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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Conflict exists at all levels of individual contact in higher education, influencing the lives of students, staff, faculty, and administrators. Warters (2000a) has identified a variety of potential sources for conflict on campuses including resident halls, fraternities/sororities, student legal services, faculty/teaching assistants, off-campus housing, security/campus police, student government, and personnel. Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1977) have identified reasons why college/university campuses may be more open to conflict than other types of organizations. These reasons include the lack of a clearly articulated institutional mission, their internal and external stakeholders demanding a role in the decision-making process, and a vulnerability to external political, economic, and demographic challenges. There are also some issues unique to the campus setting including academic freedom, intellectual property, and faculty/staff-student personal relationships (Volpe & Chandler, 1998).

It is clear that the cost of handling such conflicts in time, opportunity, and dollars is significant. In 1997 legal defense expenses for employment-related cases alone averaged annual costs of $110,000 at public institutions and $175,000 at private institutions in the United States (Hutter, 2003). Corporate estimates are in excess of $100,000 as a cost to defend a wrongful termination suit (Ford & Barnes-Slater, 2006). In 1994 18 million such cases filed in the U.S. courts resulted in a cost of more than $300 billion (Levine, 2006). These costs include attorney and other professional fees, lost time, loss of relationships, and emotional stress. As a result, other more cost-effective dispute resolution processes
like mediation and facilitation could be a benefit to campus communities, replacing expensive litigation and other adversarial processes.

Within the past twenty-five years, great strides have been made in the introduction and implementation of systems for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in our civil courts and through networks of community dispute resolution centers throughout the United States (Bush & Folger, 1994). Introduced to campus settings, this trend has resulted in a variety of services promoting “win-win” dispute resolution alternatives. Services that can be provided through a campus center can include training, conflict coaching, conciliation, facilitation, and mediation (Thomas, 2006). At present over 225 programs nationwide have been registered with Wayne State University’s Campus Conflict Resolution Project, with programs available for students, faculty, and staff (Warters, 2004). This project was established in 2000 with the award of a Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant, which supported the development of the project’s web site, www.campus-adr.org. This site documents the existence of campus mediation programs as representatives choose to self-report basic information relating to the demographics of their campus setting and the type of services offered. It also serves as a significant resource for dispute resolution research, programming, and services within and outside of the campus community.

The site www.campus-adr.org also has excellent information on how to organize a campus center and other sources like Michigan’s Community Dispute Resolution Program (Michigan State Court Administrative Office, 2006) and Campus Judicial Consulting (Olshak, 1997) offer specific process training materials to prepare service providers in ADR processes. Little information however, is available about what campus
centers actually do regarding organization, specific processes practiced, and the specific training models or systems they use to prepare service providers from a lack of prior research. As various campus dispute resolution centers gain experience and build successful program reputations, opportunities exist to improve mediation center designs and promote their growth in all university settings nationwide based upon the successes of their peer institutions.

University staff with responsibilities for resolving issues of conflict among campus stakeholders, but without a formalized, practical system for ADR, could benefit from the availability of a standardized, conflict resolution procedure. Such a procedure could be developed from a study of the “best practices” of systems currently implemented in campus settings and deemed successful by their administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify in greater detail the practices, processes and measurable successes identified by existing campus mediation/dispute resolution programs. To accomplish these tasks, programs identified through www.campus-adr.org were surveyed and asked to identify the primary mediation process/model used, the perceptions of mediation staff regarding the success of such processes, measureables that would identify those successes, and what staff members consider to be “best practices” within their respective systems. As significant successes were identified through this survey process, select campus program representatives were then asked to participate in a telephone interview to gather more detailed program information.

Through the course of this study, particular emphasis was given to adherence to the theoretical process and how mediators are prepared to assist disputants in seeking
resolution to their own conflicts. This information facilitated the identification of “model” campus mediation process steps appropriate for the continuous improvement of existing systems and can serve as maps for those campuses interested in development of their own programs.

Research Questions

The following research questions were be considered in this study of campus-based, mediation systems:

1. What types of ADR/mediation processes are available and are being utilized for faculty and staff in campus settings?
2. What types of training practices qualify ADR staff members to serve as mediators or provide ADR services on campus?
3. To what extent are the ADR/mediation processes used in campus settings based upon recognized, theoretical model(s)?
4. How have campus ADR/mediation center staff members measured the success of their programs?
5. Are there components of campus ADR/mediation processes that warrant recognition as a “best practices” by campus mediation center staff?
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To best develop a framework for this study, three focus areas for the literature review were considered. Understanding the history of ADR systems and their recent growth both outside and inside campus settings offers insight to the utilization of these systems and some explanation of their origins. Realizing that economics provide the basis and support for all business and educational institutions, the "business case" review will highlight the cost advantages of ADR systems in contrast to more adversarial methods. And finally with the identification and description of various ADR processes including mediation, methods identified by the campus programs participating in the study can be better understood for evaluation.

History of ADR Systems on Campus

Historically ADR systems in campus settings have grown from ombuds offices to formalized mediation programs, used to supplement more traditional methods like grievance procedures (from collective bargaining agreements) and "open door policies" for administrative/management intervention (Warters, 2001). Particularly the ombuds role grew as a method to deal with campus unrest present in the 1960's and 1970's (Warters, 2000a). Such functions represented the first "neutral" roles available for dealing with conflict in a non-punitive fashion.

Subsequently, mediation as an ADR process for campus settings developed recognition in the early 1980's with support from the American Arbitration Association and by the publication of a special issue of the journal New Directions in Higher Education dedicated in support of such systems (McCarthy, 1980). In the 1990's support
for mediation systems continued to grow as demonstrated by the first National Conference on Campus Mediation Programs held at Syracuse University in 1990 (Warters, 2000a). Subsequently other conferences were held and national organizations formed to support the use of mediation on college/university campuses and in K-12 systems. Part of that support deals with the preparation of service providers to offer ADR intervention. In 1995 and 1996 the National Association of College and University Attorneys (NACUA) offered two specific training sessions to prepare university attorneys in non-litigious methods to help individuals resolve disputes (Warters, 2001).

Grievance procedures emphasize a method of due process related to the terms and conditions of a contract. Often disputes are not related to contract language, but to other issues that arise among individuals and their respective relationships (Roberts, 2003). In campus settings, these could involve varied groups of stakeholders including faculty, staff, and students and often result from dysfunction created by the more traditional, organizational structure of a college or university (Todaro, Brattlie, & Stafford, 2002). These disputes may be initiated to air a variety of non-contract issues, as no other reasonable alternatives are present. As a result, grievance resolutions often fall short of dealing with the true concerns of individuals and indeed, can result in long-term damage to personal and employment-related relationships. By design, grievance procedures are based upon a "win-lose" model of dispute resolution, often resulting in decisions that appear more "lose-lose" in content (Stulberg & Love, 1997).

Factions from either management or union groups have assumed roles defined by power-based methods of dispute resolution. To offer alternatives often challenges unions' existence and can establish them as the natural opponents to these systems changes.
Considering the role of the transformational leader (Burns, 1978), the best solution is to involve and re-train this population in these methods and remove the threat to their ongoing existence. As the value is identified by example, these stakeholders may likely become the strongest support base for change and by Senge’s model (1994), can work to “inspire” the population by showing the value of developing methods for peaceful solutions.

Other ADR processes offer alternatives to traditional, employment “grievance” handling methods and litigation. Specifically mediation methods of dispute resolution support the collegial model of college/university organization by offering a process for dispute resolution emphasizing a balance and role-sharing for decision making (Ramaley, 2002).

The Business Case for ADR in Higher Education

The costs of managing conflicts and disputes within any organization are significant and can be analyzed as factors of both dollar costs and time (Ford, 2003). Considering actual costs, budgets are developed specifically for the purpose of defense based upon litigation models in many organizations. Attorneys are retained (and often employed) for support and counsel for all steps of grievance systems and may eventually be used as the primary resource, if disputes are forwarded to a third-party for a decision. Litigation models are expensive by design. For business organizations outside of higher education, organizational defense claim were averaged between $100,000 and $115,000 in 1986 (Hanrahan, 2004). From 1992 to 1997 the cost of a legal defense claim on a college/university campus rose 250 percent, from an average of $70,000 to $175,000 per incident (Casper, 1998). In comparison a study from 1980 to 1988 showed that the cost of
mediation was less than twenty percent on the average to that of seeking an opinion from an arbitrator (Ury, Brett, & Goldberg, 1988).

Costs may also be considered a function of time and capital. Disputes divert significant human and material resources from their defined purposes. These costs are represented within the hours spent by staff and the associated materials that are channeled away from the purpose and intent of their institutional role(s). Collaborative models of dispute resolution like mediation help reduce time otherwise spent in the avoidance of issues, hiding information, and reducing workplace efficiencies by posturing defensively (Slaikeu & Hasson, 1998). Grievance systems tend to “drain public resources” and fail to represent the intent of the larger community, including students, tax payers, trustees, donors, alumni, and other university stakeholders (Hutter, 2003).

Grievance systems by design are slow. Even in the presence of defined time-limiters for response, days often turn into weeks, months, or years before a resolution is met. The typical grievance system usually has a minimum of three, progressive steps (Colsky, 2003). Each of these steps can have multiple phases of response with separate, defined time-limiters. Each step, by design, also represents an escalation of the dispute in terms of the actual costs and often the emotional costs of all involved parties.

By tradition, grievance systems have persisted as rights-based and have not focused upon the building or maintenance of relationships (Colsky, 2003). Rights-based systems can be either advisory (non-binding) or determinative (binding), in either case involving the introduction of a third party to introduce an opinion or final decision (Stitt, 1998). They also focus on which side has the most power measured in strength, wealth, politics, and/or status (Cloke, 2001). Costs associated with morale, poor
leadership/management styles, and "lingering animosities" build and add to the actual costs of these litigious methods (Roberts, 2003). And unfortunately, two significant concerns remain. The first of these is that the conclusion of a grievance is usually a formal decision, without a requirement for a long-term solution of the issue that spawned the original dispute. The second concern is that the disputants themselves are distanced within the dispute resolution process and their interests are often not considered in any eventual decision.

As employee relationships ("employee/employee" and "employee/supervisor") continue, systems must be utilized to assure solutions are institutionalized. Hutter (2003) asserts, "When it comes to internal disputes, colleges and universities must throw off the cloak of feigned collegiality, which often delays the onset of genuine conflict resolution, and open the conversation" (p. 3). By putting off (or often ignoring) disputes, situations continue to escalate to a point that power-based solutions may be the most reasonable means for (short-term) solution. Mediation and other ADR-based systems offer solutions for dispute resolution with long-term, institutional benefits.

The System(s) of ADR

Overview

To better understand the relationships among various ADR processes, authors have projected how these processes relate to individuals' behavior toward conflict. Stulberg and Love (1996) offer the systems model shown in Figure 1.
CONFLICT MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

- Avoid the Conflict
- Talk about it & Problem Solve
- Negotiate
- Mediate
- Top Down Decision by Authority
- Outsider Makes Decision
- Court, Law, i.e. Legislative Decision
- Non-violent Action
- Violent Action

People Involved in Coming to Their Own Decision
Third Party Decides
Legal Decision by a Third Party
Forced Decision may be Extra-legal

INCREASED COERCION AND LIKELIHOOD OF WIN/LOSE OUTCOME
INCREASED COST IN TIME, ENERGY, MONEY
DECREASED EMPHASIS ON RELATIONSHIP

INTERESTS

RIGHTS

POWER

Figure 1. ADR Systems and Conflict Management Options (Stulberg & Love, 1996, p. 4)

According to Stulberg and Love’s model, methods to address conflict may be shown on a continuum. Those processes that allow the conflicting parties to work toward their own solutions are shown to the left, associated with the techniques of negotiation and mediation. In the middle, “third parties” identified as arbitrators, judges, and court systems, assume that decision-making process. To the right, social control may be lost with the introduction of non-violent protests or possibly violent actions. Moving from left to right, conflicting parties lose control of decision process. They likewise move away from a personal interest focus toward a power focus. Without question, this model supports the use of negotiation and mediation methods to recognize and value the true interests of conflicting parties.
Moore (2003) projects the same basic model, shown in Figure 2.

