

APPENDIX

Overview of ADR Processes¹

Although the processes that constitute the universe of ADR are theoretically unlimited, the program modules in this Program Guide focus on some or all of the following four basic processes: mediation, early neutral evaluation, non-binding arbitration and settlement conferences. Below is a description of each:

I. Mediation

Goal:

The goal of mediation is to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement resolving all or part of the dispute by carefully exploring not only the relevant evidence and law, but also parties' underlying interests, needs, priorities and feelings.

Process:

Mediation is an informal, flexible, non-binding and confidential process in which a neutral mediator facilitates settlement negotiations. Neither the mediator nor the participants may disclose mediation communications to the judge or to outsiders. The mediation session typically begins with presentations of each side's view of the case, through counsel or clients. The mediator, who may meet with parties in joint and separate sessions, works to:

- Improve communication across party lines;
- Help parties clarify and communicate their interests and understand those of their opponent;
- Explore the strengths and weaknesses of each party's legal positions; and
- Identify areas of agreement and help generate options for a mutually agreeable resolution.

Parties can determine the kind of role they want their mediator to play. That role could range from purely facilitative to more analytically assertive. Unless asked to do so, however, the mediator generally does not give an overall evaluation of the case. Mediation can extend beyond traditional settlement discussion to broaden the range of resolution options, often by exploring litigants' needs and interests that may be independent of the legal issues in controversy.

Preservation of right to trial:

¹ The following descriptions are taken in large part from the website of the United States District Court, Northern District of California, which may be found at: <http://www.adr.cand.uscourts.gov/adr/adrdocs.nsf/354c0e78f4dde1a6882564e1000be228?OpenView>.

The mediator has no power to impose settlement and does not attempt to pressure a party to accept any proposed terms. Parties' discovery, disclosure and motion practice rights are fully preserved. Parties may agree to a binding settlement. If no settlement is reached, the case remains on the litigation track.

The neutral:

Most courts impose minimum qualifications on any court-connected mediators. For example, the Northern District of California requires the following:

- Admission to the practice of law for at least 7 years (if a lawyer);
- Experience in communication and negotiation techniques;
- Knowledge about civil litigation in federal court; and
- Training by the court.

Some court mediation panels also include non-lawyer mediators, who would serve in any given case with the consent of parties. Non-lawyer mediators generally have special process skills or subject matter expertise, e.g., in real estate, securities or some highly technical intellectual property cases.

Written submissions:

Counsel usually exchange and submit written statements to the mediator before the mediation. The mediator may request or accept additional confidential statements that are not shared with the other side. Mediation statements are not filed with the court.

Appropriate cases/circumstances:

Almost any case might benefit from mediation. Cases with the following characteristics may be particularly appropriate:

- Parties desire a business-driven or other creative solution
- Parties may benefit from a continuing business or personal relationship
- Multiple parties are involved
- Equitable relief is sought, and parties, with the aid of a neutral, might be able to agree on the terms of an injunction or consent decree
- Communication appears to be a major barrier to resolving or advancing the case
- Strong emotions are or may be at play

II. Early Neutral Evaluation**Goal:**

The goals of Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) are to:

- Enhance direct communication between parties about their claims and supporting evidence
- Provide a confidential assessment of the merits of the case by a neutral expert
- Provide a "reality check" for clients and lawyers
- Identify and clarify the central issues in dispute and assist with discovery and motion planning or with informal exchange of key information
- Facilitate settlement discussions, when requested by parties

ENE aims to position the case for a more efficient resolution, whether by settlement, dispositive motion or trial. It may serve as a cost-effective substitute for some formal discovery and pretrial motions. Although settlement is not the immediate goal of early neutral evaluation, the process can lead to settlement.

