



U.S. Institute Breaking New Ground on the Evaluation of ECR

New insights into the performance of environmental conflict resolution (ECR) were presented at the ACR 7th Annual Conference hosted in Phoenix, Arizona, in October 2007. The findings presented are part of a multi-agency ECR evaluation study (MAES) led by the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute). The U.S. Institute is part of the Morris K. Udall Foundation, an independent federal agency. MAES was designed to shed light on how ECR performs, identify key factors that contribute to ECR success, and distill feedback from participants and practitioners so that future processes can be improved. Highlights from the U.S. Institute's ACR conference session are summarized in this piece including the evaluation framework, below.

see **NEW GROUND** on page 3



THE CASE OF LOCAL TRAIL ACCESS: SEARCHING FOR OPTIONS WITH PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH

by Myriem Le Ferrand

Dispute resolution processes open the door for local knowledge in public policy development. Sometimes, however, those local voices don't quite make it into the room. To encourage shy guests, what can be done? Participatory Action Research (PAR) offers an enticing menu from which facilitators and conveners can choose in deepening communication with locals. PAR includes visual data displays, oral history and existing research to highlight local knowledge. PAR practitioners

see **TRAIL ACCESS** on page 2



ALSO INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- **The Recent Evolution of Democracy** page 5
- **Diversity Mentoring Pilot Project** page 6
- **Conferences and Dates of Interest** page 10

Trail Access continued from page 1

encourage community members to inquire into their own condition.

So what can PAR do? Does the viability of an outcome increase? Is resolution encouraged, when stakeholders are otherwise at impasse? In the debate on neutrality, does PAR credibly and equitably empower disputants? Does PAR substantiate social and historical claims in rigorous and defensible ways? What are the net benefits of connecting policy development to the day-to-day intimacy of local values, customs and stewardship? Does tilling this complex layer of experience generate knowledge that demonstrably expands the horizon of choice?

To assess PAR as an intervention tool, I applied the technique and then evaluated the results on a range of qualitative measures. Assessment themes were either emergent or drawn from the collaboration and dispute resolution literature. I can send the evaluation upon request. Here instead, for the sake of brevity and to encourage your imagination, I illustrate the application of PAR in a community dispute.

The dispute arose over access to a wildland trail in the Colorado Front Range. A billionaire newcomer purchased a glorious parcel of land in a meadow bejeweled with views of the Divide. On this parcel, he closed access to a historic and popular “social” trail that traversed both public and private land. Heated exchanges ensued on the trail itself. Those involved mobilized other residents in the historic village of 350 people. They did so by phone, in the local cafe and in the “Town Meeting.” The new landowner avoided discussion choosing instead to “patrol” the trail.

An ambiguous legal framework further hampered resolution.

In attempting to resolve this dispute, I encouraged PAR in the form of reflective community inquiry. Of primary interest to locals on the “Trails Group” were issues faced by the newcomer and how best to articulate their own claims. Broadly, the issues included liability, liability insurance, law enforcement, restorative experience, security, tax incentives, land use planning, history, sense of place, and sense of community.

The PAR and its results opened a channel within which communication could flow. A community handbook presented the PAR results. The handbook also presented the legal case for access (e.g. RS2477) and varying forms of access permissions adopted by other landowners in the area. Secondarily, the handbook presented “grounded” theory on the role of trails in community life and ecological stewardship.

Public disputes such as this localized trail dispute can bring to light as yet, unobserved trends like the effect of recreational demand on local trail closures. Exogenous factors can unleash core inconsistencies in the application of local custom and land tenure. In this case, demand for mechanized and motorized access by those living in nearby population centers impacted customary patterns of trail use. Of benefit, the PAR results in this case provide insight for wilderness advocates, policy makers, planners, law enforcement officers and recreationists in mitigating the effects of recreational demand.

With the focus on clarifying attributions, PAR served to de-escalate

the dispute. It did so by redirecting antipathy into a search for integrative options. PAR opened a period for suspended judgment, increased local capacity to resolve dispute and built relationships around trails. Concurrently, a trail bypass was constructed. Later, permission to travel over the trail was provided to certain community members. Open access to all publics was not restored.