Moore’s model emphasizes that while negotiations may be the most common way to reach mutually acceptable agreements, mediation proves to be more successful when dialog is difficult to initiate or in the face of impasse among parties. In addition he identifies an administrative or executive dispute resolution approach, allowing for the involvement of third parties who may have an organizational membership, but are not otherwise associated with the disputants. These representatives would also utilize a mediation model, differing only in their internal relationship as opposed to a true neutral from outside of the organization.

Some explanation of why mediation processes are often favored over other ADR techniques can be derived from a more detailed view of conflict itself. Crawley and Graham (2002) have defined a “conflict zone” that separates disputants based upon differences in their respective environments, behaviors, beliefs/values, and needs. Their model is represented in Figure 3.
This model by Crawley and Graham emphasizes a variety of subject matter or “layers” of potential opposition, each of which may represent a gap in understanding. The differences among individuals with respect to these subjects offers a prime base for conflict and becomes the mediator’s or third party’s basis for supporting the dispute resolution process. Disputants are often not able on their own to express these differences. They may require outside assistance to initiate dialogue and build paths toward solutions in the face of these differing life positions and mental models. Identifying and building a basic understanding of these differences can represent a mediator’s primary approach.

Ury, Brett, and Goldberg (1988) identify a balance necessary for an effective, interest-based, dispute resolution system. In this example the components of interests, rights and power are used to show how a distressed system or one emphasizing the strength of power over interests, differs from a more interest-based model. A systems
design challenge then is how to proceed from a power-based model and successfully "turn the pyramid over."

Cloke and Goldsmith (2001) offer a more basic understanding of the dynamics of a particular dispute and how the mediation of common interests can be a valuable technique in resolution. Figure 5 represents how a basic conflict unfolds.

Figure 4. Moving from a Distressed to an Effective Dispute Resolution System (Ury, Brett, and Goldberg, 1988, p. 19)
If A attacks B (A ➔ B), B can respond in several ways:

- A ➔ Counterattack
- A ➔ Defend
- B ➔ Roll over
- B ➔ C ➔ Blame someone else
- B ➔ Run away
- B ➔ Refuse to budge
- A ➔ Undermine A

Figure 5. How the Conflict Between Two Individuals (Party A and Party B) Develops (Cloke & Goldsmith, 2001, p. 34)

In this example, note that in each of Party B’s responses, Party A is more dominant and powerful, while Party B appears weaker and merely responds to cues. Party A also gets something from every one of Party B’s responses: If Party B counterattacks, Party A succeeds in getting attention, support, or sympathy by no longer appearing to be the initiator; If Party B withdraws, Party A wins; If Party B becomes defensive, Party A can say she/he is not being “heard”; If Party B refuses to budge (or blames others), Party A claims Party B’s refusal to accept responsibility; or Party A may even look like the innocent victim of Party B’s unprovoked attack to an outsider. Mediation is offered as a process to lead the parties away from warfare based upon various power bases and toward opportunity through the understanding of common interests and values. Figure 6 illustrates a number of practical ways to shift toward potential collaboration.
Figure 6. The Development of Collaboration Among Conflicting Individuals (Party A and Party B) (Cloke & Goldsmith, 2001, p. 37)

As shown in each of the collaborative responses, the cycle of aggressive or defensive responses is halted. The mediator is responsible to assist the disputants from focusing on “people” issues to exploring topics of mutual concern. Collaborative interaction can begin with simple steps, each of which can be part of a strategy to create solutions rather than obstacles.

Ombuds Programs

Ombuds programs traditionally handled citizens’ complaints toward governmental agencies. Now organizational ombuds are used widely for internal issues on college/university campuses (Slaikeu & Hasson, 1998, p. 94). Broadly defined, ombuds are individuals that use a variety of techniques to resolve disputes, including counseling, mediating, conciliating, and fact-finding (Masters & Albright, 2002). Appearing on campuses as early as the 1960’s, ombuds offices were established in response to the unrest of that era (Packwood, 1977). Michigan State University was one of the first large universities to open an office in 1967 (Warters, 2001). These early
offices focused on the establishment of a neutral, confidential, and safe place to seek guidance and support toward the resolution of disputes.

Differing from some campus mediation programs, ombuds programs avoid affiliation with academic programs and/or particular administrative functions (like Human Resources). This independence is crucial to the maintenance of their neutral, confidential role (Griffin, 2002). Their missions typically are to provide information and assistance by consultation and to make organizational recommendations to administrators and decision-making bodies. While mediation may be a service they provide, they are more likely to work to identify the steps a disputant might follow to resolve their own concern or issue.

Campus ombuds work continuously to stay current with the issues, trends, and legal aspects of higher education and with their particular institution (Kelly, 2003). They likewise must maintain skills in ADR methods, restorative justice, and communications. To support the ombuds’ role, the University and College Ombuds Association (1999) offers a code of ethics grounded in the principles of objectivity, independence, accessibility, confidentiality, and justice.

*Interest-Based Bargaining (IBB)*

In recent years, unions have recognized the limits of antiquated grievance processes and have begun to seek IBB-like solutions to resolve their disputes (Colsky, 2003). Originally used as an alternative to more traditional labor contract negotiations, IBB systems today have been developed to deal specifically with grievance issues. In comparison to a mediation system, rather than a single mediator, a team of trained management and labor representatives serve to facilitate a process focusing on problem
resolution and de-emphasizing right and wrong. The IBB process has been developed from the methodology offered by Fisher and Ury (1991). This method includes separating people issues from the central problem, focusing on true interests - not positions, the invention of options for mutual gain, and the use of objective criteria. Participants in the IBB process are typically trained to follow process steps according to these principles (Stack, 2003):

1) one disputant’s gain should not be at the expense of the other disputant(s);
2) a free-flow of information should exist, without concealment or misrepresentation, for mutual use and understanding;
3) parties become responsible for the search for solutions that meet the needs of all involved parties;
4) parties will work toward understanding the needs and concerns of all involved parties;
5) parties will follow the defined process and avoid unpredictable or confusing behaviors;
6) parties will maintain an atmosphere of mutual dignity and respect; and
7) everyone will participate in issue analysis, the search for reasonable solutions, and the drafting of resolution agreements.

Stack (personal communication, March 13, 2003) confirms that this IBB process can follow the same approach as Moore’s (2003) administrative dispute resolution method. IBB systems demand the commitment of staff to be trained in IBB techniques and provide the time and attention necessary for the process. While this represents some additional costs in time and training over the use of traditional mediation, the benefits
come from that involvement of internal resources. Participants should represent a variety of constituents, who support this effort for the institution and so develop a culture of reasonable dispute resolution ideals.

Both ombuds programs and interest-based bargaining, as dispute resolution processes, deal with unique circumstances and as such, are not appropriate for a more general category of campus disputes. Mediation as a process may be applied to a variety of conflicts involving two or more parties who are capable of finding solutions for their disagreements with some assistance.

The Process of Mediation

Mediation Defined

The US Office of Personnel Management (2006) has defined mediation as a traditional ADR technique that can be effectively used to resolve, reduce, or even eliminate workplace disputes. Warters (2000a, p. 6) adds that “mediation is generally a voluntary, semi-structured process where a neutral or impartial third party assists the disputing parties in identifying, and hopefully satisfying, their individual and mutual interests relative to the dispute.” Other definitions focus on various roles the mediator might play in the mediation process. These may include housekeeper, ringmaster, educator, communicator, and innovator (Masters & Albright, 2002).

Riskin (1996) offered one of the first models to define the roles of mediators through the use of a two-dimensional grid. One dimension differentiates between evaluation (the offering of an educated opinion) and facilitation (methods that support disputing parties reaching their own solutions). Evaluation is a more directive approach and utilizes a range of techniques from developing complete solutions to offering specific
opinions as optional solutions (Young, 2003). Facilitation follows a process that defines the role of the mediator as a neutral, utilizes process management techniques, and supports active listening as a primary skill for the participants. Riskin’s second dimension considers the scope of the dispute – from narrow to broad. Narrow dispute topics may form around a single transaction between two parties. Broad transactions could involve multiple concerns involving several parties and a broad constituency. In application of this grid, quadrants like “broad evaluative” define the role a mediator would assume when faced with a particular type of dispute.

**Figure 7.** Riskin’s Grid (Riskin, 1996, p. 25)

Criticism has been raised regarding Riskin’s approach to defining mediators’ roles. Kovach and Love (1998) express a concern for associating evaluation with mediation, seeing the later as a distinctly different process. They identify the evaluator’s role as one with an expertise in a particular area (the law) and who accordingly uses that expertise to render an opinion. The focus therefore is only on legal matters and may not
deal with other issues in dispute. Currie (2004) identifies mediation as a true alternative to the legal process and therefore it should not be associated with other methods as Riskin’s grid might suggest. The mediator’s role should be defined by the process and how the mediator was prepared to act, as opposed to an evaluation of the particular conflict. Young (2005) suggests that evaluation is a more “heavy-handed” style often used by less skilled mediators, who may not be prepared to deal with all the dimensions of a particular dispute.

Mediation Models

Adler (2003) has identified three primary approaches to mediation - facilitative, evaluative, and transformative. All of these models are based upon the central idea of the mediator as a neutral facilitator of the process – not in any way a decision-maker. The disputants would assume the responsibility of developing their own solutions and without a question, would need to deal with relationship issues as they are identified.

Considering these models, each may be associated with their particular structures of directive and non-directive approaches to psychological intervention. More directive mediation methods mirror those in “rational emotive therapy” (RET), including providing feedback and questions intended to identify statements of “musts” and “absolutes” (Ellis & Harper, 1975, pp. 203-204). Mediators following an evaluative process would ask directive questions similar to the process followed through RET to facilitate a “cognitive restructuring” (Rubin & McNeil, 1985, p. 431). This method serves to motivate a disputant to substitute a more rational belief for one that was represented in the original position statement(s). These initial irrational positions often fall within the categories of fear, discomfort, and single-solution mindsets (Voyles, 2003). Fear often freezes
disputants into indecision, considering a variety of “what ifs” which are beyond the scope of the existing conflict. Discomfort is manifested in a reluctance to engage in problem solving. Sometimes it seems easier to pass an ultimate decision on to a “third party” to make the decision without participation. Single-solution mindsets are difficult to break, as disputants often focus on their original position statement and do not consider what their true needs and interests are.

Modeling, another RET technique, is also used through directed questioning. The mediator asks the disputant(s) to consider which solutions are possible and realistic (Darley, Glucksberg, Kamin, & Kinchla, 1984). This is accomplished often by having the disputant(s) consider their “best alternative to a negotiated agreement” or BATNA (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1991, pp. 97-106). This intervention serves to duplicate Ellis’ method of replacing irrational thoughts identified in his “A-B-C” analysis of clients’ position statements (Ellis & Harper, 1975, pp. 119-120).

Moving toward less directive techniques, facilitative mediation softens the approach of the mediator and uses methods that are less challenging. Diagramming the results of conversations as they occur between disputants is a common technique used in this process. Outlined in the “BADGER” process advocated by Michigan’s State Court Administrative Office, this method develops an ever-changing, written agenda for following the mediation process (Stulberg & Love, 1996). Considering a variety of learning styles of individuals, this technique offers visual and cognitive cues to assist with the identification of common issues and needs. Klatt (2004) used the term “drilldown” to explain how progressive steps of diagramming can be effective in developing specific and mutually satisfying solutions for all involved parties.
Transformative mediation, best represented by the *Redress* system of the United States Postal Service (USPS), follows the most non-directive process steps in mediation (USPS, 1999). Following Bush and Folger's (1994) approach, the mediator's primary concern is the relationship between/among disputants, with a focus on "congruence." This is defined as the close matching of awareness and experience (Brammer & Shostrom, 1977). If a disputant is aware of communicating a particular feeling, they are more likely to be "congruent" or able to own or identify that emotion. Mediators' most directive technique is to identify and affirm the expression of emotion through the mediation session. With concentration on the relationship, they will model an unconditional positive regard for all disputants, similar to Rogerian theory (Rubin & McNeil, 1985).

