

A CADRE Webinar
Inclusive Listening: Building Understanding, Supporting Collaboration (Part 2)
Lorig Charkoudian & Erricka Bridgeford
January 29, 2014
Transcript

MARSHALL PETER: And I think we should go ahead and go. So hi, this is Marshall Peter, the Director of CADRE, The National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education. And I want to welcome you to part two of Inclusive Listening: Building Understanding, Supporting Collaboration. Another in a series of CADRE webinars. Our presenters today are Lorig Charkoudian and Erricka Bridgeford who come to us from Community Mediation Maryland. Lorig Charkoudian, 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 serving 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. Erricka Bridgeford 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 to state agencies and organizations. She has provided advanced skills training to mediators at the Maryland Human Relations Commission, for Federal EEOC mediators, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, and at many national conferences. Prior to coming to Community Mediation Maryland, 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 where she's trained, mentored, evaluated and supervised both new and experienced mediators. And so we are delighted to have Erricka and Lorig with us today. Please take it away.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Great. Thanks. Happy to be here. So, very exciting to be doing part two. I just will say a few words about what it means to be doing part two. First, I am hoping

that everybody who is on the line had a chance to practice these skills over the holidays. I know I did. You can do it with your family; you can do it with anybody. So what we've done is we've - - we're building on part one. I'm hoping everybody had a chance to see part one either live or had a chance to look at it before they came on because we're going to just do a very brief review before we go into practice. One of the things that we tried to do was take some of the questions that folks had in part one or some of the examples people seemed to be asking for when we did part one and incorporate them into part two. So what we're going to do in just a second is start by reviewing -- very quickly reviewing Inclusive Listening and then we're going to do some practice where folks will have a chance to actually take a look at the example and figure out what feelings, values, and topics they would pull out of it. And we'll discuss the results of that and then we'll close by talking about some of the different ways that Inclusive Listening can be incorporated into Collaborative, Problem Solving and Facilitation and Mediation and meetings and so on. So that's our process for today. And I am going to hand it to Erricka to start our Inclusive Listening.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Good afternoon, everyone. So we're going to just take a review of in general what Inclusive Listening is. So we like to say that this is the way we do non-judgmental. We talk about being non-judgmental and listening in a non-judgmental way and Inclusive Listening is the way that we do that. And so for the overview -- right, that's here. Okay. So Inclusive Listening in a nutshell. So it's the process of taking a positional statement. So when someone is venting about something, when there's a challenging conversation, the person's position is from where they sit in the conflict. And generally that position is still the blame language and victimhood, and that sort of thing. And so in order to listen to them in a way where you can work on understanding without judgment, Inclusive Listening is one way to do that where you're focusing on what feelings you hear the person expressing, what topics, what things they say and they have conflict about, and then also what's important to them.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Yeah. So taking a look at -- oops, we both went -- so taking a look at feelings expressed. This is where we should be capturing the intensity of what's going on. If people are repeating themselves that means they don't feel heard and one way for people to feel heard is to express feelings. So one of the clues we give if it seems like someone is

repeating themselves. You want to take a look at what feelings are they expressing that aren't being heard. There were some conversation in the end of the last webinar that we did about well what if people are screaming and yelling or what if people are cursing or behaving inappropriately. And it's -- our general sense is that for shifts and transformation to occur people need to act in an authentic way like a real way and feel heard and not judged in that real place as opposed to act and behave "properly" because we've told them to. And so when we use these strategies and mediations in meetings and facilitations, when people are screaming and yelling and cursing, we work on understanding and often the first thing we're going to work on understanding are feelings. So when there is that level of intensity we're going to be especially aware of and paying attention to feeling.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: And then we're also listening for topics. So this is where you often hear people say, "You have to separate the personality from the issues." Well, because we live in America and when we say the word issues people freak out and think you need medication. We say topics because these are specifically the things people are saying that they have conflicts about. So what's important is that you want to name these topics in a way that avoid your judgment of what the problem is, that removes people's blame language and it just focuses on what they want to make plans about concretely. And so one way to make sure you have a good topic that's not going to make things worse and isn't going to take a side is to run it through what we call the topics grinder. So you want to know is this thing something that someone actually said they have conflicts about, not your suggestion about what they should be making a plan about or something they talked about make -- having conflict around. The way you name the thing, it should be specific or concrete. The word shouldn't blame anyone, and so it shouldn't be something that's loaded with what someone thinks is wrong with the other person and it shouldn't take anyone's side. It also shouldn't set up a dynamic, a reaction. Someone should be doing this thing or no, someone shouldn't be doing this thing. So things that are someone's suggestion like cleaning the house would not be something as the topic. So you can see there at the bottom some examples of the things that will be concrete things that would pass the grinder would be things like parking, communication, schedule, clothing, dog, food, activities, guests, mornings, homework, so. And then values.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So taking a look at values or what's important. This is the stuff that we have as goals. So in thinking about what -- when we listen to people, blame or insult other people there's usually somewhere in there something that's important to them that's not getting met so in the midst of the blame and the insults we're listening for what is this person saying they want out of this situation. And so one of the things that we like to highlight is we want to be careful with the word values. It's because sometimes it sounds like -- it's a loaded word. So value is one way to think about it, what's important is another way to think about it. And here we just have this quick example that you want to be careful that when you're listening you're not thinking about what's important to you, but you're really listening to what is this person saying is important. And so in this quick example this person is saying, "Because she slashed my tires, she needed to get what was coming to her. Since I went through having to miss work and 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 a lot of us would listen to that and think, "Oh, my gosh, this person has no values." And we'd listen to it and we think, "Well, you know, I don't know what values she's talking about or she wants -- she just want revenge or payback." And what she's saying is she needs to understand what I went through and here's my sense of justice and fairness. So even if it's not our sense of justice or fairness if we're listening deeply to what this person is articulating then we would identify in this statement, understanding justice and fairness as the values. So that's a quick review. And again if you're joining us for the first time you can at some point go back online and see -- we spend the entire time sort of doing what we -- last time doing what we just did in 10 minutes. So you could go back and take a look at that if you feel like this was too fast for you. We're going to move on to really looking at practicing it and so here we go with the first question. One of the questions that somebody asked was about note taking. Someone asked about that at the last -- the last webinar that we did. So what we did is we set up this first slide in a way that reflects the way that I would take notes. So for example the -- this is what the IEP Chair is saying in this meeting and my notes would look like -- I wouldn't actually have written down what the -- what the person said but I would have this cross on my notepad and while this person was talking I would be writing down the

