Lorig and Erricka, are you still there? Oh, well, I think what I'm going to do then I believe we've lost Lorig and Erricka. So, I'm going to go ahead and move us to the end here and...

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Hello, can you hear me?

MARSHALL PETER: Oh, yes. Now, we can hear you.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Sorry. I think I got muted when everyone got muted. So, sorry.

MARSHALL PETER: Okay.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So, you want me to take a few more questions I can see here?

MARSHALL PETER: Sure. That would be great. I'm going to wrap it up. Maybe take another three minutes or so, Lorig, that would be great and then I'll wrap it up and we will make sure that we've done everything we can to not have these problems on Part Two. I really appreciate your and Erricka's patience and the patience of everybody else who's on the line.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So, and what I'll say as I'm scanning these questions, I'm going to answer two of them but we'll make sure that in Part Two, we can start by addressing some of these notes and maybe we'll give an example from a public policy mediation and that one as well. So, the two that I want to address -- so cognitively impaired. I think that -- I think that it is a human experience to want to be heard and understood and so sometimes we need to be especially aware of the accessibility of our language and I think I was talking a little bit about that when we were -- when we were talking about, when I was talking about working with teams and that that experience kind of made me more, you know, aware about accessibility of my language and the simplicity of my topics kind of more generally. But my experience is even with people with different cognitive levels or even with people who -- I mean, I would mention someone who had been drinking or people who, you know, we'll work with people who have dementia or who have sort of memories or an understanding of what's happening around them

that's kind of coming and going or they have like their good moments and their bad moments. Those are the kinds of challenges I think for the mediation process and to understanding the process in what we're doing in the context of a process and we have actually a whole separate training on how to deal with that. But the fundamentals of listening deeply to what somebody is saying and reflecting back their feelings or values and their topics I think doesn't change. So, even when we're adding other things to support people to understand the process we're using, we don't change this piece about working to understand what they're saying. So, I would say that this piece of the strategy sort of stays the same. The second thing that I wanted to answer is this thing about a caucus. I understand that a lot of people use that as a strategy when things get heated. Our basic -- did you already answer that? Our basic -- our basic philosophy is that for the shift to be authentic that happened in the mediation, the shift has to have happened when people were engaged with each other. So, if there's going to be folks who starts by screaming and yelling at each other, if their outcome is going to be one that's a different place from screaming, yelling, crying, and, you know, stomping, it's going to have had to have happened in a real way with everyone together, not in a sort of contrived way where people were separated and a mediator was running back and forth between them. And so, while it may be uncomfortable for us as mediators, the most effective thing we can do is really listen deeply even while two people are talking at once, people are screaming, people are cursing. And those are where some of the most fundamental and deep shifts happen is when people can act in ways that everyone else in the world will judge and as mediators, we don't judge it by separating them or judge it by telling them to stop, we respond by working to understand. That's really where some pretty amazing changes happen for folks. And we can give some examples of that when we prepare the Part Two. We've got part of Part Two prepared but this is helping sort of us think about other things we might want to put in there some examples of -- I don't know, Marshall, are we allowed to curse on these webinars, we could give some example of some pretty intense stuff and how we responded into it?

MARSHALL PETER: You know, maybe what you could do is substitute pickles or something.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Pickles. [laughter] It's not quite the same. It's just...

MARSHALL PETER: I know. And I appreciate your concern about that. We probably would keep the -- keep those examples out but I'm very, very confident that you have a rich portfolio of examples. I also have to say I really appreciated the remarks that you made about caucusing. It's a lively continuing discussion that we have here and that we've had when we were out on the road. The initial mediation training that I had came from the Community Boards of San Francisco and they similarly believed that -- were not fans of the caucus and believe that you really stayed together and worked it out together. So, it's -- that's a lively discussion and one that it would be, be really fun to hear you and perhaps people who are strong champions of caucusing, talking together about. So, this was an absolutely tremendous webinar. I, again, want to really apologize to Lorig and Erricka and to all of you on the line for the -- for the audio difficulties that we had. We'll spend some time between now and the next webinar to be sure that we are -- have done everything we possibly can to preempt future difficulties. I want to share a few pieces with you. We have two upcoming CADRE webinars. Lorig and Erricka will join us again on January 29<sup>th</sup> at 11:30 for Part Two. In Part Two, they'll -- I believe that the plan is that we'll have another case study and that you all will have an opportunity to work it from wherever you are and then interact with Lorig and Erricka about your work. Do I have that pretty much right, Lorig and Erricka?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: That's correct.

MARSHALL PETER: Good. Yeah, we just when we looked at the original content for this, it was so rich that this seemed like a really great approach. We also are very pleased to say that on February 6th, also at 11:30 Pacific, CADRE's own, Richard Ziller and Amy Whitehorn will provide an update on Dispute Resolution National Trends. As you maybe aware, Dick and Amy keep CADRE's longitudinal database of national dispute resolution utilization data. It's really interesting stuff and so we hope that you will join us also to get a sense about what's been happening over the last seven years in terms of national dispute resolution use. So, with that, I want to really thank Erricka and Lorig and thank all of you who joined us today. Please note that instead of doing an evaluation at the end of this webinar, we will be sending you out a survey to get your feedback about today's webinar. We would really appreciate it if you would take a couple of moments to complete that survey. It actually will be a SurveyMonkey so you'll

receive a link but that data is extremely valuable to us and we'd love to hear from you. So, thank you all very much. We appreciate your attention and again, Lorig and Erricka, thank you. That was absolutely terrific.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: My pleasure.

MARSHALL PETER: Take care.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Thank you for having us.

MARSHALL PETER: Okay. Bye-bye.

ANNOUCER: The leader has disconnected. The conference will be terminated in two minutes.