Billikopf (2004) was inspired by the work of Carl Rogers in his definition of "party-directed" mediation. As with Rogers' client-centered approach, he believes that disputants come to mediation with their own solutions. The mediator facilitates the identification and definition of those solutions through particular steps in the mediation process. No matter what the parties express, the mediator will continue to facilitate open conversation among all parties, offering only an occasional question or suggestion to move the process along. The ultimate emphasis is creating the atmosphere for the disputants to truly develop their own solutions with as little intervention as possible. This helps to model future behavior to resolve disputes, as most conflicts arise from particular relationships, not just singular transactions (Roberts, 2003). Epstein (2003) uses the term "elephant inside the tent" to describe these "emotional" issues that drive personality conflicts, surfacing as particular work-place issues. Non-directive methods work then to
focus on long-term relationships and less on the particular subjects that lead individuals to seek intervention.

Contemporary Alternatives

Other methods in ADR have been developed, often times representing some combination of skill sets offered through various models of mediation and negotiation. Peer complaint resolutions systems utilize a panel of peers, trained in a peer review process, to hear disputed cases and render opinions and/or binding decisions (Caras, 1987). By the definition of the system adopted, panels will offer only those decisions developed by consensus or a majority. In employment systems, panels are comprised of both management/administrative staff and peer employees, often with a majority of the latter. While deemed to be impartial, panelists may be excluded from cases that represent an obvious work-relationship conflict (Masters & Albright, 2002).

While peer review systems do involve the decision of a third-party (the panel), this process represents a reasonable method to include in a menu of ADR systems that are available to resolve and in some cases, prevent disputes (Noble, 2004).

In some organizations, the idea of a menu of ADR techniques available to meet specific needs has been recognized as an appropriate system to deal with internal conflict. This may differ from the approach that supports only one, specific process to handle all referred disputes. Benjamin (2004) suggests that many ADR/mediation practitioners have become involved in "style wars," recognizing only the methodology that they tend to practice as the appropriate method. This type of theoretical conflict may limit the opportunities to support disputants in their search for assistance. Lynch (2004) has introduced the Integrated Conflict Management System (ICMS) as a model of integrated
systems. This ICMS approach has two, basic components. The first component represents the availability of a variety of ADR processes that may be selected by professionals to meet the specific needs of a dispute. Recognizing that many disputes are complex and may change as ADR processes are engaged, there is also the allowance for multiple entry and exit points within processes, to allow for the selection of specific ADR components to deal with particular circumstances.

The second component of ICMS is the development of a culture within the organization that supports the use of such a system and recognizes the value of ADR systems to foster internal dispute resolution. ICMS systems may be adopted through a “gap analysis” process that considers the culture and existing dispute resolution systems within an organization.

Warters (2000b) considers variations in mediators’ style, suggesting that mediation process methods have value in different dispute situations and that practitioners should have the flexibility to choose their style within their system, depending upon the circumstances they face. He identifies some continuums representing these styles including “bargaining vs. therapeutic,” “problem-solving vs. transformative,” “evaluative vs. facilitative,” and “settlement-oriented vs. restorative,” recognizing that each may be identified by skill sets to be deemed more appropriate to the particular setting and circumstance. In campus settings, depending on the affiliation of the campus program to a particular administrative/academic department, single process methods only may be supported by design. This may limit the range of service and methods available by not recognizing the strengths of different methodologies.
Conclusions

Within the past two decades, ADR systems have developed and matured in communities, within court systems, and on campus settings across the nation. This growth is supported by the economic advantages of ADR processes over adversarial conflict resolution methods and increased recognition for dispute systems that promote, rather than tear down, interpersonal relationships.

Various processes including mediation are included within the broad definition of ADR systems. The most common themes for these methods include the disputants’ roles in the resolution of their own disputes, and the utilization of trained neutrals to assist disputants with these approaches. Ombuds processes and interest-based bargaining deal with specific circumstances while mediation may be applied to a variety of multi-party disputes and is recognized by its continued growth and utilization by public institutions, agencies, and court systems across the United States.

Moore (2003) recognizes that mediation, a method of third-party assistance in the voluntary resolution of differences, has a long history, but has not been supported until recently with documented methods that mediators use to aid people in conflict. While the information base for theories and methods in ADR systems is growing, little empirical information is available regarding the successes of existing systems and their historical social and economic effects.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Description of Research Methodology

A sequential, mixed methods research design was used with quantitative techniques (survey methods) and qualitative techniques (interviews) to collect the appropriate data from the university/college ADR process representatives participating in the study. Creswell (2003) describes this approach as a technique to expand the findings of one method with a subsequent method, and as a way to both generalize the findings to a population and develop a greater detailed view of significant phenomenon or concepts. McMillian and Schumacher (2001, pp. 541-544) used the descriptor “developmental” to identify this approach, which suggests that the first method will be used to assist with the sampling approach for the second method. With this particular study, a survey format provided preliminary information relating to the research questions. As participants identified significant, measurable process successes and/or “best practices,” selections for five, subsequent interviews were made to provide greater insight into the participants’ processes.

Survey Methods

The “Campus Mediation Center Survey” was prepared by the researcher to identify college/university participant demographics and collect information to develop answers for the primary research questions (see Appendixes A and B for the survey format and item relationship to the research questions). This survey consisted of a variety of open- and closed-form questions combined with Likert scale questions when participants are
asked to respond in the form of an opinion or belief (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, pp. 261-263).

The first section of this survey was used to collect demographic information from the college/university hosting the respective mediation center. Along with the size of both the student and employee populations, information regarding the history and affiliation(s) of the center was identified.

The second, third, and fourth sections of the survey explored staffing, services, and funding respectively. This information helps to explain the day-to-day operations and services of each center and collectively, create some reference to differences among centers across the surveyed population.

The fifth section of the survey began to establish a basis of requisite skills and training required by the centers for the service providers (mediators and facilitators). It also provided information regarding the mediation processes (and theories) that centers surveyed embrace as a standard for support services.

The final sections six and seven asked questions regarding perceived process successes experienced by the program and best practices within their systems of services. Developed originally in *Microsoft Word*, staff from Ferris State University’s Institutional Research Department copied the *Word* document into the *SNAP Survey* software package and prepared the survey to be released through electronic mail. Appendix A represents a copy of the survey as viewed in its electronic format.

Survey Sample

Colleges and universities within the United States that had voluntarily registered their campus ADR programs with the *Campus Conflict Resolution Project* of Wayne
State University (Warters, 2004) were asked to participate in the “Campus Mediation Center Survey.” Contact information for the respective Universities’ program administrators was available from the Wayne State University’s project web site www.campus-adr.org.

Pilot Studies

Two selected universities in Michigan and two universities outside of Michigan, all registered with the “Campus Conflict Resolution Project,” were asked to participate in a pilot survey, utilizing SNAP Surveys (2006) web-based software to introduce the instrument. Those participating in the pilot were first contacted by telephone to solicit their agreement to participate and verify their electronic mail address to assure there were no issues with delivery. They were also asked to comment on the design of the survey and the experience of responding electronically. Results from this pilot study were not used in the data set collected as a result of the final survey. Comments made by pilot survey participants did not result in any changes to the format of the electronic mail communication or the format or content of the survey instrument. Feedback from the pilot study did not indicate the need for any revisions to either the content or format of the instrument. With completion of the pilot study, the researcher completed an application with Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB). Permission was received to proceed with the survey process on February 27, 2006 (see Appendix E).

Survey Procedures

Following the pilot study, the initial send of the survey to 189 remaining electronic addresses was completed. The electronic mail message included an
introduction to the survey and provided an electronic link to the *SNAP Survey* software (see Appendix C). This step resulted in the return of 30 non-existent addresses. Using this list, the researcher made telephone contacts, if telephone numbers were available, or completed searches through the institution’s web pages to look for alternate contact sources and web addresses for the specific centers. That effort resulted in finding 18 alternate electronic mail addresses from the original list. The survey was then sent to those additional addresses, resulting in 177 total surveys confirmed as received.

From the point of the initial send for each of the confirmed addresses, if a response was not received after one week, an electronic mail reminder message with the survey address link was sent. For non-responding addresses, this process was followed for a total of three attempts to receive a response. As a result, a total of 44 responses were received for the electronic survey.

With some concern for the response rate, the researcher made a contact with Dr. William Warters from Wayne State University. Dr. Warters explained that it had been some years since the database had been updated, which could explain some of the issues with response rate and valid contact information (Warters, 2006). Indeed, when the researcher made telephone contacts trying to look for current electronic mail addresses, many stories of staff members no longer being employed at the institution or of centers no longer in existence were heard. With this feedback and with some review of the data set received, the researcher, in consult with his dissertation committee, decided to base the study on the survey responses received, considering that the second phase of the research project would include telephone interviews of a subset of the respondents to further explore best practices for mediation centers. The researcher then contacted the
Ferris State University Institutional Research Department staff and communicated that the survey steps were complete. That department then transferred the survey data set, in SPSS software input file format, to the researcher electronically.

Analysis

Parametric procedures including the parametrical analysis of data can only be used when the researcher can assure that the subject population is normally distributed, has homogeneity of variance within different groups, and has data that is interval or ratio in scale (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, pp. 382-386). Because of concerns with both the original data source and the resulting sample size being too small, nonparametric procedures including the use of percentages (response ratios), the Spearman rank-order coefficient ($r_s$), and the chi-square statistic ($\chi^2$) were used to analyze the survey data set. SPSS version 13.01 software accepted a direct download of the data from the SNAP Survey software and provided an analysis of the coded (objective) data set generated from the survey. The “cross-tabulation” function in SPSS was used to initially identify Spearman rho ($r_s$) correlations at an alpha level of .05, considering combinations of all subjective survey responses. The Spearman rho is appropriate for data measured on nominal or ordinal scales (Pavkov & Pierce, 2003). A chi-square analysis of the relationship between the mediation center demographics and processes and the recorded responses for measurements of success was also completed and is reported in a subsequent section of this chapter. This method has been identified as appropriate to find whether the observed proportions in two or more categories differ significantly from theoretically expected proportions (Glass & Hopkins, 1996).
Five mediation centers were selected to participate in a telephone interview based upon their detailed responses to the objective survey question regarding best practices and their affirmative response to a question at the end of the survey concerning their interest to participate in such an interview. The researcher used the original electronic mail address to contact representatives from the selected centers, make an appointment for the telephone interview, and verify the appropriate telephone number for that call. Interviews were subsequently conducted within two weeks of the completion of the electronic survey. The telephone interviews followed the format of the “Telephone Interview Questionnaire” developed by the researcher (see Appendix D). This interview guide approach helped assure that the specific questions would be equitably offered to each respondent, but allowed the interview to be more conversational and situational (Patton, 2002). With the permission of the respective interviewees, the conversations were recorded with an *Olympus VN-1000* digital recorder through a telephone with an external speaker. The interviews were subsequently transcribed for coding and analysis. Open-ended survey responses and collected program documentation are summarized in Chapter 4. Direct quotes from the telephone interviews are not disclosed as permission for such reporting was not obtained by the researcher from those individuals.

Appendix B lists the survey questions by number and may be used as a reference for the analysis in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings from the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” and subsequent telephone interviews completed by mediation center staff from colleges and universities across the United States. Representatives from these centers had voluntarily listed their organization’s contact information on Wayne State University’s Campus Mediation Center Database and Directory, found on the website campus-adr.org. Institutional demographics and mediation center characteristics are reported in detail followed by an analysis of the associated responses regarding measurements of success and best practices. Open-ended survey responses detailing the specifics of processes and approaches of center programming are reported in an analysis of each of the related survey questions. As originally introduced in Chapter 1, this study addresses the following research questions:

1. What types of ADR/mediation processes are available and are being utilized for faculty and staff in campus settings?
2. What types of training practices qualify ADR staff members to serve as mediators or provide ADR services on campus?
3. To what extent are the ADR/mediation processes used in campus settings based upon recognized, theoretical model(s)?
4. How have campus ADR/mediation center staff members measured the success of their programs?
5. Are there components of campus ADR/mediation processes that warrant recognition as a “best practices” by campus mediation center staff?
Results from the Electronic Survey

Profile of the Mediation Centers

Institution Demographics. The first section of the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” dealt with basic demographic information from the responding mediation centers’ hosting institutions. Table 1 describes the respondents by institution type (public or private) from survey question 2.