feelings that I heard, the values that I heard and the topics that I heard. So let's take a look at this.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: So if IEP Chair is saying, "You know, at this point we have brought the best technology, most current methods, and some of the best trained teachers to Daniel's program. We are totally committed to Daniel's progress, and we know he can make great progress. But we can't teach children who are not in school. We have had this conversation over and over again. We have reviewed the data with you. Looking at it now, Daniel has six absences and was tardy 12 times in the last quarter, sometimes missing half the day. That's too much. You complain about Daniel not making progress and you have inappropriately criticized my staff members. But this is a partnership. You need to get Daniel to school or we can't teach him." And so if you're going to -- so, that's the person's position and what you're listening for is what the feelings were that were expressed. So again avoiding the opinion of what the person is feeling. And so here you're looking especially at what we call a clean translation from things that the person said to feelings that were actually expressed. There was not too much explanation in your brain about how you got that feeling. So we have words like that he is expressing or she is expressing that they're feeling dedicated, proud, confident, exasperated, disrespected, protective, set up and also hopeful. So notice that there's a mix of what you might call the negative drama feelings with also the positive feelings like dedicated, proud and hopeful. So we're listening deeply to all of it not just the pieces that we think are conflicts. And then also we had what's important and so this person is expressing that partnership is important to them, that follow-through and accountability, respect I think that they're looking for. Progress and availability and opportunity are also things that are important to them. And then so while there's a lot going on with the intangible kinds of things with the feelings that they expressed and then what's important to them, concretely the things that they're saying they're having conflict about in a way that's not going to blame anyone are attendance and then about the way communication has been happening.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: So before we move on to the parent which is we're going to take a look at next, I just want to highlight that when I'm -- just coming back to this note taking piece that people had questions about. If I were listening to this Chair saying these things, I would take all

of these notes. It doesn't necessarily mean I'm going to have an opportunity to use every single feeling word I write down and every single value word I write down, but what I want to sort of lean towards is getting everything that I do hear and then later if I'm going to do a reflection or if I'm going to build a set of goals for the group for them to think about how they could accomplish. I want to have all of these possibilities written down, everything I heard on my notes so that then later I can decide which pieces of it I'm going to bring back in in a reflection that I might do or in a question that I might ask or in a set of goals that we might be setting as a group. The other thing that I just want to highlight is when I do take my notes I mean you'll look at this, this is literally all that I would have so because I'm coming in as a facilitator I don't have any when I'm -- when I'm facilitating IEP meetings for example which is what this would be, I don't have the responsibility to track contents, right? There's someone else taking notes at the table with the content. So I don't need to write down 12 tardy, six absences, half the day, you know, whatever. I don't know -- that content stuff I don't actually need because what I'm doing is I'm working on supporting them to have a dialogue and then to resolve their conflict. So I know there's people who are playing lots of different roles in IEP meetings or other meetings on this call but when I'm coming in as a facilitator I'm just in the role -- or mediator and I'm just in the role of supporting quality dialogue, the notes that I would take was literally just be the feelings, values, and topics that you sort of see on here. So then we move on to the mother and she says, "Do you have any idea about what it takes to get Daniel moving in the morning? He's getting bigger now and I'm a small woman. I have to get him bathed and dressed and into his chair. And don't get me started on feeding breakfast. As he gets older, he can resist more if he's feeling cranky. I'm doing this all by myself and some days it's just too much. Then I come in here and you all sit there all high and mighty and tell me I'm not doing a good enough job, and that it's my fault he's not making progress." So now, we listened for feelings, overwhelmed, exhausted, insulted, judged, misunderstood, alone and blamed. And so some of those feeling words are intense, right? And so the idea is we really want to make sure we're meeting people where they are. That -- so just a word about this particular dialogue comes out of a meeting that I facilitated and what was so interesting about it is that in it, the mother said essentially this, I mean this was -- this was sort of how the conflict started. And

before I had a chance to jump in one of the participants in the meeting said -- really attempting to be very helpful said, "Oh, we know exactly how you feel. We know it's hard." And the effects that that had is the mother got more outraged because she was essentially saying that you don't know how I feel, you don't -- and whether or not the person who said that did or didn't know how she felt and whether that person themselves maybe had a child at home that needed this level of care it's sort of irrelevant because this mother was feeling alone and blamed and judged and misunderstood and until that was honored, she couldn't move on to thinking about problem solving. So when I had a chance to jump in I was able to reflect these feelings that we have here on the page and as the mother started feeling heard she was able to shift to engage in problem solving and the solutions that the group came to were involved bringing the mother and the family a lot more support. So these supports were available in the community, but because of this inability to have this dialogue where people felt heard and understood even though the resources were there, the resources couldn't come in to the conversation because people were feeling judged and misunderstood. So it was a really good example of where people are feeling heard because their feelings are reflected without judgment, gave them the chance to then let go of that intensity and be ready to do the problem solving and then those other resources that were available to sort of come in to this family's situation. So then we go onto values/what's important, recognition, understanding, support and awareness and then the topics as we frame them here were mornings and communication. So then moving on, so just talking a little bit more about we have -- so my notes would initially look like this. I'm tracking what the Chair said and I'm tracking them this way and then I'm tracking what the mother said and I'm tracking it this way. And then when I want to start to put it all together, I can track it this way so some people take all of their notes this way. I usually start with the two earlier versions I showed you and then I move on to this. Well, what this helps us see is now we're organizing the conflict in terms of what are the topics and then what's important and what are the feelings that everybody has. And so now the Chair talked about attendance. So attendance and mornings are clearly related but in this case we're framing them as separate topics at least for now until we find out more about the situation. And then we have the Chair's feelings in terms of attendance and then they both talked about