Process:

The evaluator, an experienced attorney with expertise in the case's subject matter, hosts an informal and confidential meeting of clients and counsel at which the following occurs:

1. Each side – through counsel, clients or witnesses – presents informally the evidence and arguments supporting its principal claims and defenses (without regard to the rules of evidence and without direct or cross-examination of witnesses). The early neutral evaluation provides parties a forum where they can examine the lawsuit from the other, as well as their own, perspective.
2. The evaluator identifies areas of agreement, clarifies and focuses the issues and encourages parties to enter procedural and substantive stipulations.
3. The evaluator writes an evaluation in private that includes:
 - An estimate, where feasible, of the likelihood of liability and the dollar range of damages;
 - An assessment of the relative strengths and weaknesses of each party's case; and
 - The reasoning that supports these assessments.
4. The evaluator offers to present the evaluation to parties, who may then ask either to hear the evaluation (which must be presented if any party requests it), or postpone hearing the evaluation in order to:
 - Engage in settlement discussions facilitated by the evaluator, often in separate meetings with each side, or
 - Conduct focused discovery and/or make additional disclosures.
5. If settlement discussions do not occur or do not resolve the case, the evaluator may:
 - Help parties devise a plan for sharing additional information and/or conducting the key discovery that will expeditiously equip them to enter meaningful settlement discussions or position the case for resolution by motion or trial
 - Help parties realistically assess litigation costs
 - Determine whether some form of follow-up to the session would contribute to case development or prospects for settlement

Preservation of right to trial:

The evaluator has no power to impose settlement and does not attempt to pressure a party to accept any proposed terms. Parties' formal discovery, disclosure and motion practice rights are fully preserved. The evaluator's confidential evaluation is non-binding and is not disclosed to the trial judge. Parties may agree to a binding settlement. If no settlement is reached, the case remains on the litigation track.

The neutral:

To be effective, evaluators must have expertise in the substantive legal area of the lawsuit. Most courts impose minimum qualifications on any court-connected ENE evaluator. For example, the Northern District of California requires the following:

- Admission to the practice of law for at least 15 years;
- Experience with civil litigation in federal court;
- Expertise in the substantive law of the case
- Training by the court.

Written submissions:

Counsel generally exchange and submit written statements to the evaluator before the early neutral evaluation session. The confidential statements are not filed with the court.

Appropriate cases/circumstances:

Cases with the following characteristics may be particularly appropriate for early neutral evaluation:

- The parties have pled many different claims or defenses, and it is not clear to the other party which claims are most significant.
- The analysis on which outcome is likely to turn is complicated or subtle, and one or more of the parties could benefit from a neutral analysis.
- Counsel or parties are far apart on their view of the facts or the law and/or the value of the case
- The case involves technical or specialized subject matter – and it is important to have a neutral with expertise in that subject
- Case planning assistance would be useful
- Communication across party lines (about merits or procedure) could be improved
- Equitable relief is sought – if parties, with the aid of a neutral expert, might be able to agree on the terms of an injunction or consent decree

III. Non-binding Arbitration

Goal:

The purpose of court-sponsored non-binding arbitration is to provide parties with access to a non-binding adjudicative disposition that is earlier, faster, less formal and less expensive than trial. The award (a proposed judgment) in a non-binding arbitration may either:

- Become the judgment in the case if all parties accept it, or
- Help inform parties' settlement discussions.

Process:

At the election of parties, either one arbitrator or a panel of three arbitrators presides at a hearing where parties present evidence through documents, other exhibits and testimony. Application of the rules of evidence is relaxed somewhat in order to save time and money.

The process includes important, trial-like sources of discipline and creates good opportunities to assess the impact and credibility of key witnesses:

- Parties may use subpoenas to compel witnesses to attend or present documents
- Witnesses testify under oath, through direct and cross-examination

- The proceedings can be transcribed and testimony could, in some circumstances, be used later at trial for impeachment.

Arbitrators apply the law to the facts of the case and issue a non-binding award on the merits. Arbitrators do not "split the difference" and do not conduct mediations or settlement negotiations.