Table 1

Responders by University Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the original data set (N=177) consisted of a balance between public and private institutions, 81.8% of the respondents represented centers hosted by public institutions (colleges or universities). 9.1% did not identify their institution type.

Table 2 describes the hosting institutions’ student enrollment from survey question 3.
Table 2

**Responders by Student Enrollment for the Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>&lt;2500 Total</th>
<th>&lt;2500 Pct</th>
<th>2501-5000 Total</th>
<th>2501-5000 Pct</th>
<th>5001-10,000 Total</th>
<th>5001-10,000 Pct</th>
<th>10,001-15,000 Total</th>
<th>10,001-15,000 Pct</th>
<th>15,001+ Total</th>
<th>15,001+ Pct</th>
<th>No Total</th>
<th>Total Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public institutions with an enrollment of 15,000+ students represent 66.7% of the total “public” response (n=36) and 54.5% of all respondents (n=44).

Table 3 represents the hosting institutions of mediation center by number of full-time employees on campus from survey question 4.

Table 3

**Responders by Number of Full-Time Employees (Faculty and Staff) on Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>&lt;100 Total</th>
<th>&lt;100 Pct</th>
<th>101-500 Total</th>
<th>101-500 Pct</th>
<th>501-2,000 Total</th>
<th>501-2,000 Pct</th>
<th>2,001-5,000 Total</th>
<th>2,001-5,000 Pct</th>
<th>5,001+ Total</th>
<th>5,001+ Pct</th>
<th>No Total</th>
<th>Total Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83.3% of the total “public” responders employee more than 500 employees on their main campuses.
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Table 4 considers how long the mediation center has been in operation on their respective campuses from survey question 5.

Table 4

Responders by Years of Operation for Campus Mediation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>&lt;1 year</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>5 years +</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69.4% of the responding campus mediation centers have been in existence for more than five years. Survey questions 6 and 7 allowed for open-ended responses to list mediation centers’ affiliations with either academic or non-academic departments or functions on campus – see Appendix F.

Table 5 identifies the mean number of mediation staff employed or serving as volunteers for each mediation center from survey questions 8-13.
Volunteers represent the greater source for staffing campus mediation centers with an average of 5.22 student volunteers for public institutions responding and 12.4/36 volunteers from outside of the institution for public institutions responding. Both public and private center representatives reported less than one full-time staff person dedicated to the center's operation.

Mediation Center Services/Processes/Funding. Research question 1 considered “What types of ADR/mediation processes are available and are being utilized for faculty and staff in campus settings?” Survey questions 14-16 were developed to gather information regarding the services Campus Mediation Centers offered and what, if any, affiliations there were to other dispute resolutions systems currently employed on campus. Table 6 identifies the services (percentage of responses) offered by campus mediation centers hosted by public and private institutions from survey question 14. The researcher defined facilitation in the survey instructions as “moderating meetings between groups/individuals in conflict and/or working toward a defined goal.” Conciliation was defined as “an ADR method where the parties seldom meet face-to-
face, with the conciliator utilizing separate meetings and/or phone calls to communicate among parties – could be referred to as ‘shuttle diplomacy’.”

Table 6

*Services Provided by Campus Centers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Students (%)</th>
<th>Faculty (%)</th>
<th>Staff (%)</th>
<th>Public (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training On Campus</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training On Campus</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Off Campus</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Off Campus</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds Services</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds Services</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75% of responding public and private institutions offered mediation services to student populations. 75% of private institutions also offered facilitation services and training to their student populations. The majority of the service categories identified on the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” are offered at some level across the population of centers responding. Survey question 15 allowed for an open-ended response to note other customer services available – see Appendix F for the verbatim responses.

Table 7 reports the affiliation of campus mediation center programming as a part of either established student judicial processes, non-union grievance procedures, and/or union grievance procedures on campus from survey question 16.
Table 7

*Services Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Type</th>
<th>Student Judiciary (%)</th>
<th>Grievance (Non-Union) (%)</th>
<th>Grievance (Union) (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41.7% of the responding centers sponsored by public institutions (n=36) and 75% of centers from private institutions (n=4) reported student judiciary process affiliation.

Table 8 considers the funding source for the campus mediation centers from survey question 17.

Table 8

*Mediation Center Funding Sources (Percent)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Fees For Service (%)</th>
<th>Non-Academic Dept Budget (%)</th>
<th>Academic Dept Budget (%)</th>
<th>Grant Funded (%)</th>
<th>Other Sources (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mediation Centers hosted by public institutions reported some percentage of funding from each of the possibilities offered on the survey. 63.9% of those centers (n=36) reported funding from a non-academic department source on campus. 75% of centers sponsored by private institutions (n=4) also offered a non-academic department as the greatest source for funding.
Mediation Center Staff Training. Research question 2 considered “What types of training practices qualify ADR staff members to serve as mediators or provide ADR services on campus?” Survey questions 18-22 were developed to determine how many hours of training and internship were required for center staff, what was the source of their training materials, what was the theoretical basis for their training model.

Table 9 outlines the number of training hours required for staff to attain and maintain their ability to provide services.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Training Hours Prior to Providing Services:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 (%)</td>
<td>10-20 (%)</td>
<td>21-30 (%)</td>
<td>31-40 (%)</td>
<td>40+ (%)</td>
<td>Resp (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervised/Internship Hours Post Training Required:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 (%)</td>
<td>10-20 (%)</td>
<td>21-30 (%)</td>
<td>31-40 (%)</td>
<td>40+ (%)</td>
<td>Resp (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours of Continuing Education Per Year Required:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 (%)</td>
<td>10-20 (%)</td>
<td>21-30 (%)</td>
<td>31-40 (%)</td>
<td>40+ (%)</td>
<td>Resp (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding mediation centers reported hours of staff (mediator) training required prior to providing services, post-training hours (supervised experience and/or internship) required prior to providing services unsupervised, and continuing hours of training per year required to maintain a staff member’s ability to provide services. 33.3% of centers
sponsored by public institutions (n=36) reported that more than 40 hours of basic training were required, while 50% of centers sponsored by private institutions (n=4) reported basic training programs of between 10 and 20 hours in length. 33.3% of centers from public institutions (n=36) reported that between 1 and 5 hours of supervised experience or internship post-training were required for staff members. 50% of centers from private institutions (n=4) listed this as a requirement. For continuing education of staff, 41.7% of centers from public institutions (n=36) offered “no response,” indicating that such a requirement has not been established. 36.1% from the same group did report a requirement of 1 to 5 hours of continuing training each year. For centers sponsored by private institutions (n=4), the responses were divided between 1 to 5 hours and 10 to 20 hours of continuing training per year.

Table 10 offers additional information regarding research question 2, reporting on the source for staff training materials used by the campus mediation centers from survey question 21.

Table 10

*Source of Staff Training Model and Materials*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Developed Internally (%)</th>
<th>Developed Externally (%)</th>
<th>Some Combination (%)</th>
<th>No Resp (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38.9% of Mediation Centers sponsored by public institutions (n=36) report that their training materials are developed internally, while 33.3% report some combination of...
internal and external sources. Centers sponsored by private institutions (n=4) all reported some combination of internal and external sources for course development.

Table 11 reports the responses to two survey questions (22 and 23) relating to research question 3 – “To what extent are the ADR/mediation processes used in campus settings based upon recognized, theoretical model(s)?” The lists of available responses for these questions were established as Likert scales, allowing some flexibility in the range of responses (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, pp. 262-263).

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model for Mediation Training and Process Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inst Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the training materials used to prepare staff, the researcher provided the following narrative as an instruction in the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” for responding to the question 22 regarding the orientation of the center’s training program:

“Some mediation processes believe in a strong, interactive role for the mediator. In this case the mediator will direct all the process steps, freely make suggestions, frequently use private meetings, and focus on achieving the ‘agreement.’ This may be referred to as a more ‘directive’ approach. Terms like ‘problem solving’ and ‘settlement oriented’ have
also been used as descriptors for this style. ‘Non-directive’ approaches differ by offering a more restricted (minimum) mediator interaction and by allowing a greater freedom for the disputants to define the process and the outcome for themselves. These approaches are often less concerned with reaching an agreement and more concerned with the relationships (current and future) of the disputants and the development of their particular problem solving skills. Terms like ‘transformative’ and ‘restorative’ have also been used as descriptors for this style.” With this instruction as shown in Table 11, 33% of centers sponsored by public institutions used training materials with a non-directive orientation (M=3.06, SD=1.97). 50% of centers sponsored by private institutions also favored training materials they described as non-directive (M=4.25, SD=1.71).

The researcher used the following narrative instruction on survey question 23 as an instruction regarding the center’s theoretical approach to the mediation process used to provide mediation services through the center (research question 3): “Mediation process differences have also been described with the terms ‘evaluative’ and ‘facilitative.’ Some mediation processes encourage the mediator to actively narrow the topic for discussion, push hard for settlement, offer disputants opinions of what seems ‘fair’ and what a legal decision might be worth, and work toward the development of a ‘settlement range.’ This style has been referred to as ‘evaluative.’” With this instruction as shown in Table 11, 55% of the centers sponsored by public institutions reported their mediation process as facilitative (M=3.86, SD=1.76). All of the centers from private institutions reported their mediation process as facilitative (M=5.00, SD=0.00).

Mediation Center Success. Research question 4 considered “How have campus ADR/mediation center staff members measured the success of their programs?” Survey
questions 24-28 were developed to report mediation center staff members’ methods to record various measurements of success including the establishment of specific measureables and feedback from customers for mediation center services.

Table 12 lists a variety of factors from which mediation center staff were able to report documented improvements. "Documented" was defined in the survey instructions as improvements from an initial base measurement.

Table 12

*Documented Improvements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inst Type</th>
<th>Reduction in Employee Complaints (%)</th>
<th>Reduction in Formal Grievances (%)</th>
<th>Reduction in Agency Charges (%)</th>
<th>Reduction in Student Jud Actions (%)</th>
<th>Improved Faculty/Staff Surveys (%)</th>
<th>Improved Student Surveys (%)</th>
<th>Other Improvements (%)</th>
<th>Resp (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mediation centers sponsored by public institutions (n=36) most frequently reported an improvement in faculty/staff surveys (36.1%). Centers sponsored by private institutions (n=4) reported a reduction in employee complaints (25%) and a category listed as “other improvements” (25%). 50% of these centers did not respond to any of the listed categories of improvements in this survey question. Appendix F lists subjective responses to list other “measurements of success.”

Table 13 lists the responses of mediation center staff regarding four targeted areas for success from survey questions 25-28.
Table 13

**Measurements of Success**

### Success Rate Measured by Percentage of Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>&lt;20% (Pet)</th>
<th>20-40% (Pet)</th>
<th>41-60% (Pet)</th>
<th>61-80% (Pet)</th>
<th>81%+ (Pet)</th>
<th>No Resp (Pet)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Awareness of Services and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>No Resp (%)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Campus Community Recognizes the Value of Mediation Center Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>No Resp (%)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-Services Surveys Recognize Services as Valuable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>No Resp (%)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Resp</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41.7% of mediation centers sponsored by public institutions (n=36) and 50% of centers from private institutions (n=4) did not respond to the survey question regarding the percentage of mediation sessions resulting in an agreement. This may indicate either that the responder had no knowledge of this statistic or that this record is not maintained by the mediation center. However 38.9% of the centers from public institutions (n=36) and 50% of the centers from private institutions (n=4) did indicate that their mediation sessions resulted in an agreement over 81% of the time.