communication and we have each of their feelings and values in terms of communication. And then they talked about -- and then the mother talked about mornings and so we know what some of her feelings and values are in terms of mornings. And the nice thing about this is that it sets us up for the joint collaborative problem solving that we're going to do later on in the process. And after we do some practice together you'll get a chance to see sort of how we would put all these pieces together in a, you know, to do sort of joint collaborative problem solving. The other thing that this tells us is we can see if there's a topic that's been raised that we haven't heard from somebody about. So before we go on to start problem solving around attendance, we would want to make sure we heard the mother's feelings and values about attendance, right? So this tells us when I have this chart set up I can look and I can say, "Oh, okay, we don't know this person's feelings and values about this topic and so it's a clue to me that I've got to ask an open-ended question, what are your thoughts about attendance to the person who I haven't heard from. " So that's either value to this particular structure of the note taking whether you're keeping those initially this way or whether you move your notes from the process earlier into the structure here. Okay.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: All right, so get your pens and pads ready, or just your brains, put your thinking caps on. So now it's your turn. We're going to look at different events and then you're going to pick out what feelings you hear, what's important, what do you hear, that's important that's being expressed, and then also what the topics are that people are talking about. And this is going to be multiple choice and there's going to be a box that pops up for you to choose which feelings and values and topics you think you hear. And we're going to do it piece by piece. Yeah. Okay. Okay. So in this first one the participant said, "The bottom line is that if we don't bite the bullet and implement appropriate zoning to limit development in the rural parts of this county, then we'll have insane sprawl with all of its negative implications. The septic everywhere are terrible for the watershed; we lose the agricultural character of this county; and providing services to the residents sprawled all over the county is not an efficient use of tax money. Not to mention the environmental impact of the pollution associated with the increased traffic to and from the metro centers and the big box stores that will then start popping up all over the currently rural areas. I want my kids and grandkids to be able to enjoy

the same beautiful county I grew up in, to swim in the rivers and play in the fields." So your choices and you can see that box popped up over in the upper right-hand corner, we have, A. Worried, B. Lost, C. Anxious, D. Committed, E. Nostalgic, and Inefficient. So you're working on - - so and you can take as many as you want. Right. So there's not just one right answer. What you're doing is what feelings are expressed by the participant, a clean translation not what you think they must be feeling or what your opinion of what their feelings or analysis is, what did they actually express is what you're looking for. Okay. Yes. So we're going to broadcast the results now. So pencils down. All right. And so here you can see thumbs up. You did it. You got the feelings if the feelings that were expressed so -- wow, a hundred percent got worried, that was A, and then C is anxious, so we got 66.6% and then D, 61.9% was committed, so that's pretty good. And then we scroll down. I didn't realize there's more in the box. Okay. So we're going to talk about the rest of these and checking out why these other ones aren't feelings that the speaker actually expressed. So when you take a look at lost, the speaker did talk about losing things, but they didn't express that they personally were feeling lost and so we want to be careful that this could be -- you may hear a person say a word that sounds like a feeling to you, but not to confuse that with an actual feeling that's being expressed. And then nostalgic would be you listen to this person talk and you go, "Oh, he's nostalgic about, you know, what about the rivers and that sort of thing." And so but that person didn't actually express that that's what they're feeling. And then inefficient isn't actually an emotion, so that would be the speaker what they think the potential problem is going to be is that something's going to be inefficient. So you don't want to take the speaker's blame and say, "Oh, that's something that they feel." So in our society, we do a lot of somebody feels that or feels like and then we -- it's a repeat of what they think is wrong, so inefficient would be an example of that, he feels like something was inefficient, so that's not an actual emotion right there.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So now we're going to take a look at the other person in this conversation who says, "It's fine for you to sit there," -- and again, what you may want to do even before you look down at this or if you can control yourself and not look at the -- at the options we gave you, try just listening to it and writing and think, "Okay, what are the feelings I'm hearing as, you know, I'm hearing this being said?" "It's fine for you to sit there and say you

want to protect the agricultural character of this county, while you've got your retirement account nicely squared away. But the farmers who have been farming their whole lives are ready to retire and don't have a fund. Their fund is their farm. You show up here with those maps, drawing arbitrary lines and you have no idea whose lives you are ruining. If you downsize this county, you'll crush their property values. Not only will they not be able to sell it to developers, the price they would get to sell it to other farmers will fall through the floor. And their kids who are just getting started in farming won't be able to leverage the value of the farm for credit to buy farm equipment, because the land won't be worth anything. That's a hell of a way to protect the agricultural character of this county." Okay. So here's your box and you can start to pick, insulted, worried, ruined, crushed, hypocritical, protective, discounted. And, so just a quick clue, think about what is this person saying, they're feeling, right? So not necessarily where they're saying on behalf of someone else, how someone else might be feeling, what are they expressing that they're feeling, right. That's what we're listening for. And sometimes, when we're talking about larger policy disputes, we have to be really careful that we're listening to this individual speaking and not what they're saying about other people. How they feel about other people, yes, but not how they're saying other people might be feeling. So let's take a look, pencils down. We have got insulted, good. Many of you had that. Worried, yes. Stop changing your answers now.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: People are in there changing their answers. It's okay because we can't say who you are -- we can't see who you are, so no consequences. Protective, yes. And you've got discounted. So discounted is an unusual one and yet that's in there because he's sort of saying that this approach in this perspective is being pushed to the side. So let's take a look at the other ones. We have ruined, is what he's saying is that these other people in our community, their livelihoods will be ruined, right? So that's what he's saying the outcome is going to be of these plans that you're putting out there. He hasn't said that he feels or she feels ruined. Crushed is, again, is a word, and so crushed could be a feeling, but where we want to be careful when we're listening for feelings is sometimes people will say a word that is a feeling word, but they're not using it to describe how they feel, and crushed is an example. What he actually said, if we go take a look was somewhere in there. Something about that, "You'll crush