Preservation of right to trial:

Either party may reject the non-binding award and request a trial de novo before the assigned judge, who will not know the content of the non-binding arbitration award. If no such demand is filed within the prescribed time, the award becomes the final judgment of the court and is not subject to appellate review. There is no penalty for demanding a trial de novo or for failing to obtain a judgment at trial that is more favorable than the arbitration award. Rejecting an arbitration award will not delay the trial date.

Parties may stipulate in advance to waive their right to seek a trial de novo and thereby commit themselves to be bound by the arbitration award.

The neutral(s):

Most courts impose minimum qualifications for court-connected arbitrators. For example, the Northern District of California requires the following:

- Admission to the practice of law for at least 10 years;
- For at least five years, spent a minimum of 50 percent of professional time litigating or had substantial experience as an ADR neutral; and
- Training by the court.

Court-connected non-binding arbitration programs also provide a fair process for selection of the arbitrators.

Appropriate cases/circumstances:

Cases with the following characteristics may be particularly appropriate for non-binding arbitration:

- Only monetary (and not injunctive) relief is sought
- The complaint alleges personal injury, property damage or breach of contract
- The amount in controversy is less than \$150,000
- The case turns on credibility of witnesses
- The case does not present complex or unusual legal issues

IV. Settlement Conferences

Some lawyers and litigants assume that a judicially hosted "settlement conference" and a mediation hosted by a person who is not a judge are the same – but these two processes are sometimes quite different. Sometimes a judge who hosts a settlement conference will play essentially the same largely facilitative role that a mediator would play – but sometimes a settlement judge plays quite a different role. In some circumstances, a

settlement judge focuses more directly on analysis of law and evidence and more assertively assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the parties' positions. Sometimes settlement judges offer a prediction of outcome at trial and indicate what they think the settlement value (or range of values) of the case is. As a general rule, settlement judges are not likely to focus as much as a mediator would on interests or concerns of the parties that might underlie or be implicated by the case but that would not be relevant under the law to an adjudicated disposition. Sometimes settlement judges place less emphasis than mediators would on improving communication and understanding across party lines. And settlement judges may attend less than mediators would to the emotional dimensions of a dispute.

Goal:

The goal of a settlement conference is to facilitate parties' efforts to negotiate a settlement of all or part of the dispute.

Process:

A judicial officer, often a magistrate judge or bankruptcy judge, helps parties negotiate. Some settlement judges also use mediation techniques to improve communication among parties, explore barriers to settlement and assist in formulating resolutions. Settlement judges might articulate views about the merits of the case or the relative strengths and weaknesses of parties' legal positions. Often settlement judges meet with one side at a time, and some settlement judges rely primarily on meetings with counsel.

Settlement conferences may be structured in a variety of ways. Some settlement judges begin the process with a joint meeting in which each side makes a presentation to the other and responds to questions. Many settlement judges use private caucusing extensively, a process that features confidential meetings with one side at a time. Clients are required to attend most settlement conferences, but sometimes their participation is limited. For example, the settlement judge might limit the joint meeting to lawyers; thus, clients might not participate directly in all of the private caucuses with the judge.

Preservation of right to trial:

The settlement judge has no power to impose settlement and does not attempt to pressure a party to accept any proposed terms. If no settlement is reached, the case remains on the litigation track. The settlement judge does not disclose to the trial judge communications that occurred during the conference or the settlement judge's opinion about the merits of any party's position. Parties' formal discovery, disclosure and motion practice rights are fully preserved.

The neutral:

The judge who would preside at trial ordinarily does not conduct the settlement conference. In some districts, parties may request that a specific magistrate judge host their negotiations or rank several magistrate judges in order of preference.

Most magistrate judges have standing orders setting forth their requirements for settlement conferences, including written statements and attendance.

Written submissions:

The settlement judge may require written settlement conference statements. If so, they are submitted directly to the settlement judge and are not filed with the court. Some judges ask the parties to exchange their written statements, while other judges ask that each party submit its statement only to the settlement judge (*ex parte*).