The PAR inquiry lasted three years. During that time, local interest peaked and waned within the rhythm of daily preoccupations. As a result, solo interludes of action research were required of this facilitator. A question then surfaces as to whether how can the opportunity cost of participation by locals be offset?

Based on my experience, PAR can provide a facilitator and locals with methods for reporting on socio-cultural and environmental phenomena. Similar to the return to organic agriculture, an “organic,” locally-grown environmental dispute resolution process can tap into vital nutrients that inform the whole system. With further testing and refinement, PAR might incrementally build a more holistic social and environmental policy. I hope that you will join me in this exploration. In turn, a role might exist for conveners and foundations to shore up participation and fund pilot PAR initiatives.

Myriem Le Ferrand facilitates public policy development and planning. Her expertise includes socio-cultural assessment, appreciative inquiry and organizational development. She is experienced in cross-cultural and international settings. Current projects include a regional mediation center, an ecotourism partnership, land use planning, and a water settlement. To learn more contact: myriem@ecoisp.com, CALATHUS LLC, www.calathus.org.

Background

Since 1999, the U.S. Institute has engaged federal agency partners and, through the Policy Consensus Initiative (PCI), state agency partners in developing an evaluation framework and data collection instruments to more systematically evaluate ECR. To test the framework and advance broader use of these evaluation tools, the U.S. Institute launched MAES with funding from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and several federal agency partners. The U.S. Institute managed the collection and merging of case evaluation data from multiple agencies, including a number of cases identified by independent case practitioners. In all, post process survey data were collected on 52 cases from 523 participants and 58 practitioners. These cases from across the country were completed between late 2005 and early 2007. The cases focused on environmental, natural resource or public lands issues, and were agreement-seeking processes guided by neutral third parties. A diverse mix of ECR applications are represented in the data set. Examples include developing and revising natural resource plans, siting and constructing facilities, negotiating government rules, and resolving disputes in the context of administrative appeals or litigation.

Covering new ground

It is commonly acknowledged that ECR evaluations tend to focus on what can be easily measured, such as settlement rates and participant satisfaction, at the expense of ultimate outcomes such as changed relationships, conflict management behaviors, and improved environmental outcomes. The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, in closing out its conflict resolution program, noted this and other weaknesses in past evaluation efforts and stressed the need for evaluations that better capture the value of ECR.

The evaluation framework that underpins MAES covers the life cycle of an ECR process, encompassing the initial determination of whether or not ECR is appropriate, the execution of the collaborative process, and the achievement of ECR outcomes and impacts. The evaluation framework is constructed in the form of a logic model. More than 50 researchers, practitioners,

program managers, and evaluators from the ECR field were engaged in articulating the working principles of ECR and in designing the framework. Evaluation questions based on the framework elicited information on the independent accomplishments of ECR as well as the relative merits of ECR compared to other alternative forums for public decision making or dispute resolution. The findings, at the case and aggregate levels, will be helpful in demonstrating the specific value of ECR, the basis for investing in ECR, and some of the factors and dynamics that drive ECR success. Learning from MAES findings will help improve future applications of ECR.

More detailed background on MAES will be reported in a forthcoming article in *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* in early 2008.

Shedding light on ECR performance

Initial ECR performance findings were reported at the ACR Annual Meeting; more in-depth analysis is forthcoming. Among the early take-home messages are the positive perspectives shared by the majority of respondents:

- ECR resulted in progress on solving the environmental problems/ resolving the environmental issues;
- ECR processes significantly improved relationships and built trust among stakeholders; and
- More progress and better outcomes were achieved through ECR than alternative processes, such as litigation.

Further analysis of ECR performance is now underway, including an exploration of why differing perspectives regarding “agreement reached” often exist among stakeholders (another emerging theme from our initial cases analysis). Additionally, this effort will distill the commonly cited factors that participants and practitioners identified as having helped and/or hindered their efforts. A catalogue of ECR performance indicators will also be created to set the stage for follow-up tracking of long-term impacts of ECR.