their property values." So he's describing what's going to happen to property values, so that's not -- he's saying -- he's not saying that he was devastated, crushed, personally feeling that way. And hypocritical, again, that's the speaker's accusation, so coming back to the concept that like is never a feeling, right? That you would say -- you'd be thinking -- what you may be thinking if you selected hypocritical is he feels like the others in the room are being hypocritical. That's a statement of his position, that is in fact what he's articulating, but that's not a feeling so that wouldn't be a -- that's an accusation. That's not how he's feeling. Okay. So we've got our two feeling pieces. Incidentally, one of the requests that someone had in the last -- in the last session that we did was examples of how this could work in public policy. So here you have a public policy example, and after we get through it, I'm going to talk about -- this is based off of one that I did, and so after we get through this I'll talk a little bit about how we use strategic listening in this specific example. So now we're going to shift to values.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So we're going to read it again. So now we're back to participant one and now you're working on understanding what's important to the speaker removing their blame of what's wrong with the other person, but what they want, so, "The bottom line is that if we don't bite the bullet and implement appropriate zoning to limit development in the rural parts of this county, then we'll have insane sprawl with all of its negative implications. The septic systems everywhere are terrible for the watershed; we lose the agricultural character of this county; and providing services to residents sprawled all over the county is not an efficient use of tax money. Not to mention the environmental impact of the pollution associated with the increased traffic to and from the metro centers and the big box stores that will then start popping up all over the currently rural areas. I want my kids and grandkids to be able to enjoy the same beautiful county I grew up in, to swim in the rivers and play in the fields." So your choices, working on understanding what they're expressing is important to them, we have A. Efficiency, B. Clean Water, C. Appropriateness, D. Control, E. Clean Air, F. Beauty, G. Limiting Sprawl, H. Legacy, I. Small Businesses. So take a second to do this. Okay. So pencil's down. Good. All right. So let's see what we have here. So A. Efficiency is important to this person, clean water, clean air, beauty, and legacy. We see a lot of people definitely got the clean water piece and the clean air piece, so let's now take a look at the ones that were more based on

what they think is wrong with the other person maybe and not what's important to them. So appropriateness is one that is vague and doesn't create clarity. So it is then just saying that appropriateness is important. It means that you're listening to what the person is saying and you're making an analysis that those are the things that are appropriate. So instead -- so we don't want this a big seem of appropriateness, what we wanted, though, what is this person talking about? What's important to them is that they're saying the appropriate thing to do. What is it really about, and so those are the pieces that are about the clean air and beauty and legacy, those kinds of things. And then to say that control is important to this person, that's a piece of your opinion as you're listening to what it is they're saying. So they didn't actually express that control was important to them. And the limiting sprawl is their suggestion about what should happen. And so again we want to be listening to -- not just basing it on what it is they think the suggestions are and the ideas that they think will fix it, but what's important to them about those ideas and that will help people take ownership of what they want and then be able to come up with suggestions that are based in their values and what's important to them.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So I'll just -- I'll just back up for a second. The thing about control often when we're teaching is a lot of people select control. They listen to someone who sounds like they just want to be in charge of everything.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Yeah.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: The truth is when we're in conflict, all of us want to be in-charge of everything because we know exactly how to fix it to make things work for ourselves or the things that are important to us. So control is almost never a value because usually it's us -- usually it's us listening to them and saying, "Oh, they just want to be in-charge of everything." So what you want to listen to is if you're hearing they want to be in control, if they were in control, what goals would they meet? Not what would they do. They would limit sprawl, that's what they would do, but what goals would that meet and the goals that them being in control and them limiting sprawl would meet would be the clean water, the clean air, the beauty, the agricultural legacy, and so on and those were what the values are. That's the stuff about what's

underneath, what it is that they're saying they want. Okay. So again coming back to the other person, we'll read this again one last time just because I want you to be practicing. We're trying to just kind of talk to practice these things by webinar, but if you want to not look and instead write while I'm talking, listening to me talk, what are the values you're hearing as I say each sentence, right? So you've heard this before, but listen again, right. What are the values that you're hearing? "It's fine for you to sit there and say you want to protect the agricultural character of this county, while you've got your retirement account nicely squared away. But the farmers who have been farming their whole lives are ready to retire and don't have a fund. Their fund is their farm. You show up here with those maps, drawing arbitrary lines and you have no idea whose lives you are ruining. If you downsize -- downzone this country -- county, you'll crush their property values. Not only will they not be able to sell it to developers, the price they would get to sell it to other farmers will fall through the floor. And their kids who are just getting started in farming won't be able to leverage the value of the farm for credit to buy farm equipment, because the land won't be worth anything. That's a hell of a way to protect the agricultural character of this county." So here we go. Fairness, Raising Values, Property Value, Opportunity, Listening, Young Farmers, Security, Character, and Awareness. I'll give you a chance to put your ideas in. Okay. Pencils down. Let's take a look. So we had Fairness, yup, several of you said that. Property Value, yes. Opportunity, Security, and Awareness. So it looks like not a lot of folks said Awareness. So let me just touch on Awareness for a second. When the person is saying these lines about you don't understand what it's like for these other folks, you're coming and making decisions that you don't have an understanding of the impact of your decision on these other people's lives, that's where awareness comes from. The person's saying, "I want you to understand what it is that's going on." You need to have awareness about that, so that's where awareness comes from. Let's take a look at the other ones that we wouldn't use. So raising Values, it looks like nobody said that, right? Right? No one said that. Yeah. So that's your assumption about what they want. They actually never, never said that. They're talking about protecting property values, that was the value, but raising values is not something they articulated. Listening, they didn't say at all. And so here's the tricky thing. Sometimes, when someone is showing up and saying, "You have no clue." They're articulating