Regarding the question on campus awareness of the centers’ programming, 41.7% of the centers from public institutions (n=36) and 50% of the centers from private institutions (n=4) agreed that their campus communities were “aware” of the services available. Center representatives from public institutions (n=36) “strongly agreed” 41.7% that the campus communities valued the services they offered – 50% of the centers from private institutions (n=4) “agreed” on this factor. As centers offered post-mediation surveys for participants, public institutions’ (n=36) responses indicated that 38.9% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that value for the process was noted by process participants. 100% of the centers from private institutions (n=4) indicated this response pattern. Table 13 profiles these results.

Factors that Effect Measurements of Success

To better understand the opinions expressed by “Campus Mediation Center Survey” participants, an analysis was completed comparing selected descriptive mediation center characteristics to questions relating to reported improvement factors (Survey Question 24i). The Spearman rho correlation technique was used to make 51 different comparisons among these factors of staffing, services, and funding sources,
resulting in 29 significant pairings as profiled in the upcoming sections. These relationships help to define what process characteristics are present when factors of success are reported.

Center Staffing and Processes. Research Question 4 considered “How have campus ADR/mediation center staff members measured the success of their programs?” Question 8 from the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” asked for a profile of mediation center staffing. The categories offered were (1) full-time college/university employees dedicated to the center, (2) full-time college/university employees with responsibilities outside of the center, (3) student employees, (4) student volunteers, and (5) volunteers from outside of the college/university. Question 24 offered seven categories for documented improvement, as defined by being recorded following an initial base measurement. The subject areas offered were reductions in (1) employee complaints, (2) formal grievances, (3) outside agency claims/charges, (4) student judicial actions, (5) improvement in faculty/staff surveys, (6) student surveys, or (7) other defined sources for recording successes. According a correlation was found between the receipt of positive responses on student surveys and the presence of student employees on the mediation center staff (Spearman $r_s = .354$, $n=43$, $p<.05$ two tailed). The presence of student volunteers on the center staff also resulted in a positive correlation (Spearman $r_s = .323$, $n=44$, $p<.05$ two tailed). Table 14 summarizes these Spearman $r_s$ correlations.
Survey question 14 reviews the range of professional services offered to students, faculty, staff, and the public. Available responses for seven specific services included (1) mediation, (2) facilitation, (3) conciliation, (4) on-campus training, (5) off-campus training, (6) referrals, and (7) ombudsman service. Positive correlations with improvements in faculty/staff surveys representing survey question 24.5 are listed in Table 15.
Table 15

*Types of Services Offered and Positive Responses on Faculty/Staff Surveys*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Mediation Center Service</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.a.2</td>
<td>mediation-faculty</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.2</td>
<td>facilitation-faculty</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.3</td>
<td>facilitation-staff</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.2</td>
<td>conciliation-faculty</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.3</td>
<td>conciliation-staff</td>
<td>0.339</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.2</td>
<td>on-campus training-faculty</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.3</td>
<td>on-campus training-staff</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.2</td>
<td>referrals-faculty</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.3</td>
<td>referrals-staff</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College/University faculty and staff offer favorable responses to campus center surveys when services are available to them through the mediation centers. Students responded positively to a much broader offering of services to all populations.

Table 16 reports Spearman $r_s$ correlations with positive responses in student opinion surveys when compared with the types of professional services offered.
Table 16

Types of Services Offered and Positive Responses on Student Opinion Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Mediation Center Service</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.a.4</td>
<td>mediation-public</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.1</td>
<td>facilitation-students</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.2</td>
<td>facilitation-faculty</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.3</td>
<td>facilitation-staff</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.4</td>
<td>facilitation-public</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.1</td>
<td>conciliation-students</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.2</td>
<td>conciliation-faculty</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.3</td>
<td>conciliation-staff</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.4</td>
<td>conciliation-public</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.2</td>
<td>on-campus training-faculty</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.3</td>
<td>on-campus training-staff</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.4</td>
<td>on-campus training-public</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.4</td>
<td>off-campus training-public</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus mediation centers' services are at times offered as a part of or as an alternative to other established, dispute resolution processes. Survey question 16 asked if services provided by the campus mediation center were a part of either a student judiciary process, a faculty/staff non-union grievance process, or a faculty/staff union grievance process. As services were offered as part of a faculty/staff non-union grievance process, positive correlations for responses on a reduction in formal grievances from survey question 24.2 (Spearman \( r_s = .319, n=44, p<.05 \) two tailed) and an improvement on the faculty/staff opinion survey from survey question 24.5 (Spearman \( r_s = .413, n=44, p<.01 \) two tailed) were recorded. As services were reported as part of a faculty/staff union grievance process, positive correlations were reported for a reduction in formal grievances from survey question 24.2 (Spearman \( r_s = .463, n=44, p<.01 \) two tailed), for a
reduction in outside agency charges from survey question 24.3 (Spearman $r_s=.323$, $n=44$, $p<.05$ two tailed), and with an improvement in faculty/staff opinion surveys from survey question 24.5 (Spearman $r_s=.340$, $n=44$, $p<.05$ two tailed). Table 17 summarizes these Spearman $r_s$ correlations.

Table 17

*Existing ADR Processes and Improvement Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
<th>Part of Other ADR Process</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$p&lt;$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(16.2) (24.2)</td>
<td>non-union grievance proc</td>
<td>reduce grievances</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.2) (24.5)</td>
<td>non-union grievance proc</td>
<td>improve Fac/Staff Surveys</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.3) (24.2)</td>
<td>union grievance proc</td>
<td>reduce grievances</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.01 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.3) (24.3)</td>
<td>union grievance proc</td>
<td>reduce agency complaints</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16.3) (24.5)</td>
<td>union grievance proc</td>
<td>improve Fac/Staff Surveys</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.05 two tailed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey question 17 considered funding sources as a part of the total operating budget for campus mediation centers. Center representatives were asked if their centers were funded by fees for service, as part of a non-academic department budget, as part of an academic department budget, grants, or from other sources not identified. Previously reported frequencies did not provide any positive correlations with the improvement factors identified in survey question 24.

In summary, faculty/staff and student surveys were identified as primary methods for reporting campus mediation center successes. No significant correlations were found for reductions in complaints, grievances, agency complaints or student judicial actions. The campus community, including students, faculty, and staff, responds favorably to the offering of a variety of campus mediation center services that are available to their peer populations. Students particularly appreciate all services offered on campus to a variety
of groups. These affirmative responses represent support for the campus mediation centers and express a level of confidence in the delivery of their services.

Cross Effects of Staffing, Processes, and Campus Perceptions

Survey questions 8, 14, 16, 17, and 24 reported on the demographics of mediation center staffing, the services offered (to specific populations) by the campus centers, affiliations of center services to other campus ADR processes, the funding sources that make up center budgets, and listed improvement factors. Staff members who responded to the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” also provided their opinions on a range of Likert scale questions that related to particular success factors. Those survey questions (22, 23, 25-28) were concerned with (1) the rate at which mediations generated written agreements, (2) the campus community awareness of services offered by the centers, (3) the campus community’s perceived value in center services, (4) the perceived value of center services customers who completed post-services surveys, and (5) the theoretical approach to training and mediation. In support of Research Question 4, an analysis of 178 parings of the descriptive factors identified in survey questions 8, 14, 16, 17, and 24 with the (Likert scale) responses concerning theoretical approaches and success measurements was completed utilizing the chi-square statistic. That analysis resulted in the following 20 significant relationships that can be used to better define “how campus centers have measured the success of their programs.”

The Ability to Reach (Formal) Mediated Agreements. Table 18 reports a chi-square analysis of factors that have a significant relationship to mediations resulting in formal agreements.
Table 18

Factors that Effect the Ability to Reach Formal Mediated Agreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
<th>Factors:</th>
<th>Outcome: 61%+</th>
<th>Chi-Square Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.b.1</td>
<td>Facilitation offered to students</td>
<td>61%+</td>
<td>df 50.0 N 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Services/non-union grievance proc</td>
<td>61%+</td>
<td>df 64.3 N 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Services/union grievance proc</td>
<td>61%+</td>
<td>df 50.0 N 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Outcome” indicate respondents reporting that formal, mediated agreements were reached 61% or more of the times mediations were held.

The attainment of a written agreement between disputants is a possible outcome of the mediation process. Survey question 25 asked campus mediation centers if they maintained outcome statistics for the mediation process that included recording that a written agreement was achieved. Possible ranges of answers included that a written agreement was reached “<20%”, “20-40%”, “41-60%”, “61-80%”, or “81%+” as mediations occurred. Campus centers confirmed reaching agreements through the mediation process at a rate of “61-80%” or “81%+” (50.0%) when facilitation services were offered to students (survey question 14.b.1). The relationship between the rate of reaching mediated agreements and offering of facilitation services to students was significant, $\chi^2(4, N=44) = 10.773$, $p<.029$.

Campus centers also confirmed reaching agreements through responses of either “61-80%” or “81%+” (64.3%) when campus centers’ processes were part of a non-union faculty/staff grievance procedure. The relationship between the rate of reaching mediated agreements and participating in a non-union faculty/staff grievance process (survey question 16.2) was significant, $\chi^2(4, N=44) = 13.997$, $p<.007$. Campus centers reached
agreements through responses of either “61-80%” or “81%+” (50.0%) when campus centers’ processes were part of a union faculty/staff grievance procedure. The relationship between the rate of reaching mediated agreements and participating in a union faculty/staff grievance process (survey question 16.3) was significant, $\chi^2(4, N=44) = 15.371, p<.004$.

This factor of success may be a function of the acceptance of faculty and staff, when they have already welcomed mediation center services as a part of their defined grievance processes. For students, the awareness of services like facilitation may also related to their willingness to participate in mediations/facilitations and be open to working toward an agreement.

_Campus Community Awareness of Mediation Center Services._ Table 19 reports a chi-square analysis of factors that have a significant relationship to the campus community’s awareness of mediation center services offered.
Table 19

Factors that Effect the Campus Community Awareness of Mediation Center Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
<th>Factors:</th>
<th>Outcome:</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\ p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2 w/ Part-time employees</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 w/ Student Volunteers</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.1 Mediation services/students</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.2 Mediation services/faculty</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.1 Off-campus training/students</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.2 Off-campus training/faculty</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.3 Off-campus training/staff</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1 Part of a student judicial process</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.280</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2 Part of a non-union grievance proc</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3 Part of a union grievance proc</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2 Funding/non-academic dept budget</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Agree-Strongly Agree” indicate respondents reporting that they either agreed or strongly agreed.

As previously discussed, Question 8 from the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” asked for a profile of mediation center staffing. The categories offered were (1) full-time college/university employees dedicated to the center, (2) full-time college/university employees with responsibilities outside of the center, (3) student employees, (4) student volunteers, and (5) volunteers from outside of the college/university. Survey question 26 offers a range of Likert Scale agreement responses dealing with the concept of the campus community’s awareness of the programs and services the mediation centers offer. Responses for this question indicate that 46.8% of the respondents from mediation centers with part-time employees (full-time employees with responsibilities outside of that center) either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that their campus community is aware of their program and services. The relationship between the presence of part-time employees
and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=43) = 11.093, p<.05$.

Mediation Centers with student volunteers serving on staff either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (54.6%) that their campus communities were aware of their programs and services. The relationship between the presence of student volunteers on mediation staff and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 12.741, p<.026$.

When a variety of services are offered to the campus community, their awareness of services also increases. Survey question 14 reviews the range of professional services offered to students, faculty, staff, and the public. As previously identified, available responses for those services included (1) mediation, (2) facilitation, (3) conciliation, (4) on-campus training, (5) off-campus training, (6) referrals, and (7) ombudsman service. When compared to campus community awareness (survey question 26), various significant relationships were identified. Mediation centers that offered student mediation services either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (45.1%) that campus communities were aware of the programs and services. The relationship between student mediation services and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 16.187, p<.006$. When campus centers offer mediation services for faculty, 57.2% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that campus communities are aware of their programs and services. The relationship between the offering of mediation services for faculty and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 14.367, p<.013$. When off-campus training is available to students, mediation centers either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (75%) that campus communities are aware of their programs and services. The relationship between the offering of off-campus training for students and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 11.397, p<.044$. When off-campus
training is available to faculty, mediation centers either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (75%) that campus communities are aware of their programs and services. The relationship between the offering of off-campus training for faculty and campus community awareness was significant, \( \chi^2(5, N=44) = 11.397, p<.044 \). And finally, mediation centers also either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (75%) that their campus communities are aware of their programs and services when off-campus training is available to staff members. The relationship between the offering of off-campus training for staff members and campus community awareness was significant, \( \chi^2(5, N=44) = 11.397, p<.044 \). Overall the availability of a broad range of services to the entire campus community (students, faculty, and staff) tends to increase their awareness, perhaps through utilization or communication with their peers.