Factors contributing to ECR success

In addition to assessing ECR performance, one of the primary objectives of this evaluation effort is to better understand the factors that contribute to ECR success. Specifically, the 52 case evaluations are being used to test the working theory of ECR (as captured in the evaluation framework), and to determine which of the factors under the control of project managers and practitioners are the strongest contributors to ECR success.

This part of the analysis uses multi-level modeling, a methodology widely recognized as the preferred way to analyze grouped data. This approach is appropriate for conflict resolution evaluation as it takes into consideration the fact that respondents are not independent of each other; indeed it is reasonable to assume that respondents for a specific case are working in a common context. This assumption has important statistical implications accounted for by multi-level modeling. MAES represents the first application of multi-level modeling to the analysis of ECR.

Using multi-level modeling, we tested the relationships among the factors in the evaluation model to better understand which factors are the strongest contributors to ECR success. For this analysis, we looked at three dimensions of ECR success: (1) reaching agreement, (2) creating quality agreements, and (3) improving participants' capacity to work together. Our preliminary results suggest that four factors stand out as key contributors to all three dimensions of ECR success:

- The extent to which participants are willing to collaborate at the beginning of the process,
- The relative challenge of the case as reported by the mediator/facilitator,
- The extent to which participants are effectively engaged, and
- The level of mediator/facilitator skills and practices.

It was also found that the extent to which relevant high quality information was integrated into the process strongly influenced the quality of the agreement.

A more detailed analysis of findings is being prepared for publication and will be presented at the ECR2008 Conference held in Tucson, May 20-22.

Conclusion

Increasing the appropriate and effective use of ECR necessitates a better demonstration of the value of ECR, and a better understanding of why some processes are more successful than others. What is emerging from this evaluation effort is a performance-based account of what can be accomplished with ECR, how ECR compares to alternative processes such as litigation, and key pointers on what drives success and how ECR can be improved. The results should translate into a better articulation of when and how ECR can create workable solutions to environmental conflicts.

About the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution is a federal program established by the U.S. Congress to assist parties in resolving environmental, natural resource, and public lands conflicts. The Institute is part of the Morris K. Udall Foundation, an independent federal agency of the executive branch overseen by a board of trustees appointed by the President. The Institute serves as an impartial, non-partisan institution providing professional expertise, services, and resources to all parties involved in such disputes, regardless of who initiates or pays for assistance. The Institute helps parties determine whether collaborative problem solving is appropriate for specific environmental conflicts, how and when to bring all the parties to the table, and whether a third-party facilitator or mediator might be helpful in assisting the parties in their efforts to reach consensus or to resolve the conflict. In addition, the Institute maintains a roster of qualified facilitators and mediators with substantial experience in environmental conflict resolution, and can help parties in selecting an appropriate neutral.

The perspectives expressed in this piece are those of U.S. Institute staff, Patricia Orr, Dale Keyes and Kirk Emerson, and draw on the work of evaluation consultant Kathy McKnight. The perspectives expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the data contributors, nor do they reflect the institutional perspective of the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Any errors or omissions are solely the responsibility of the authors. Contact Patricia Orr at orr@ecr.gov with any questions.

The Recent Evolution of Democracy by Matt Leighninger

Excerpted from Matt Leighninger, The Next Form of Democracy (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2006)

In the last ten years, I've found myself in the same situation over and over again. The recurring scene is a planning meeting: the people in the room are talking about how to mobilize citizens around a key issue in their community. The composition of the group varies from place to place, but it is usually a mix of public officials, long-time volunteers, neighborhood activists, and directors of nonprofit organizations. I am there to listen, and to describe what other communities have done.

For the most part, the tone of the discussion is hopeful: these are capable, confident people, leaders who believe that they can make progress on an issue like education, crime prevention, or public finance. They are talking about the difficulties of getting citizens, public officials, and community organizations to work together. Suddenly, the conversation comes to a complete halt: someone turns to me and says, "You've got to understand – it's different here. It's political."

The response to this statement is invariably the same: people nod solemnly, sigh, sometimes laugh a little ruefully, and move on. They act as though there is nothing they can do about "politics." They seem to think their community has been infected by some unique, incurable virus.