that understanding and awareness is important to them. And what we hear is, "Oh, they want to be heard. They want to be listened to," but they haven't said that, so we need to be careful that our idea that, "Oh, if people were listening, to them then they wouldn't feel like the other person has no clue." And so then we stick listening in there, but they didn't say -- they didn't show up saying, "Well, I think we should have dialogue and really hear each other out or you need to hear where I'm coming from." So that's why we wouldn't have listening in as a value. Young Farmers is a group that they mentioned, but that's not a value. So the question would be what do they want for those young farmers? Well they want security, they want property value, they want opportunity, that's the values. Young farmers is a group of people just like if I'm talking about my children and the fact that I want safety and security for them, my children wouldn't be the value. The safety and security would be the value. And then character, again, this is -- we threw it in there because sometimes, we hear a word, but it's vague and we don't know what's important to them. And so we want to be careful that we don't just grab it because it sounds like a value. Character sounds like a value where we don't just grab it and say, "Oh, that's, you know, that's their value." We're -- we still need to be listening for what is it that they're saying is important. So now we're going to go ahead and take a look at the things, the topics.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: So we're going to avoid reading it this time, but now, you're looking through what are the things that people are talking about. And again, you want to keep in mind the grinder that the words should not blame anyone. It should be something the person said they had conflict about. It shouldn't take anyone sad, it shouldn't set up a yes, someone should or no, someone shouldn't. So let's see what we have. We have A. Pollution, B. Zoning, C. Limiting Development, D. Grandkids, and E. Services. So take a minute to pick what the things are that this person is saying they have conflict about.

WOMAN: I don't know.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So we have the poll here and we're ready. So pencils down. We're ready to see which things actually were the topics. And we have -- okay. So we have B. Zoning or the thing that the person is saying they have conflict about, and then also Services.

So, we got pretty good numbers on Zoning. Very well. Very good. You are awesome as the dog is telling you. So, let's see what is about the topics that weren't there. So we have the topics grinder on the left hand side. So you can compare the things that weren't topics against the grinder. And so Pollution is a loaded word, so that's going to fail, that way it's blaming someone. And then Limiting Development, this is setting up a yes or no and taking a side because of someone's suggestion about what should happen, not specifically a concrete thing. And then the Grandkids, they're going to fail at the top of the grinder. It's not something that they're saying, it's not a thing that they're saying that they have in conflict about. So although they mentioned the grandkids and what they hope for, and as you're working at -- working on understanding those feelings and values related to that piece, you're definitely going to listen for but there's not a concrete topic there with the grandkids.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So let's take a look at the next one. So this is person talking about the impact of downzoning on farmers. And we won't read through this whole thing again but now, we're going to take look and see if we can put the little quiz up there. And the choices for the topics that we're hearing here, Development, Credit, Zoning, Downzoning, Protecting Farmers, Price of Farm Land, so go ahead and make your picks. While you're picking, I wanted to say something else about the process. Some of the things that are not topics, may eventually become topics in this conflict, and so what we're trying to do is we're with people each moment of the way. So we don't know yet what they're going to tell us 10 minutes from now. So when we're saying, you know, at this point in time, from what we've heard such and such is not a topic that's because in these scripts that you're looking at, that has not yet been articulated as a topic or as a value or as a feeling, but as we keep listening it's possible that as we find out more of those things become topics. And so the idea is we're with people in the moment hearing what are they saying right now and as we identify and hear what they're saying, then more and more becomes clear. And there may be more topics added. Clearly, this particular conflict was very complex and had, you know, several people involved and had a lot of different perspectives, and so we're simplifying it with two different perspectives here for the purpose of learning, but it's clearly more complex than this. So from what we have heard in these two -- this dialogue that we've got going on right now, the topics are -- take a look, the

topics are Credits, which no one had, that's interesting. Zoning and Price of Farm Land. So I want to say something about credit that's sort of interesting. I think one of the reasons we probably are not hearing credit as a topic is because it doesn't seem initially like they're fighting about it, right? So the other person wasn't saying, "Jeez, I don't think farmers should have access to credit. I want to keep farmers from having access to credit." But this person right here is saying, "Here's the problems in our community that are manifesting themselves around this conflict we're having." And one very clear one, he's saying is credit and people's ability to access credit is this thing that's influenced by these decisions we're making. And so we need to figure out what to do about credit in our community. So that's why we've got credit up there as a topic. And then let's take a look at -- well, I'm going come back to talk about credit as a topic in this particular conflict actually. And I'm going to come back and I'm going to look at the topics grinder. So Development at this point is not specific. It's vague. So something may come out of that idea of development. Something may come out of that idea of development as they continue to have the conversation but right now, it's a very broad sort of vague concept, not specific and concrete. Downzoning sets up yes/no. Yes, we should downzone, no, we shouldn't. So again we're trying to frame the topics in a way that the -- while zoning is a topic and we can think about several different solutions to zoning that meet the needs that people have articulated, downzoning is one possible solution and so we're not putting words in as topics that are one possible solution that some people want and other people don't want. And protecting farmers is more of a value than anything else. It sets up a side, it's not specific. It's what this person wants. It's not a neutral topic in their conflict. And so that concept gets captured earlier on when this person -- when we had -- that concept of protecting farmers gets captured in their values of opportunity and security and awareness and their feelings which are not going to bounce all the way back to overprotective unless you remember one of their feelings was protective. And so -- and then you'll hear something they'll say, but they said something about protecting farmers and so why wouldn't that be a topic? It may be that in that concept, there isn't a topic yet or listening for what were the feelings and values in it. And the topics that we have so far that are associated with this person's interest in protecting farmers would be Credit and Price of Farm Land. Those are tied directly to that, but they're