As noted previously in Table 7, some campus mediation centers have services that are offered as a part of other campus ADR programs including student judicial services and grievance procedures. Survey question 16 asked campus mediation centers if their services were part of another established dispute resolution process on their campuses. The range of responses included a (1) student judiciary process, (2) a non-union faculty/staff grievance process, or (3) a union faculty/staff grievance process. When compared to campus community awareness (survey question 26), various significant relationships were identified. Mediation centers whose services were part of a campus student judiciary process either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (63.2%) that their campus communities were aware of the programs and services. The relationship between the coordination of services with a student judiciary process and campus community awareness was significant, \( \chi^2(5, N=44) = 11.280, p<.046 \). When campus centers’ services
are part of a non-union grievance procedure for faculty and staff, 78.5% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that their campus communities are aware of their programs and services. The relationship between campus centers’ services being a part of a non-union faculty/staff grievance procedure and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 12.374, p<.030$. When campus centers’ services are part of a union grievance procedure for faculty and staff, 87.5% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that their campus communities are aware of their programs and services. The relationship between campus centers’ services being a part of a union faculty/staff grievance procedure and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 12.069, p<.034$. This recognition by the campus community as services relate to other, established ADR processes suggests that those affiliations have helped with communications for the mediation centers and improve the awareness of their potential customer base.

Survey question 17 requested information regarding funding sources for the campus mediation centers. The range of responses for this objective question included (1) fees for service, (2) part of a non-academic department budget, (3) part of an academic department budget, (4) grants, and/or (5) other funding sources. When campus centers are funded in part from a non-academic department, 55.6% either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” their campus communities are aware of their programs and services (survey question 26). The relationship between a non-academic department funding source and campus community awareness was significant, $\chi^2(5, N=44) = 12.851, p<.025$. This relationship suggests that funding from a non-academic department may also promote other support, including advocacy and communications.
Perceived Value in Mediation Center Services. Table 20 reports a chi-square analysis of factors that have a significant relationship to the campus community's perceived value of mediation center services offered.

Table 20

Factors that Effect Campus Perception that Mediation Center Services are Valuable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
<th>Factors:</th>
<th>Outcome:</th>
<th>Chi-Square Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Student employees</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>90.0 4 43 12.370 0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.2</td>
<td>Mediation services/faculty</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>85.8 4 44 13.071 0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.3</td>
<td>Mediation services/staff</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>84.7 4 44 10.532 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Part of a non-union grievance proc</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>100.0 4 44 10.197 0.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Agree-Strongly Agree” indicate respondents reporting that they either agreed or strongly agreed.

Survey question 27 offers a range of Likert scale agreement responses expressing campus mediation centers opinions that campus communities recognize their programs as “valuable” and meeting their needs. Mediation centers with student employees either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” (90%) that their campus communities valued the centers' services and “met their needs” (survey question 27). The relationship between the presence of student volunteers and campus community perceived value was significant, \( \chi^2(4, N=43) = 12.370, p<.015 \). As noted earlier, the presence of student volunteers seems to positively affect the factors of awareness and perceived value. The campus community supports the presence of both dedicated employees and (student) volunteers to deliver the range of services the centers offer.
When campus centers offer mediation programs to faculty (survey question 14.a.2), 85.8% of their responses range from “agreed” to “strongly agreed” that their campus communities value the programs they offer. The relationship between the offering of mediation programs for faculty and campus community perceived value was significant, $\chi^2(4, N=44) = 13.071, p<.011$. Also when campus centers offer mediation programs to staff, 84.7% of their responses range from “agreed” to “strongly agreed” that their campus communities value the programs they offer. The relationship between the offering of mediation programs for staff (survey question 14.a.3) and campus community perceived value was significant, $\chi^2(4, N=44) = 10.532, p<.032$. Faculty and staff seem appreciative that a variety of services are available to them through the campus centers.

They also express that appreciation when mediation center services are part of a (non-union) grievance procedure. When campus centers’ programs are part of a non-union faculty/staff grievance procedure, 100.0% of their responses range from “agreed” to “strongly agreed” that their campus communities value the programs they offer. The relationship between participating in a non-union faculty staff grievance process and campus community perceived value was significant, $\chi^2(4, N=44) = 10.197, p<.037$.

*Perceived Value Expressed in Post-Services Surveys.* Table 21 reports a chi-square analysis of factors that have a significant relationship to mediation center customers expressing value in the services offered.
Table 21

Factors that Effect Customers’ Perceptions that Mediation Center Services are Valuable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question(s)</th>
<th>Factors:</th>
<th>Outcome:</th>
<th>Pet</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.d.4</td>
<td>On-campus training/public</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.469</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.4</td>
<td>Referral services/public</td>
<td>Agree-Strongly Agree</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.693</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “Agree-Strongly Agree” indicate respondents reporting that they either agreed or strongly agreed.

Post-mediation surveys are offered to disputants following their participation in an ADR process like mediation. Survey question 28 offers a range of Likert scale agreement responses expressing campus mediation centers recognition that post-services surveys recognize those processes as “valuable” and meeting their needs. When campus centers offer on-campus training to the public (survey question 14.d.4), 80% of their responses range from “agreed” to “strongly agreed” that their post-services surveys recognize their ADR processes as valuable. The relationship between the offering of on-campus training programs for the public and post-services surveys recognizing that center’s ADR processes as valuable was significant, $\chi^2(3, N=44) = 9.469, p<.024$. When campus centers offer referral services to the public (survey question 14.f.4), 81.9% of their responses range from “agreed” to “strongly agreed” that their post-services surveys recognize their ADR processes as valuable. The relationship between the offering of referral services to the public and post-services surveys recognizing that center’s ADR processes as valuable was significant, $\chi^2(3, N=44) = 12.693, p<.005$. For campus centers that offer services to the public, those who were actually customers of those services
expressed appreciation. This ability to use established resources to serve yet another population offers opportunities for a variety of benefits including communications, (monetary) support, and advocacy.

In summary, faculty, staff, and students particularly appreciate the offering of services by the campus mediation centers and how they may coordinate with other, established ADR processes like grievance procedures. In particular, the frequency of mediated agreements improves when mediation is a part of these other ADR procedures. Customers of mediation center services express their appreciation, whether the delivery of services is accomplished by employees (either full or part-time) or (student) volunteers. The public (outside of the campus community) also values the services offered by the mediation centers, including referrals and training.

Review of Open-Ended Responses

Campus Affiliations and Programs. Survey question 6 asked if the campus mediation program was affiliated with any particular academic department. Thirteen responses were recorded from the responding population. The most common response was “peace studies,” followed by “law school.” Survey question 7 asked for any affiliations with administrative departments. Twenty-eight responses were recorded from the responding population. The modal response was for a category of “student affairs/student services” with the second most common response of “human resources.” Survey question 15 asked for the identification of campus center services not identified in question 14. Fifteen responses were recorded with “conflict coaching” being the modal response. Survey question 24a requested information about other possible “measurements of success” not categorized in survey question 24i.7. Nine total responses were received.
with the most common answer affirming that no other improvement measurements were maintained. See Appendix F for the verbatim responses for survey questions 6, 7, 15, and 24a.

*Quality Assurance.* Survey question 29 asked mediation center respondents to identify other methods to assure the quality of services on an ongoing basis. Twenty-four affirmative responses were recorded from the responding population in this category. The most common responses, listed in the order of their frequency, were in-service/continuing education, certification training prior to offering services, observation with feedback, role-playing, co-mediation, and exit (post-services) surveys. In general, the majority of these responses dealt with "training" as the primary tool for assuring quality for mediation center services. See Appendix F for the actual responses.

*Best Practices.* Survey question 30 is the primary source for responses relating to the fifth research question, "Are there components of campus ADR/mediation processes that warrant recognition as a ‘best practices’ by campus mediation center staff?" Fifteen affirmative responses from the responding population were recorded for this survey question. These responses were unique with some common themes of affiliation with other entities, organization, and special services. Five campus centers were selected for a telephone interview based upon their responses:

1) An advisory board consisting of one-third faculty, one-third staff, and one-third administrators;

2) The transformative process;

3) A community mediation center that provides the campus service;

4) The only university-wide mediation program in our state; and
5) A new service called “actively resolving group hostility” (ARGH!)

These telephone interviews will be summarized in a subsequent section of this dissertation. See Appendix F for the actual responses for survey question 30 regarding “best practices.”

Future Mediation Center Planning. Survey question 31 asked respondents to identify any future plans their centers may have including new directions, services, etc. Twenty-four affirmative responses were recorded from the responding population. Although all of the responses were also very unique, some common themes included new service program offerings, new training programs, expansion of clientele served, new marketing initiatives, dealing with funding issues, and new affiliations. Those centers selected for telephone interviews based upon their response to survey question 30 were asked to offer an expanded explanation of the future plans for their respective campus centers. The results from those telephone interviews will be reported in a subsequent section of this dissertation. See Appendix F for the actual responses for survey question 31 regarding “future planning.”

Results from the Telephone Interviews

Research question 5 considered “Are there components of campus ADR/mediation processes that warrant recognition as a ‘best practices’ by campus mediation center staff?” Five campus mediation centers were selected for post-survey telephone interviews based upon their answers to survey question 30 regarding “best practices.” Mediation centers representing the following campuses participated in this interview process:

1) University of Missouri – Columbia;
Participants were contacted in advance to schedule an interview date and time. Each participant affirmed their willingness to have their interview recorded. An *Olympus VN-1000* digital audio recorder was used in conjunction with a telephone and an external speaker to record each interview session. The “telephone interview questionnaire” found in Appendix D was followed, allowing respondents the flexibility to define their own depth and breadth of responses. Subsequent to the interviews, the researcher transcribed the conversations for coding and analysis. Direct quotes from the telephone interviews are not disclosed, as permission for such reporting was not obtained by the researcher.

**Interview Questions**

*Documented Improvements.* Participants were asked to expand upon the subject first introduced in survey question 24 regarding the campus mediation center’s ability to report documented improvements (as measured from an initial base). No specific processes dealing with a measureable for reducing the level of conflict (reduction in grievances per year, etc.) were identified. All of the centers described some level of post-services surveys. Some were taken immediately following services, while others were completed on a periodic basis. One center provided a post-services, on-line survey method specifically for student mediations.

Two responses fell outside of this “survey” category. One center cited the use of a modified version of the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) self-
assessment instrument used for student affairs disciplines. This method was followed to provide some standards recognition that could be expanded outside of that particular location. Another center cited the “popularity of their training programs” as an indicator for success.

All participants confirmed the need for such measureables of success to benchmark the value-added aspects of the services offered and provide a rationale for funding and expansion.

*Best Practices.* Each of the mediation centers participating in the telephone survey were selected based upon unique answers to survey question 30 regarding “best practices.” While the subjects of these responses varied, each of these practices identified had added, in the respondents’ estimation, to the success of their centers to-date.

One center described their campus center advisory board as consisting of one-third faculty, one-third administrators, and one-third staff. That board’s function is primarily one of long-term, strategic planning, rather than oversight of day-to-day operations. With this balance and diversity, issues of recognition and support could be managed and reasoned planning could be attained to assist future growth and development.

Another respondent identified their organization as an independent community mediation center (outside of campus) that contracted to provide the services otherwise handled by an on-campus model. Mediation services and training were the primary services offer, with affiliations to two campus functions – one employment related and another student services related. Many of their volunteer staff (service providers) were also associated and/or employed by the college/university, which seemed to be a
reasonable (and valued) secondary relationship. Funding for the center was a combination of contracts for these campus services, some “fee for services” structure, and some volume of local court referred cases. When asked if there were any issues of “conflict of interest” with the utilization of campus volunteers, it was noted that a “co-mediator” model was followed and that helped balance most differences not handled through intake. Co-mediation in this case was the presence of two mediators working as a team in the presence of two or more disputants.