There are two ironies here. First, I have watched this scene being enacted so many times that I can

say, from firsthand experience, that the scourge of "politics" is not unique to any one community. People in very different cities and towns have very similar complaints; if they had the chance to talk it through, I suspect they would come to roughly the same conclusions about what is wrong with public decision-making and problem-solving.

Second, these leaders seldom realize that what they are doing, or planning to do, is changing the very nature of local politics. They may be focused on improving the schools, ending racism, or balancing the city budget, but their work is about more than that: they are trying to transform the way that citizens and government interact. They are part of a shift that is broader and deeper than they know.

In fact, we are all sailing on this same sea. In communities throughout North America, the skills, capacities, and frustrations of ordinary people are spilling over into the political process. Despite their disgust with politics, or perhaps because of it, citizens have become a stronger, more vocal force in public decision-making than at any time in the last 100 years. Obviously, these generalizations gloss over class and cultural differences – as usual, the 'haves' are more connected than the 'have nots,' raising the question of how changes in democracy may reinforce social inequalities – but even in economically impoverished neighborhoods like Southwest Delray Beach and Rochester's Sector 10, people are demonstrating both their impatience and their capacity for action.

At the same time, local leaders are trying to solve daunting public problems without the same levels of funding, legitimacy, and public trust that they used to enjoy. Practitioners in planning, education, law enforcement, human relations, environmental protection, housing, economic development, and public health are realizing that they need more support if they are going to succeed. They are increasingly unwilling or unable to sidestep citizens by hiding behind financial data or scientific jargon. They seem more aware of the benefits and complications presented by cultural difference. Many of them have experience as community organizers or neighborhood activists, and so they have seen the citizen-government divide from both sides of the barricade.

These conditions have set the stage for the development of democratic governance. It is neither a 'top-down' shift nor a sign of grassroots 'bottom-up' change: it is the result of both, interconnected, happening at the same time. And though these pressures are most visible at the local level, they are increasingly evident in regional, state, and federal politics as well. Citizens and officials are becoming frustrated with each other, and trying to find new ways to work together, even on policy questions like homeland security and pandemic influenza. The ripples are extending far beyond local politics, into the realms of the media, the Internet, presidential campaigns, and foreign policy.

It may be a little misleading to call this transition an "evolution"

of democracy, since that term implies that we are moving inevitably toward some higher, better, more advanced plane of public life. It is unclear what lies ahead. But to make the most of the changes, we need to move beyond the assumption that "It's different here." We're all in this together; we're all facing the question of how politics ought to function. At the beginning of the 21st Century, it is different in a lot of places.

Matt is the Executive Director of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium and Senior Associate of the Study Circles Resource Center; Hamilton, ON, Canada.

Diversity Mentoring Pilot Project Summary and Evaluation

by Dana Mason

The Diversity Mentoring Pilot Project (DMPP) was created, launched and coordinated by the EPP Diversity Mentoring Work Group, which is composed of a diverse range of practitioners in the EPP section who volunteered their time for the project (see Appendix A). The day-to-day project administration was carried out by the work group chairs Juliana Birkhoff and Mary Skelton Roberts and the work group coordinator, a RESOLVE associate whose hours were paid from the DMPP budget. From August 2003 to October 2004, the Work Group designed the DMPP. They designed and conducted the application process in 2005. Program activities took place from March 2006 through March 2007. The activities undertaken to develop, implement, and evaluate the DMPP are described below.

Developing and Designing the DMPP

To frame and define the scope of the project, the Work Group discussed the problem of the lack of diversity in the EPP section, theorizing that a system of mentoring might help address the problem. After considering several approaches, the Work Group decided to recruit mediators who already had good collaboration and consensus-building skills and who wished to learn to employ those skills in the environment and public policy arena.

Having developed a project proposal, the Work Group solicited support from the EPP section and ACR leadership. While both the section and ACR expressed support and a desire to learn from the pilot project, determining and coordinating project staffing and funding between ACR, EPP, and RESOLVE proved both difficult and time-consuming in the implementation phase of the project.

Recruiting and Selecting the Learning Partner-

Mentor Teams

The Work Group maintained a database of interested candidates, volunteer mentors, and EPP members who wished to help.