neutrally framed. Well, it looks like Erricka is answering some other questions here. So here's one of the interesting things that I wanted to say about this and we're about to go on to another conflict. So let me just say a few things about this particular zoning public policy issue as this just comes out of a real like scenario, as I said, that we did recently. So because we sort of listen to what everybody was raising, certainly, zoning was the really kind of obvious topic that they were going to go forward and make a decision about in the context of this facilitation, but because credit came up as a separate topic, one of the outcomes of the facilitated dialogue that happened was that several people, in fact, several people who had been on opposite sides of the initial issue decided to work together to find other ways to bring credit to -- especially young farmers who didn't have lot of collateral and who didn't have a history of farming. And so there's several apparently creative strategies out there that are implemented by states around the country. And because we listen to all of the pieces, not just the really obvious stuff about zoning, credit came in to the conversation and this group walked away with not only solutions related to the zoning issue they came in with, but also to this question about credit and how farmers in their community had access to credit. One of the things that I wanted to say in terms of people asked questions about how this gets used, and again, we're going to do a summary of this when we get to the end of today's session, but while we're on this issue of this particular public policy conflict, one of the things that we did was we used the values in this case, we did a lot of listening and we took the values. Where are my values? Here's some values. We took values from the 25 people that were sitting around the table. And we made a very transparent list of the values that we called the goals that the group had in order to resolve the issue. And so very transparently, everybody together identified their goals. We were using this concept of value, listening for value, listening for what's important. And then we had that set of values, so when they started doing the brainstorming about what were some possible outcomes, we framed the brainstorm as what ideas do you have that could meet these joint set of values that you've all identified, and their list of values were not all agreed upon. They weren't values that everyone had. Everyone's values were up there but they were -- but there were some values that were up there that belonged to one person and not to another person, but jointly, they created this values list. And then that was used both to brainstorm

and develop solutions, and then later, we used it to narrow down the solutions into the ones that they use to prioritize the solutions they wanted to go forward with. And I'm just going to -- I think because of the time, it would make sense for us to jump -- I'm going to jump to -- so I'm not sure -- this is a question for the CADRE folks. We have another example in here. And I don't know if it's possible to put it in the recorded version that people can access online if we don't have -- it seems like we don't have time now to go over it. Marshall, is there a way to do that for people to have access to this if we don't talk about it now?

MARSHALL PETER: We would need to spend a little bit of time with you and record something related to that. The...

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. Well, we'll figure out if we can do that.

MARSHALL PETER: Great. The full PowerPoint will be accessible to people but it won't be -- we'd need to spend a little bit of time to figure out how to actually merge it into the content if that's something that you wanted to do.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Okay. So I'm going to jump to -- we want to make sure that we have time for this conversation about how does this actually gets used. And then we also want to make sure that we leave you some time at the end for questions.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: [inaudible]

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: [inaudible] Okay. Okay. So just -- one of the things that we want to highlight before we go into this next one is this -- just to be fully transparent and we've said this as we've gone through. We find this particular skill to be extraordinarily useful. We find it to be the foundation on which absolutely everything we do, all of our interventions, and the mediations we do, and the facilitations we do are grounded in Inclusive Listening. And so when we were invited to do a webinar, we felt like this was kind of the most valuable thing that we had that we could offer to this -- to this webinar. The trick is we've never really tried to teach Inclusive Listening via webinar and the reason is as you can see in this dialogue that we're trying to have is it's a sort of subtle skill and sort of complex. And our concern is that if people don't have a full understanding of it and then go try to use it, it might backfire and it feels like it's not

working but it's not necessarily the skills that aren't working. It's just that it takes time and practice to really have a full understanding of it and to kind of feel comfortable with being able to use it seamlessly. So, we are happy to share it and we're happy to talk now about the various ways that we use it but we also want to give it with this caveat of it took us years to perfect it and it takes people years to, you know, sort of kind of continue to practice it with extensive training. And so we encourage folks to sort of -- if you really want to use it and incorporate it into your work to come back and look at these webinars, to access training that we do if you can, to find us at conferences if you can do that, so we can continue to support practice and learning in the skills and especially in the subtleties of it. So, having said that, we're going to talk a little bit about the various ways to incorporate it and you might find ways to incorporate Inclusive Listening into your work even beyond the ones that we're going to articulate.

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. So, you want to be really paying attention to -- when you use Inclusive Listening, it's not really going to be very helpful if you don't say back what you heard. So, that takes practice to not just hear it and you can say filtering out what actually was expressed but then also how do you say it back in a way that doesn't point out the blame, that doesn't take a side and that sort of thing. So, it's most effective when you use it while you're reflecting back and it helps the speaker feel heard and understood. And it does take more training and practice to be able to do it in a way where you're not taking sides. And then as we saw earlier and I'm sure you had questions that you might want to ask even in these last examples but you'll hear people talk about things or say things where you go, "Well, wait a minute. What's that about?" And maybe that needs to be unpacked. So, open-ended questions is a good tag team skill to help work on understanding to unpack the blame language, insults, and then help people get clarity.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: I'm going to take these ideas and just give a quick example from earlier, if you remember, we had the IEP meeting and the mother who was talking about the mornings, getting Daniel moving in the morning. So, the reflection to her might have sounded something like -- so using the feelings, values and topics that she had articulated, what we might have said to her would have been, "Okay. So, it sounds like you feel overwhelmed and exhausted and the