Another center has based their training materials and (service) processes on the transformative model described in Bush and Folgers’ *The Promise of Mediation* (1994). As described in Chapter 2, the focus of this mediation model is the relationship between/among the disputants and it follows a more non-directive process. As a part of the “Institutional Study of Conflict Transformation,” this center is able to utilize a variety of training materials for their outreach services and to support the preparation of their staff. That staff is dedicated to the application of this theoretical model and feel it is primary factor in the success of their program.

With one example of an outside agency contracting to provide services to the campus, another respondent represented an on-campus center that not only provided services to all levels of campus stakeholders, but also extended services to the outside community. This included being the primary training source for mediators for the local court system. This affiliation had helped their university in the management of some “town-gown” issues regarding students and community members. It is also an excellent model of value-added, university resources available to local communities.
Finally, one campus center identified the development of a unique service called “actively resolving group hostility” or “ARGH!” Recognizing that some disputants may be reluctant to engage in a process as formal as mediation or who may otherwise be “turned-off” by the time necessary for the intake and scheduling of a mediation session, center mediators developed a “conflict coaching” service that provides counsel to disputants on a one-to-one basis. This can be scheduled in a reasonable timeframe and to date, has been one of the most utilized services the center has offered over the past year.

_Future Plans._ Each telephone interview participant was asked to describe plans their center may have for change or growth in the immediate future. Two common themes were communications and outreach services.

One center was concerned that the communication of their programs was not reaching all of the campus community. Most of their efforts had been based upon electronic communications. Numbers of their employees, however, may not have access to the web or maintain e-mail addresses. Their new communication plan would include mailings to home addresses and some “payroll stuffers” to all campus employees of their presence and services available.

Another campus center was developing a program to train student employees (similar to resident assistants) in their “fundamentals of mediation” program and offer dispute resolutions services to students living off-campus. This would be coordinated with other residential life staff training, recognizing the needs of both student populations.

This same theme of outreach outside of campus may be seen by another center that provides mediation services to the local community and court system. A new
program under development for them will focus on landlord-tenant issues with students living off campus. This could be the first of many services focusing on “town-gown” issues and improving the relationship between the campus and community.

With the popularity of web communications, one center was expanding its web presence to include a “menu” of services with specific descriptions. Some specific groups would be targeted in the format of this new site, including incoming freshmen and female students. This would also serve as the launch for a new service called “facilitated dialog,” a mediation-like process with a less formal intake procedure and format. This approach recognizes that people in conflict have various levels of comfort and this type of flexibility with a variety of services could better attract and serve a broader population.

As quality standards continue to become a trait important for attracting clientele, a campus mediation center is working toward recognition as a “center of excellence,” through their state’s board of education. This standard will require their proof of service to both their campus community and to the state’s population. Such recognition will also help support their continuation and funding.

Emerging Themes

Several important themes were identified during the telephone interviews outside of the response to the basic interview questions.

Conflict Coaching. Although not identified in the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” as a particular service category (survey question 14), “conflict coaching” has emerged as a service that is recognized and valued by some of the campus mediation centers. As described, conflict coaching allows for the mediation center staff to focus on training individuals in dispute resolution skills relating to a particular conflict or for
future utilization. Some centers may provide this training “face-to-face”, while others may offer this in the form of web-based training. Students in particular may value this service, instead of utilizing a more formal process involving a mediator or facilitator with the conflicting party.

**Student Orientation.** Considering the primary functions of colleges and universities, campus mediation centers began their existence in service to student populations. Expansion of services to other groups (faculty, staff and the public) has been historically the next step in their development. Respondents to the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” recognized that faculty, staff members, and the public appreciated the offering of services to their particular populations. Respondents to the telephone interview were very focused on their student populations and were actively engaged in improvement to quality and range of services for those groups.

**Funding.** Funding for the on-going support of campus mediation centers was a shared concern of all the respondents. Responses varied from those of “survival” to concern for the funding of specific, future initiatives. Fees for service, particularly for non-student groups, was a typical method for the support of center budgets. Recognition for the value of services was both a concern and approach for garnering support for continuing budgets and expanding services. Survey respondents also appreciated the (economic) support from a non-academic department, which represented a significant relationship with the value mediation center customers gave to center services. Without the public recognition of the need for dispute resolution service and established quality standards, the future survival of many centers is in jeopardy.
**Affiliations.** The affiliation to outside entities is important for the continued success of many campus mediation centers. Those affiliations represent possible funding sources, resources for materials and operational standards, and partnerships that provide access to opportunities generally outside of the campus setting. Partnerships also represent a viable use of resources to the public, with economies of staff, services, and budgets.

**Expansion of Services.** All of the respondents to the telephone survey were in some stage of expanding services to the public or for planning such initiatives. Many opportunities also existed for re-defining ADR services beyond the traditional offering of mediation and facilitation. Overall this represented recognition of the need to respond to customer needs and demands and indeed, to expand the customer base as appropriate to their settings and communities. Conflict coaching in particular was a service developed in particular to meet the needs and requests of mediation center customers.

**Web-Based Marketing.** Presence on the web has been the primary method to communicate the existence of the campus mediation centers, providing basic contact and location information. Future opportunities exist to better utilize the web as a marketing tool, providing menus of services and in some cases, actually serving as the method of service delivery. This includes offering web-based training and basic information for disputants before they would otherwise contact center staff. Campus mediation centers can work with their on-campus information systems functions to best position their electronic presence in those communication paths most often visited by the students, employees, and the public.
**Customer Feedback.** Many campus mediation centers are concerned about the development of quality standards to support the growth and recognition of their professional services. The most common feedback method however, remains to be their contact with the populations that they currently serve. All of the respondents expressed some recognition of the opportunity to improve and expand on these processes. While many plans and initiatives were identified to expand affiliations and services, the idea of continuing to improve on customer communications and feedback from the population that use their services now is key to the on-going survival of the campus mediation centers.

**Summary**

In summary, this study expanded the existing base of information about campus mediation centers including how they are organized, what business (budget) models are being utilized, how they are staffed, what operation processes they follow, and how they identify success they have enjoyed to date. Survey respondents reported that campus stakeholders and other customers of their services express their appreciation and value through positive feedback on various surveys.

Other campus mediation centers described struggles with staffing issues, institutional support, and budgeting. Some centers were not longer in existence because of personnel changes and funding issues over the past few years. Those centers who reported success over the course of their existence, had established some recognized strength in the particular service they provide, unique affiliations they have established, and/or their ability to adapt their programs to the unique needs of their respective organizations.
Chapter 5 will conclude this study with a summary of the overall findings and with the offering of a list of “components of success” to consider for mediation center organization, based upon the results of the electronic survey and the subsequent telephone interviews.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

In this chapter the researcher summarizes the findings of this study as they relate to the original research questions. A list of "components of success" is suggested for the campus mediation centers, based upon the feedback from the respondents to these associated surveys. Finally, the researcher reviews opportunities for future studies involving this subject area.

Research Questions Summary

The Services Offered by the Campus Mediation Center

Respondents to the "Campus Mediation Center Survey" as a group affirmed the existence of all of the possible services offered within the range of objective survey responses. These included mediation, facilitation, conciliation, on- and off-campus training, referral services, and ombudsman services (see Table 6). When services were available as a part of an existing, ADR process such as a grievance procedure, faculty and staff were more aware and valued the services offered, as expressed in Tables 19 and 20.

Individual locations had various histories of what specific services were offered to the groups identified as students, faculty, staff, and the public, and had continued those particular services based on their respective successes to date. Training was a service valued by all constituents. Conflict coaching as a service offering was identified by a number of respondents as still another category that was developed based upon expressed needs of their populations (see Appendix F, survey question 15). Some campuses had a separation of staffing and process between students and other groups. In some cases this separation was based on the unique histories of their institutions. It was most common to
have first offered ADR services to the student populations in some form. Faculty and staff particularly expressed a recognized value of mediation center services when such services were offered to their populations (see Table 20).

How Are Mediation Center Staff Prepared to Provide Services

Mediation center staff consists of some combination of dedicated campus employees, part-time employees, student employees, student volunteers, and outside volunteers (see Table 5). Faculty and staff members most value center services offered by full-time staff members, while students appreciate services offered by their peers (see Table 21). Most campus mediation centers prepare their staff members for service with training programs developed internally, sometimes with the inclusion of standardized external materials otherwise available. As shown in Table 9, the primary training is usually between thirty and forty hours in duration and consists of a combination of traditional and experiential delivery components. After this training, up to ten hours of additional experience is required in the form of role-play, observation, and co-mediation. Some centers require up to five hours of continuing education each year, but most commonly offer in-services throughout the year to maintain staff status.

Theoretical Models for Process and Training

Training materials and processes followed by mediation center staff were influenced by the backgrounds of founding staff members and the unique histories of their centers and the roles they played within their institutional settings. Centers affiliated with a particular academic function (i.e. law school or center for “peace” initiatives) might focus on processes and materials supported by that influence. In most cases, respondents did not specifically identify the sources for their training materials. Two
campus mediation centers that participated in the telephone interview were influenced or had an affiliation with groups associated with transformational ADR/mediation approaches defined in Bush and Folgers' *The Promise of Mediation* (1994). As outlined in Chapter 2, the focus of this mediation model is the relationship between/among the disputants and it follows a more non-directive process. Overall the respondents to the electronic survey noted that their training followed a non-directive approach, defined as “...offering a more restricted mediator interaction and by allowing a greater freedom of the disputants to define the process and outcomes for themselves.” Those respondents also defined their mediation/facilitation process as more “facilitative” rather than “evaluative,” defined as “...approaches (that) focus less on the mediator determining the choice of topics and do not usually involve the mediator offering opinions or the evaluation of options, leaving these topics to the discretion of the disputants.” This follows the Chapter 2 discussion of the dimensions within Riskin’s Grid (Riskin, 1996). In this case, facilitation as a method defines the role of the mediator as a neutral, who utilizes process management techniques, and who supports active listening as a primary skill for the participants.

*Self-Report of Program Success*

As shown in Tables 15 and 16, the most common respondent response for program success involved the use of opinion surveys from campus groups that may or may not have utilized the services of the campus mediation centers. The opportunity to respond to those surveys were offered in some cases either one-time, annually, or directly following the delivery of the service. Indeed post-services surveys seemed to be most represented by the respondents participating in this study. Faculty and staff appreciated
the presence of full-time staff members at the mediation centers and the particular services offered to their respective employee groups. Students appreciated the utilization of their peers (as student employees or volunteers) on staff. The offering of training was one of the most valued services that the campus mediation center offered, particularly by the public. One telephone interviewee noted the “popularity of their training programs” as one indicator for success for their center. Through the telephone interview process, some participants recognized the need for identifying and maintaining formal measurements of success as a method to improve the quality and content of their service offerings and build the credibility of their functions.

“Best Practices” for Campus Mediation Centers

The “Campus Mediation Center Survey” defined best practices as “. . . unique and/or very successful aspects of their organization, process, and/or services.” Responses to this question varied, with answers relating to organization, processes, and affiliation. All the responses were identified as factors that significantly contributed to the success of those particular mediation centers to date. Five mediation centers were contacted for telephone interviews based upon their responses to this electronic survey question. Those factors identified the following subjects of best practice:

1) An advisory board consisting of representatives from the primary service groups across campus;

2) Training content and service processes based upon a recognized school of thought for ADR approaches (transformative model);

3) The campus mediation service contracted by an outside agency (community mediation center);
4) A mediation center that serves all campus stakeholders and serves as a model for campus mediation centers across their state; and

5) The development of a new ADR “conflict coaching” service that responded to the needs of their particular student population.