The Work Group developed and administered a recruitment and selection process for the project. In order to solicit interest in the program, the program announcement was widely to Committee contacts and lists. The announcement went to the Center for ADR, the Mediators of Color Alliance (MOCA), the ACR Diversity Committee a number of listservs and posted at relevant conferences. The announcement was also sent to a list the Committee developed from talking about the program at the Capital University Minorities in ADR conference.

In designing the application, the Work Group aimed to create an easy process that would allow them to determine 1) interest in environmental and public policy problems; 2) collaboration and consensus-building experience; and 3) ability to participate in the program.

Applicant feedback on the application process included the following comments:

- The application itself and the process was not easy;
- The application should consist of oral interviews, not written applications;
- The application seemed to require candidates to "prove" themselves, rather than inviting them to share their experiences; and
- Those who had no demonstrated interest in environmental or public policy issues should not be excluded.

Furthermore, the Work Group discovered that the

application process timeline was too long and that it was difficult to review applications by conference call.

The DMPP received completed applications from eight candidates and incomplete applications or indications of interest from another 10 people. After reviewing the applications, the Work Group selected four qualified learning partners. The Work Group then matched the learning partners (LPs) to volunteer mentors, EPP section members recruited on the basis of interest, location, and the correspondence of their skills and experiences to the LP's needs (see Appendix B). The process of matching the mentoring pairs took longer than anticipated and required a significant time investment on the part of the project administrators. One of the four LPs dropped out of the program after several months, citing a lack of time to devote to the project. The three learning partners who completed the project were Bruce Coleman, Tina Patterson, and Robyn Moore-Johnson. They were matched with mentors Maggie Lewis, Tim Mealey, and the mentoring team of Lucy Moore and Linda Ximenes, respectively."

Program Activities

Project launch. Once the mentoring teams were formed, the project administrators coordinated the initial contact between mentors and partners and provided materials developed by the Work Group to facilitate those contacts, including self-evaluation forms and a mentoring contract. An orientation conference call was then held with LPs, mentors, and Work Group members to give an overview of the project, introduce participants to each other, discuss expectations and goals, and answer participant questions.

Training workshop. The Work Group members and administrators scheduled, planned, and delivered training for LPs and mentors in July 2006. The DMPP training team identified training materials and developed new ones, producing a binder of materials for participants. The administrators handled logistics and fundraising to cover the costs of the training.

Learning partner-mentor interaction. Once the mentoring pairs had discussed expectations, set learning goals, and developed their contracts, the program anticipated that they would engage in regular conversations, that the learning partners would observe or assist the mentors with their cases, and

that the mentors would provide the LPs with feedback and advice, as well as introduce them to colleagues in the field. These activities were carried out to varying degrees among the mentoring pairs, depending on the circumstances and their time investment in the project.

Conference calls. The project work plan anticipated monthly peer learning (among the LPs only) and group learning (with LPs and mentors) conference calls. Given the time constraints on participants' schedules, these proved too difficult to schedule on a monthly basis, so they were held every other month. EPP section members were invited as guest speakers on the calls to talk to the group about specific aspects of their experiences as mediators in the EPP field.

Conferences. EPP donor Ramsay "Buzz" Wiesenfeld sponsored one of the LPs to attend the June 2006 EPP section conference. The law firm of Bilzin Sumberg Baena Price & Axelrod LLP offered the LPs frequent flyer miles to cover their travel to the 2007 EPP section meeting or ACR conference.

Project website. The work plan also envisaged the development of a project website, where participants could interact and post documents. Unfortunately, the website was never developed, due to a number of factors – the Work Group was unable to identify an appropriate host for the website, the project lacked the resources to develop it, and participants were already devoting significant time to other project activities.

Program Evaluation

To evaluate the project, a subcommittee of the DMPP Work Group prepared a questionnaire and distributed it to the three learning partners (LPs), four mentors, and three administrators participating in the project. The evaluators, who were not involved in the program design or administration, followed up on the questionnaires with individual calls to participants when warranted. The evaluation summary that follows gives an overview of the feedback, categorized by the major aspects or phases of the program, and documents participants' specific suggestions for program improvement.