Appropriate cases/circumstances:

Almost any case might benefit from a settlement conference. Cases with the following characteristics may be particularly appropriate:

- A client or attorney prefers to appear before a judicial officer
- Issues of procedural law are especially important
- A party is not represented by counsel
- A client or lawyer is especially interested in hearing a judge's views about the case
- It is especially important to minimize litigation costs. One or more of the parties does not want to or is not in a position to pay for the services of a neutral

Guide to Court-Sponsored ADR Resource Persons

Alaska

Judge(s)	Honorable Herbert A. Ross, Sr. Bankruptcy Judge (on recall) U.S. Bankruptcy Court Historic Courthouse 605 West Fourth Ave, Suite 138 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2296 (907) 271-271-2630
-----------------	--

Arizona

Judge(s)	Honorable Frank R. Zapata District Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, District of Arizona Evo A. Deconcini U.S. Courthouse 405 West Congress Street, Room 5113 Phoenix, Arizona 85067 (520) 205-4530
ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Richard H. Weare District Court Clerk U.S. District Court, District of Arizona Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse 401 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85003 (602) 322-7101

California - Central

Judge(s)	Honorable Dorothy W. Nelson Senior Circuit Judge (Chair, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee; Chair, Western Justice Center Foundation) U.S. Court of Appeals 125 South Grand Avenue, Suite 303 Pasadena, California 91105 (626) 229-7400
-----------------	--

Judge(s)	<p>Honorable Raymond C. Fisher Circuit Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. Court of Appeals 125 South Grand Avenue, Suite 402 Pasadena, California 91105 (626) 229-7110</p> <p>Honorable Jeffrey Johnson Magistrate Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, Central District of California U.S. Courthouse 312 North Spring Street, Room 831 Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 894-5094</p> <p>Honorable Margaret M. Morrow District Judge U.S. District Court, Central District of California (Chair, Central District's ADR Committee) U.S. Courthouse 255 East Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 894-1565</p> <p>Honorable Judge Barry Russell Chief Bankruptcy Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Central District of California Edward Roybal Federal Building and Courthouse 255 East Temple Street, Room 1660 Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 894-6091</p> <p>Susan M. Doherty Mediation Program Coordinator U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Central District of California Edward Roybal Federal Building and Courthouse 255 East Temple Street Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 894-6093</p>
-----------------	--

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Lydia Yurtchuk ADR Coordinator U.S. District Court, Central District of California 312 North Spring Street, Suite G-8 Los Angeles, California 90012 (213) 894-8249
--	---

California - Eastern

Judge(s)	<p>Honorable Gregory G. Hollows Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Central District of California 501 "I" Street, Suite 8-200 Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 930-4195</p> <p>Honorable Kimberly Mueller Magistrate Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, Central District of California 501 "I" Street, Suite 80230 Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 930-4022</p>
ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Linda Martinez Administrator for Voluntary Dispute Resolution Program U.S. District Court, Central District of California 501 "I" Street, Suite 8-200 Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 930-4280

California - Northern

Judge(s)	Honorable Wayne D. Brazil Magistrate Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, Northern District of California Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse 1301 Clay Street, Suite 400 South Oakland, California 944612 (510) 637-637-3324
-----------------	---

	<p>Honorable Jeremy Fogel District Judge U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 280 South First Street, 5th Floor San Jose, California 95113 (408) 535-5166</p>
	<p>Honorable Susan Illston District Judge U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 19th Floor San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 522-2028</p> <p>Honorable Edward Infante Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 280 South First Street, 5th Floor San Jose, California 95113 (408) 535-5377</p> <p>Honorable Randall J. Newsome Chief Bankruptcy Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of California 1300 Clay Street, Suite 300 Oakland, California 94601 (510) 8973530</p> <p>Honorable Jon True III Superior Court Judge Superior Court of Alameda County 24405 Amador Street, Hayward Hall of Justice, 1st Floor Hayward, California 94544 (510) 670-6321</p>
<p>ADR Administrators or Court Staff</p>	<p>Howard Herman, Esq. Director, Alternative Dispute Resolution Program U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 19th Floor San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 522-2027</p>