mornings are particularly tough. And right now, you're looking for understanding and recognition of what it takes to make these mornings work and right -- and right here, you're feeling insulted and judged. And in terms of communication, it sounds like you're feeling blamed and you're looking for support and awareness going forward, is that right?" So, if you hear, I'm sure everyone is familiar with the ideas of reflective listening. You say back what somebody said but if you hear in that reflection that I just gave, almost all of it was grounded in the feelings, values, and topics. I wasn't just reading off a list but I was putting my sentences together with feelings, values, and topics as the sort of the foundation of that reflection. And then, I might follow up by saying, "Can you tell us more about mornings? What happens in the morning?" Right? And so, that's the open-ended question that gets us to that next place. Okay. So, then other -- so other uses. So, the fundamental uses, we we're using it all the time. We're using reflective listening. We're asking open-ended questions to get -- to get more solutions. I think I gave the example earlier of -- before we even started talking about possible solutions, we make sure people feel heard, so I was giving the example of that mother and her feeling heard about how she felt judged and blamed and alone before we moved on to talking about what are some solutions in terms of services that could, you know, help with -- help the family made her more open to being able to talk about those services. So, some other pieces, we use the values, the goal language to generate ideas about possible solutions. "So, it sounds like you're looking -- you're saying that accountability is important to you around this project. What ideas would help you get the accountability you're looking for?" So, you hear how we're coming back now to these values people said were important, accountability. Projects would have been the neutral range topic. And we're asking what ideas would you have to get the accountability you're looking for. So, that's that piece that opens up possibilities grounded in the value as opposed to grounded in what's wrong with the other person and how to fix them. Taking that a step further, people might have talked about very different values, so this idea of win/win. This was actually out of the example that you didn't get to see about parents who have conflict about what food their children should be eating. "So, in terms of food, what ideas do you have that could ensure the good taste you are looking for and the -- and support the nutrition and health that you're committed to?" All right. So you can imagine what this conflict

was like, you know. We need to give them, you know, more vegetables and only kale and primarily tofu and the other person's going, "That stuff's nasty. And they're not going to eat anything because that's so gross." All right. So, we're listening for what the -- what the values were. And the values on the tofu and kale side were about the nutrition and health and the that's nasty side was about the taste and so then we ask this question, so, in terms of food, what ideas do you have that could ensure the taste that you're looking for and support the nutrition and health you're committed to. So it sets up this question, I don't know what the answer is when I ask that question. They've got to figure it out but I'm framing the question in a way that brings their values into it and then food is the neutral topic. Once people are considering a set of solutions, they think they have some solutions, look into the feelings to test those solutions. So, the example here, "Earlier, you said you felt afraid coming to work. If you applied all of the agreements that everyone has come up with here, would you still feel afraid?" And so, especially if you have -- if you're working with people who feel like they have probably made some progress on solutions but you're not sure if there's real buy-in to it. Like one of the ways to check buy-in is go back to the feelings that they said earlier. So, not based on do we think it's realistic, do we think it would work for them but bringing their feelings back and kind of evoke what it's like for them to go into that space and ask for them to do a reality check for themselves of -- based on these new possibilities will I still feel afraid. And then, agenda items, so, if you're using this -- assuming if you're using in the context of a mediation and setting an agenda for a mediation or for a meeting, a facilitation, an IEP meeting but even in general when you're setting up agenda topics for any meeting, you can use the topics grinder. And think about, "Am I putting topic ideas on this agenda that kind of inherently assume a particular outcome or are loaded and blaming somebody in the room?" And so, the example here is, "It sounds like you're all saying that meetings, projects, and supplies are things to discuss today, is that right?" And that's -- out of listening to people. But you can use the concept of how we frame topics in writing any agenda. So, you're writing the agenda for the, you know, PTA meeting or the special ed advisory committee meeting or whatever it might be and there might be a lot of intensity around the meeting that's coming up and you can take a look at your

agenda topics in terms of the topic grinder to see, you know, are we framing these topics in a way that really opens it up so everybody feels like they could be part of this conversation?

ERRICKA BRIDGEFORD: Okay. And so, you would be amazed how your everyday life while -- you know, we really do believe that more training is very helpful to help you practice. Meanwhile, watch some reality TV if you want to, especially if you're listening to the things that you normally think of ridiculous. If you're going to work on understanding and not judging the feelings and what's important to people who you think are ridiculous then, you know, that's pretty good practice. If you want to listen to talk radio, again, not the shows that where you agree with all of their political ideas but the people who you think are way off base. Work on understanding the feelings and values, the things that they are talking about. I like to eavesdrop on conversations, so like when you're in elevators and you hear someone on the phone or when I'm in a store and a little kid is yelling at their mom about, "You lied, mom. You said I could have the candy. You are not doing what you said." You know, I'm listening going, "Okay. So, he is upset and follow-through is important for him and he feels betrayed and the candy is the things he's talking about." You know, and so, just in little ways like that. Even when friends call you and they have problems, so if they're angry at you, you know, and if you can practice while someone is angry at you, kudos. But especially when they call you to vent about things, use this as an opportunity to listen differently to friends and co-workers and even, you know, when you say, "How is your day?" You know, generally we say, "How are you doing?" And you know, we keep walking, you don't really listen to the answer but now, you can use when people answer that question. Use it as an opportunity to listen what feelings are they expressing and what are they saying is important to them today. So, yeah, everyday life is a great opportunity to practice non-judgment and listening to others -- who would have think it.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Feel free to reference this slide when your spouse or co-workers are wondering why you're watching reality TV in the office or at home or why are you watching that trash TV. You can just reference this slide and say that we told you to. Okay. So, we're going to wrap up here in just a second. This is just little bit more about CMM. We're really working on finding more ways to create practice opportunities, excuse me, for folks to learn more about Inclusive Listening. And in general and so hopefully, we'll have some of that soon

but here's our website and then Prisoner Re-Entry Mediation as one of the main -- one of -- one of our major initiatives. And so, you can see more -- you can see all of our initiatives on our general website but our Re-Entry Mediation has a website, has some stuff that -- that's really specific to that work. And you can find us on Facebook where Erricka is posting stuff right now. So, we have a couple of minutes for questions I think, right? Can we open this up for questions?