Candidate Selection and Mentor-Learning Partner Pairing Process

Several participants cited distance between the

partners and lack of travel funds as the greatest obstacles to carrying out project activities.

Project Start-Up

While some LPs felt that the project's objectives were clearly expressed, some mentors mentioned that there was a need for more clarity regarding the program's expectations of the LPs, the program schedule, and the time commitment involved for LPs. Several participants noted that the self-evaluation and the mentoring contracts were useful in clarifying expectations and the LPs' sense of their own needs; however, not all LP-mentor pairs completed the contracts.

Training Workshop

All the respondents said that the training was a valuable and productive experience. Some mentors would have preferred to have more time with their LPs and less time with the other mentors. Although the mentoring pairs were surveyed in advance of the training to determine learning needs, one mentor's comments suggested that gathering additional information would be useful in order to better custom-design the training. An administrator observed that organizing the workshop engaged and focused the energies and resources of the participants, Work Group members (who planned the training), and project donors.

An LP noted that the opportunity to meet with people of color who are successful in the field was very helpful. Some mentioned that more networking opportunities would be beneficial.

Mentor / Learning Partner Interaction

Participants expressed appreciation for the opportunities to meet one-on-one in their pairs and many would have liked to meet more frequently, but were hampered by distance or competing commitments. The mentors in particular expressed a desire for feedback on the support they provided to the LPs. Some LPs said they would like more opportunities to facilitate or mediate on actual cases.

Conference Calls

LPs and mentors frequently cited the value of the conference calls held with experienced practitioners in the field and several participants said they would like to have more such calls. Some respondents observed, however, that the calls were not always well attended.

Project Administration & Timing

Many participants mentioned that the difficulty of scheduling conference calls and meetings was a source of frustration. Some observed that it was difficult to juggle the program requirements with other demands of their professional and personal lives. In addition, an administrator felt that the program required more administrative involvement and coordination than current funding levels allowed.

Other timing-related issues identified were:

- Changes in project deadlines (for the applications) were detrimental.
- The timing of the project cycle was an issue, as the summer is not the best time to have project experience opportunities to offer LPs.
- It was difficult to sustain the engagement of Work Group members (who are volunteers) throughout the course of a year, given their professional engagements.

Changes / Improvements to the Project

Participants commended the EPP section, the volunteer mentors and Work Group members, and the project administrators for their efforts and expressed appreciation for the proactive approach. They encouraged the section to continue with the project next year. One LP advised that the number of participants was appropriate and should remain at that level. Respondents also offered the following suggestions for improving the program:

- Funding for travel: The most frequently-suggested change was that funding be allocated for LPs to travel to trainings and to attend cases with their mentors.
- Project funding: Increased funding would allow for more involved and sustained project support. Participants mentioned they would like more trainings, more conference calls, and more networking opportunities.
- Mentor-LP proximity: A frequently-mentioned suggestion was that LPs and mentors be located in close proximity to each other.
- Recruitment and selection process: Respondents had a number of suggestions on the recruitment process. Their ideas included the following:
 - Inviting individual practitioners and firms to nominate LPs that work for or are associated with them.

- Inviting practitioners to look for grassroots leaders in their processes who are interested in the field and then apply jointly to the DMPP as a mentor-LP pair.
- Recruiting minority participants in the University of Texas Law School Leadership program and other potentially relevant programs.
- Conducting more in person outreach at minority dispute resolution conferences, such as the spring ABA conference, Capitol University's annual event for minorities in ADR (Ohio), and the June Center for ADR conference (Maryland).
- Conducting more in person outreach to organizations that represent people of color, such as the Center for ADR, the Mediators of Color Alliance (MOCA), the ABA section of DR Diversity Committee.
- Expectations: The expected outcome should be more clearly defined, including whether LPs are expected to become EPP members or conduct outreach to other minorities. The program needs to assure that LPs are clear about the program expectations and are willing to commit the necessary time, energy and resources.
- Mentoring teams: A mentor suggested that instead of assigning a sole mentor, there could be a primary mentor along with a team of secondary mentors, who could assist or offer supplementary activities. This approach was attempted with one of the mentoring groups, and it had some early success in allowing the mentors to back each other up when one mentor was not available, but the LP's relationship with one of the mentors apparently tapered off over time.
- Project cycle: The project schedule should be more clearly defined. A suggested schedule would be advertising in the spring, selecting candidates in

the summer, holding the training in the fall, and conducting mentoring through the fall, winter and spring.