	<p>Robin Siefkin, Esq. Alternative Dispute Resolution Program U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 19th Floor San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 522-2199</p>
	<p>Sheila Purcell, Esq. Appropriate Dispute Resolution Director Multi-Option ADR Project San Mateo County Courts 400 County Center San Mateo, California 94063 (650) 363-4148</p> <p>John Toker, Esq. Mediation Program Administrator State of California Court of Appeal, First Appellate Dist. 350 McAllister Street San Francisco, California 94102-3600 (415) 865-7375</p>

California - Southern

Judge(s)	<p>Honorable Louise De Carl Adler Bankruptcy Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of California 325 West "F" Street San Diego, California 92101</p>
ADR Administrators or Court Staff	<p>Honorable Louisa S. Porter Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Southern District of California 940 Front Street, Room 1140 San Diego, California 92101 (619) 557-6582</p>

Guam

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Mary Moran District Court Clerk U.S. District Court 4 th Floor, U.S. Courthouse 520 West Soledad Avenue Hagatna, GU 96910 (671) 473-9100
--	---

Hawaii

Judge(s)	Honorable Barry M. Kurren Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii 300 Ala Moana Blvd., Rm. C-229 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 (808) 541-1306 Magistrate Judge Kevin S. C. Chang 300 Ala Moana Blvd., Rm. C-229 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 (808) 541-1308 Magistrate Leslie E. Kobayashi 300 Ala Moana Blvd., Rm. C-353 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 (808) 541-1331
ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Sue Beitia District Court Clerk U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii 300 Ala Moana Boulevard, Room C-338 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 (808) 541-1300 Elizabeth Kent, Esq. Director Center for Alternative Dispute Resolution The Judiciary – State of Hawaii P.O. Box 2560 Honolulu, Hawaii 96804 (808) 539-4238

Idaho

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Denise M. Asper ADR Program Director (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, District of Idaho 550 West Fort Street Boise, Idaho 84724 (208) 334-9067
--	--

Montana

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	Leandra Kelleher Chief Deputy Clerk Russel Smith courthouse P.O. Box 8537 Missoula, Montana 59807 (406) 542-7261
--	---

Nevada

Judge(s)	Honorable Valerie Cooke Magistrate Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, District of Nevada 400 South Virginia Street Reno, Nevada 89501 (775) 868-5855 Honorable Robert Johnston Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, District of Nevada 333 Las Vegas Boulevard Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 464-5550 Honorable Peggy Leen Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, District of Nevada 400 South Virginia Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89501 (702) 464-5570
-----------------	---

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	<p>Honorable Gregg Zive Chief Bankruptcy Judge (Former member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, District of Nevada 404 U.S. Courthouse 400 South Virginia Street Reno, Nevada 89501 (775) 784-5017</p> <p>Tom Harris, Esq. Director, Settlement Program Nevada Supreme Court Regional Justice Center 200 Lewis Avenue, 17th Floor Las Vegas, Nevada 89101</p>
--	--

Northern Mariana Islands

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	<p>Galo L. Perez District Court Clerk P.O. Box 687 Saipan, CM 96950 (670) 236-2902</p>
--	--

Oregon

Judge(s)	<p>Honorable Ann L. Aiken District Judge (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. District Court, District of Nevada 211 East Seventh Avenue, Room 286 Eugene, Oregon 97401 (541) 465-6409</p>
-----------------	--