MARSHALL PETER: Yeah, we do. I think we're not getting questions in the box and so what I would suggest would be that if you have a question that you would like to ask live over the phone, if you would press *6, that will unmute your phone and you can ask a question. And then after you've asked your question, if you would press *6 again, that'll take some of the noise off the line, so any questions?

WOMAN: Oh, yeah.

MARSHALL PETER: We have a couple of people who are typing. Myriam Alizo asked, "Could we have an example of Inclusive Listening?"

MAN: [inaudible]

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: So, yes, well, just to be clear about Inclusive Listening. All right. So, well, when we say Inclusive Listening, the examples -- what we mean is listening to someone say whatever it is they're saying, however they want to say it, and listening for the feelings, values, and the topics. So that's the term we're using to describe that. So, that's kind of what we have been teaching. The examples that we have given are some ways that it could manifest itself in a conversation, you know, this last little set of -- can I get back to it? Yeah, this -- these two pages sort of give you how to use it in practice but Inclusive Listening, when we say that, what we mean is just listening and hearing feelings, values, and topics and then incorporating them in the various responses. So, then, it would be helpful to have a series of examples for both the values and the topics grinder. Do you mean -- oh, yeah. Yeah, I'm not sure I understand what that question, so I don't know, Bob, if you want to get on the line and say it or if you want to write more.

BOB: Can you hear me? Hello?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Do you have any question? Yes.

BOB: Yup, I'm here. Hello?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Yeah, were you going to ask your question.

BOB: Hello?

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Yeah.

MARSHALL PETER: So, someone just unmuted and it sounded like they had a question they wanted to ask, please proceed.

BOB: Oh, it's Bob. Can you hear me?

MARSHALL PETER: Yes.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Yup.

BOB: Okay. Yeah, what I was thinking about was just a series of examples that you could portray unpacking topics from values and more examples.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: I'll do it? Yeah, yeah. Oh. Okay. Yeah, so...

BOB: Maybe...

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: ...you -- are you -- you're asking about like how do we distinguish topics from values? Is that what you're just saying?

BOB: Yeah, well, for example using like the examples that you used, maybe having some more of them with some examples of what the topics would be and what the values would be, so we could unpack them.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Yeah. So, I think, you know, what we'll try to do -- again, I'm -- this technology is sort of -- sort of newer to us. We do have that other one. It's a -- it's a conflict between parents and maybe I'll work with CADRE, see if we can sort of walk through that other example. I will just quickly say what you want to think about is the topic is the thing people

have conflict about and you want to name it in a way that doesn't take a side. So, the example will be food and the values are what people want about that topic. So, for example, if I'm the parent who wants to feed the kid kale and tofu and spinach and no sugar, then what I want is about health and nutrition. And if my kid's father is the one who wants the kids to have fun with food, you know, go to McDonald's and have a good time and be able to eat in any culture and not be restricted in terms of meat then his values might be around inclusiveness and culture and enjoyment and convenience, right? So, those are the things he wants around food and the nutrition and the health are the things that I want around food and then I gave that example of how you could pull both of those together. So, food is still the topic that is neutral and then, our values are the ones you're going to want to tie together here in this, you know, this example here by generating win/win ideas. So, the values are generally the things that we want out of, goals out of the situation and the topics are the things that we could make a plan about. And we'll try to get -- we'll try to see if we can find a way to post this other example that we are ready to walk people through.

BOB: Okay. That sounds good.

MARSHALL PETER: So, we're coming up on time to wrap this up. The full PowerPoint is available on the CADRE site and I believe that if you thumb through that PowerPoint, you'll in fact get to the additional example slides, so you won't have the benefit of hearing Lorig and Erricka talk about them but you will be able to kind of see how the whole thing works. I want to really appreciate Lorig and Erricka really plowing some new ground for us. And so, we have historically had webinars where there's been a presentation and, you know, an opportunity to ask questions but we've really been aware that there -- that the limitations of the technology and the absence of the opportunity to practice or to kind of see if there's a way that you can have the experience of using some of the concepts. And so, this really has plowed very new and fertile ground for us. So, in addition to the -- to the superb content that was presented and the obvious command that Lorig and Erricka have around Inclusive Listening, it's really very, very grateful that they took the chance to do this practice stuff and I think it's really been -- I'm certainly speaking for myself, very useful, so thank you very much Lorig and Erricka.

LORIG CHARKOUDIAN: Our pleasure.

MARSHALL PETER: A few words -- so, a few words about upcoming CADRE webinars. We're pleased to announce that our own Richard Zeller and Amy Whitehorne will provide an update on Dispute Resolution National Trends: 8 Years of APR/Section 618 Data on February 6th from 11:30 to 12:45 Pacific Standard Time. Many of you are aware that we have for some time maintained a longitudinal national database that really tells us what's happening in the country related to use of due process hearings, use of mediation, resolution meetings, complaints. It's fascinating to look at the trends and to drill down into them and Dick and Amy spend an enormous amount of time doing that, thinking about it. So, it promises to be a very interesting and entertaining webinar. We're also in the process of planning another webinar for mid-March and we've not yet -- we would expect to be able to announce the topic and presenter on February the 6th and of course, the information both about the upcoming webinar, about today's webinar is all available on the CADRE website. So, again, I want to thank Erricka and Lorig and all of you for joining us today for your questions, your participation, and your attention. We will send out a survey to everyone who registered, asking you to please evaluate today's webinar. We'd very much appreciate you taking the time to complete it. And so, with that, I think that we are done. Thank you all very much and take care. We'll look forward to joining another webinar with you in the future. Bye.