Possible Alternative Approaches

Some respondents had suggestions for taking a different approach to the next pilot project and their recommendations included:

- Encouraging and supporting organization or firm-run mentoring programs.
- Training EPP members into how to mentor so that people would be ready if they met someone and had an opportunity.
- Organizing a "diversity club" that allows EPP members and LPs to provide each other support in mentoring efforts; the club would come together at ACR or EPP events. LPs could be involved in the effort and help with outreach to minority groups.
- Encouraging EPP members to look for meeting participants who have an affinity for EPP work and meet with them about their potential for getting into the field.
- Asking USIECR to create an accessible list of minorities interested in observing or assisting in EPP projects.
- Maintaining a database of candidates of color that EPP members could access when they have job openings or project assignments.
- Having an on-the-job training or apprenticeship program. A model program or one that EPP members could become involved in is the New Voices National Fellowship Program, funded by the Ford Foundation. EPP member organizations could apply to the program to become host organizations for fellows, who are young people of color entering the nonprofit sector. The fellowship covers the fellow's salary for a year.

Appendix A. Work Group Members: Juliana E. Birkhoff, co-chair, Mary Skelton Roberts, co-chair, Murl Baker, Dan Baldwin, Jeff Blair, Xantha Bruso, Joan Calcagno, Kathleen Conway, Deborah Dalton, Tom Fee, Jan Marie Fritz, Laura Kaplan, Catherine McCracken, Rafael Montalvo, Patricia Moore, Monique Pierel, Gregory Sobel, Tom Taylor, Kimberly Vogel, Larry Williams.

Appendix B.

Learning Partners

Robyn Moore-Johnson
Dallas, Texas

Tina Patterson
Washington, DC

Bruce Coleman
Columbus, OH

Mentors/Mentoring Teams

Lucy Moore - Santa Fe, NM
Linda Ximenes - San Antonio, TX

Tim Mealey - Washington, DC

Maggie Lewis - Columbus, OH

SAVE THE DATE: ACR-EPP Conference

The 2008 Environment and Public Policy Section Conference will be on **Monday, May 19, in Tucson, Arizona**. Further information will be made available on ACR Environment and Public Policy Section's website (<http://www.mediate.com/acrepp/>) as it becomes available.

The section conference will be held in conjunction with the National Environmental Conflict Resolution Conference (sponsored by the US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, May 20 - 22). Information concerning the ECR conference is available at <http://www.ecr.gov/ecr.asp?link=600>.



Conferences and Dates of Interest by Catherine McCracken

**Note: Information correct as of December 2007 – be sure to confirm via organization websites.*

The Quivira Coalition 7th Annual Conference

January 17-19, 2008
Albuquerque, New Mexico
For more information: www.quiviracoalition.org

American Bar Association Midyear Meeting

February 6-12, 2008
Los Angeles, California
For more information: www.abanet.org/mtd

Aspen Environmental Forum

March 26-30, 2008
Aspen, Colorado
For more information: www.aspeninstitute.org

American Bar Association 10th Annual Section of Dispute Resolution Spring Conference

April 3-5, 2008
Seattle, Washington
For more information: www.abanet.org/dispute

American Planning Association's 100th National Planning Conference

April 27-May 1, 2008
Las Vegas, Nevada

For more information: www.planning.org/2008conference

Interaction 2008 - Conflict Resolution Network Canada Biennial Conference

May 7-9, 2008
Ottawa, Ontario
For more information: www.crnetwork.ca

4th National Coalition for Dialogue & Deliberation Conference

October 3-5, 2008
Austin, Texas
For more information: www.thataway.org

The ACR EPP Section is always looking for articles and story ideas for the newsletter. Contact the Communications Committee Chair, Bryant Kuechle at (208) 739-3048 or bkuechle@langdongroupinc.com.