Washington - Eastern

Judge(s)	<p>Honorable Robert H. Whaley Chief District Judge U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington P.O. Box 283 Spokane, Washington 99210 (509) 353-2170</p> <p>Honorable Lonny R. Suko District Judge United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington P.O. Box 2706 Yakima, Washington 98907 (509) 454-5635</p> <p>Honorable Cynthia Imbrogno Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington P.O. Box 263 Spokane, Washington 99210 (509) 353-0660</p> <p>Honorable Michael W. Leavitt Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington P.O. Box 128 Yakima, Washington 98907 (509) 575-5997</p>
ADR Administrators or Court Staff	<p>James R. Larsen District Executive and Clerk of the Court U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington P.O. Box 1493 Spokane, Washington 99210 (509) 353-2150</p> <p>Leslie Downey Chief Deputy Clerk U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington P.O. Box 1493 Spokane, Washington 99210 (509) 353-2150</p>

Washington - Western

Judge(s)	<p>Honorable Robert S. Lasnik Chief District Judge U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 370-8810</p> <p>Honorable John C. Coughenour District Judge U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 370-8800</p> <p>Honorable Monica J. Benton Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 370-8900</p> <p>Honorable James P. Donohue Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 370-8940</p> <p>Honorable Mary Alice Theiler Magistrate Judge U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington 700 Stewart Street Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 370-8890</p>
-----------------	--

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	<p>Janet Bubnis Chief Deputy U.S. District Court, Western District of Washington 700 Steward Street Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 370-8483</p> <p>J. Kirkham Johns Chair, ADR Committee – Federal Bar Association Western District of Washington [Administers Local CR 39.1 ADR Program] Stafford Frey Cooper 601 Union Street, Suite 3100 Seattle, Washington 98101-1374 206-667-8287</p>
--	--

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

ADR Administrators or Court Staff	<p>David Lombardi, Esq. Chief Circuit Mediator (Member, Ninth Circuit ADR Committee) U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Circuit Mediation Office P.O. Box 102020 San Francisco, California 94119 (415) 556-9907</p>
Mediators	<p>Roxanne Ash, Esq. Claudia Bernard, Esq. Margaret Corrigan, Esq. Lisa Evans, Esq. Steven Iacora Ann Julius C. Lewis Ross, Esq. Peter Sherwood, Esq. U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit Circuit Mediation Office P.O. Box 102020 San Francisco, California 94119 (415) 556-9900</p>

	Chris Goelz, Esq. Circuit Mediator U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit 1200 6th Avenue, 3rd Floor Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 553-6101
--	---

Additional Information about or Assistance with Court-Connected ADR

Robin Donoghue
Assistant Circuit Executive for Legal Affairs
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Office of the Circuit Executive
95 Seventh Street, Suite 429
San Francisco, California 94103-1526
(415) 556-9588

Court ADR Program Assistance (CAPA)
The American Bar Association
Section of Dispute Resolution
740 Fifteenth St, NW
Washington DC, 20005-1009
www.abanet.org/dispute/California pa

Donna Stienstra
Senior Researcher
Court ADR Program Assistance
Federal Judicial Center
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building
One Columbus Circle NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-8003
(202) 502-4000

Ninth Circuit ADR Program Evaluation Form

Title of Conference/Meeting: _____

Title of Program: _____

Date of Program: _____

What did you think about the ADR program? Your suggestions are important to the Ninth Circuit ADR Committee for future program development. Please return this form to the registration desk or leave it on your chair. Thank you!

Rating Method on a scale of 1 to 5				
Poor/Least Useful		Fair		Excellent/Most Useful
1	2	3	4	5

I am a Circuit Judge District Judge Bankruptcy Judge Magistrate Judge
 Lawyer Court Staff Other (please explain) _____

1. Please rate the value and effectiveness of the topic: 1 2 3 4 5

Comments: _____

2. The quality of the presenters' preparation: 1 2 3 4 5

3. The length of the session was: 1 2 3 4 5

4. What I LIKED MOST about the program was: _____

5. What I LIKED LEAST about the program was: _____

6. The presenter(s) could have SPENT MORE TIME on: _____

7. The presenter(s) could have SPENT LESS TIME on: _____

8. What topics related to court-sponsored ADR would you like to see addressed in future programs?

Please use the other side if you have more comments.
Please leave at your seat or turn in at the program registration desk. Thanks!