For these centers such practices represent examples of success and a significant foundation for their continued growth and development. As identified in Chapter 4, all of these practices could be adopted in some fashion by any campus center with similar services and customers. Tables 18 and 19 show when faculty and staff are offered services, their appreciation and level of awareness of services increases, as expressed through surveys. Advisory boards consisting of these campus stakeholders then seems a reasonable approach to develop that involvement and build some level of internal support.

Affiliations with a variety of campus constituents including academic and administrative departments were identified through the survey process. Outside agency (mediation center) associations were also explained through the telephone interviews. These partnerships help through sharing resources and expertise that may otherwise not be available. It would seem to be a reasonable partnership to utilize the campus mediation center as a “learning lab” for academic departments that provide some level of ADR subject programming. This combination seems natural for a “best practices” example.

As campus mediation centers serve their customer base, their continued success seems dependent on providing services that meet the needs of their constituents. The offering of “conflict coaching” appeared on survey responses and through the telephone interviews as a process that was truly customer-defined and has proven to meet the needs
of a variety of campus stakeholders, most notably students. It seems then that a reasonable “best practice” is to continue to monitor the needs of all customers and practice the flexibility to modify existing programs and create new services as necessary. This will serve to build upon the support and recognition that campus populations have shown for campus centers that are able to provide the services that best fit their particular situations.

Components of Success

As identified in Chapter 4, various components representing the success of campus mediation centers have been identified by the survey respondents. Based upon those responses, a description of these components to consider for existing campus mediation centers or for those institutions interested in establishing such a function is a primary outcome of this study is offered as follows.

Figure 8. Components of Success for the Organization of a Campus Mediation Center

Figure 8 identifies eight subject areas for consideration in the organization or a successful campus mediation center.
**Affiliations**

Affiliations with outside organizations offer opportunities and support that may otherwise not be available to an on-campus center. Examples include connections in the form of memberships or other contacts that could provide sources for training materials, standards for training and organization, the professional qualifications for staff, and the strength of the counsel to be offered by peers. As identified in the telephone interviews, partnerships with agencies like local community mediation centers represent avenues for staffing, services, sharing resources, and organization models. These affiliations also demonstrate an excellent utilization of public resources, garnering support from groups outside of campuses.

**Sponsors/Mentors**

Partnerships with internal campus groups associated with either academic departments (schools of law, etc.) and/or administrative functions (student services, human resources, etc.) could efficiently offer resources in the form of counsel, staffing, funding, and location (office space). These affiliations can represent “win/win” opportunities, developing focused services that meet the needs and responsibilities of these sponsoring groups. The survey respondents also identified ties to academic (dispute resolution) programs and majors that allow the campus mediation centers the opportunity for internships and to become learning labs for student volunteers and employees (see Appendix 15, survey question 6).

Establishing an advisory board can be an effective method to develop a strong representation of campus needs and interests. A cross-functional membership of individuals representing the various campus/public groups served help assure that not
only the needs of the center, but also the needs of the customers will continue to be present on an equitable basis. One critical concern expressed by participants in the telephone survey was the ability for the campus mediation centers to become a credible, professional entity, recognized by the campus community and the public. Advisory boards comprised of a cross-functional representation of members help to develop a base for advocacy and communication, building the reputation of the center and supporting that growth with counsel and promotion.

**Funding**

Campus Mediation Centers cannot be established or continue to exist without the development of a funding base appropriate to the scope of operations. Mediation center respondents to the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” identified affiliations, partnerships, contracts, grants, and “fees for service” as reasonable methods now used to maintain their status. In some cases internal (economic) support can be a significant method of advocacy. The survey also revealed a significant relationship between the campus communities’ perceived value of center services and the presence of funding from non-academic departments (see Table 19). Contracts for providing services outside of campus as identified in the telephone interviews also represent a budgeting method to help maintain a level of professional staffing. Each of these budgeting techniques requires significant oversight that needs to be the established, on-going responsibility of either dedicated staff or (advisory) boards. This represents a base necessity for continued maintenance and growth of the organization.
Web Presence

A web presence seems to be a basic requirement to best assure that the campus community is aware of the existence of the campus mediation center and the services that it offers. All of the participants in the telephone survey had in place or had plans to develop the web presence for their centers for communications, advertising, and/or as a means to offer training. Key to the success of this approach is to offer this presence in (electronic) pathways that campus stakeholders are most likely to visit. In at least one example, a mediation center identified in the telephone interview that they needed to expand their “hardcopy” based advertising, as an employee group did not have a ready access to their methods to advertise/communicate electronically. Centers must recognize that some populations otherwise served may not have web access or may not view such materials on a regular basis. Mailings, postings, and “payroll stuffers” can also be effective methods to use, assuring that the needs of all populations are met. As opportunities (resources) are available, websites can offer detailed menus of services offered and be an efficient, cost-effective resource for communications.

Quality Standards

Quality standards may include (but are not limited to) sources for training materials, standards for staff training and continued certification, the establishment and maintenance of measureables, and the adherence to rules and standards established by outside entities. In Appendix F, the open-ended responses for survey question 29 show that surveying customers is still a primary method to deliver some level of quality assurance. All of these areas identified involve oversight by a variety of internal and external sources concerned with the quality and value of the services delivered. In the
absence of such a quality component, services may be dependent on personalities and needs other than those of the customer-base. As with the subject of funding, adherence to quality standards requires significant oversight that needs to be the established, on-going responsibility of either dedicated staff or (advisory) boards.

As identified in Chapter 4, the most common response to the open-ended question on quality processes (survey question 29 – See Appendix F) was related to providing on-going training for mediation center staff. This is an important component for maintenance of the skill-base of service providers. However, as was expressed by one telephone interviewee, there was little effort identified toward the development of credible, professional standards or recognized, professional certification. Methods to measure processes and services with established standards were not widely reported, with some responses relating to a lack of staff time. Development efforts in these areas could support the mission and growth of all campus mediation centers and should be an area of focus for those interested in the improvement of their functions.

Staffing

Staffing models may include a variety of full-time, part-time, and volunteer staff dedicated to the mission of the campus mediation center (see Table 5). As revealed in the telephone interviews, resources (funding) can represent a defining factor in what opportunities are available. Regardless of the staffing source, staff members should be adequately trained to deliver a quality service to their customer base. Respondents to the “Campus Mediation Center Survey” reported that faculty and staff members particularly valued the presence of full-time staff members. Various training models and materials are available externally in addition to the internal development of training content.
Continuous experiential training was revealed as them most common method to assure the on-going delivery of quality services. As indicated by this study, the customers served appreciated a staff who represented their campus peers and who were dedicated in their responsibility to the campus mediation center.

**Services**

Services offered by the campus mediation center need to be appropriate to the customer base. Staff members need to be aware of changing needs expressed by campus/public stakeholders and modify the scope and particular menu of offerings as needs arise. Along with basic mediation and facilitation services, training offered in a variety of formats seems to be in demand from groups inside and outside of campus communities and particularly valued by the public. Offering basic skills training supports the concept of ADR in providing opportunities for individuals to develop their own conflict resolution skills. Conflict coaching in particular was a training method identified by “Campus Mediation Center Survey” respondents and by the telephone interview participants (see Appendix F, survey question 15). This service was established through the demand of center customers and was reported as being particularly valued by students.

**Continuous Improvement**

Feedback from populations served represents a primary source for a data-based, continuous improvement program (see Appendix F, survey question 24.a). Post-services surveys were reported as an effective method to provide immediate information regarding the quality and appropriateness of services. Other survey methods done on a scheduled basis or established for a particular purpose (interest in a new service offering) can add to
the base of information required to effect change in processes and approach. Web-based approaches may be appropriate for particular purposes and populations, but electronic communication techniques should not restrict access to groups otherwise served. Most important, campus mediation center staff and advisory board members must act upon the feedback received and champion changes in the mission of the campus center to assure continued growth and success.

Opportunities and Recommendations for Future Studies

Continued studies into the detail of the operation of campus mediation centers may be beneficial to those interested in the establishment of such a function or have an interest in providing for the continuous improvement and growth of an existing center. The Campus Conflict Resolution Project database found on Wayne State University’s campus-adr.org website proved to be an excellent source to develop a research population to contact. However, as previously discussed, it was discovered that this voluntary, self-reported data had aged - many of the listed contacts were no longer employed by that college/university and many of the centers listed were no longer in existence. This was discovered through an extensive web search and with subsequent telephone calls to establish alternate contact information for those centers. Other examples of projects to identify campus mediation centers were revealed through the telephone interview process of this study. One source had assembled their database for another study through contacts with multiple, outside ADR-interest organizations (Olshak, 2006). An alternate method to develop a representative database would be to assemble lists from responses to a communication sent through electronic mail "list-serve" functions. Possible organizations to contact could be the College and University
Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR), the Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA), and/or the Association for Conflict Resolution (ACR). The "Campus Mediation Center Survey" could again be utilized and forwarded for a response to a population of campus centers identified from this process step.

A longitudinal approach could be utilized to study the progress of the campus mediation centers who participated in this research at some time in the future. A mixed methods model could compare objective responses to a similar objective (electronic) survey and interviews could be subsequently conducted to explore the continuing stories of the campus centers as they go forward with their operations.

Finally, the "Campus Mediation Center Survey" offered a limited number of questions concerning the theoretical approaches for training and process. Future studies could consider exploring with greater detail the specific content and sources for training materials. Personal interviews could also be conducted to better identify and understand process approaches for mediation and facilitation. As more detailed information regarding approach was obtained, comparisons to measurements of success could be made to determine if different (theoretical) approaches may affect successes in operations and methods.

Summary

Beginning as a student-oriented service, campus mediation centers' successes are a function of offering appropriate services through the efforts of their founders and staff. Indeed their continued success will be based upon their flexibility, credibility, attention to the needs of their customers, and support from their institutions and service communities.
Examples of processes and services are available that have proven to be successful components of campus mediation centers that have prospered since their creation.

Many centers have struggled with staffing issues, institutional support, and budgeting. Other centers have reported success over the course of their existence and have established a recognized strength in their approach or for the particular service they provide. Success may also be a function of the particular affiliations they have established, and/or their ability to adapt their programs to the unique needs of their respective organizations.

Campus mediation centers provide a broad range of services to their campus communities and the surrounding public including mediation, facilitation, conflict coaching, and training. As services are offered to faculty and staff, appreciation is expressed on surveys to those populations for providing mediation, facilitation and training on campus.

Marketing their existing services and expanding service offerings to groups both on-campus and outside of campus is a common method of growth and continuous improvement. Affiliation with outside organizations is a recognized method to expand opportunities for continuing support, resources, growth, and recognition.

Based upon the findings of this study, a list of “components of success” for campus mediation centers’ operations was developed. This list identifies affiliations, sponsors, funding, web-presence, quality standards, staffing, services, and continuous improvement as key factors to consider when establishing such an operation.

The future of campus mediation centers will be based upon a variety of factors: their ability to continue to deliver quality services to the groups they serve; the expansion
of a broader range of services to new populations; the development of methods to insure the recognition of value in the services they provide and the professionalism of their staff; and the continuing ability to recognize their primary service to the student populations of their institutions.
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APPENDIX A

Campus Mediation Center Survey
Q1 Please indicate your consent to participate in this study.

I Consent .................................................
I Do Not Consent ........................................

Institution Demographics:

Q2 Is your university/college a public or private institution?

☐ Public
☐ Private

Q3 How many students are enrolled at your campus (full and part-time):

☐ <2500
☐ 2501-5000
☐ 5001-10,000
☐ 10,001-15,000
☐ 15,001+

Q4 How many full-time employees (faculty and staff) do you have at your campus:

☐ <100
☐ 101-500
☐ 501-2000
☐ 2001-5000
☐ 5001+

Q5 How many years has your mediation program been in existence:

☐ <1 year
☐ 1-2 years
☐ 3-5 years
☐ >5 years

Q6 If your mediation program is affiliated with a particular academic program on campus, please identify that program and academic department:

________________________________________________________________________

Q7 If your mediation program is affiliated with particular administrative department(s), please name them:

________________________________________________________________________

Mediation Center Staffing:

Q8 At present, is your program staffed by: (check all that apply)

☐ Employees of the college/university (dedicated only to the mediation program)
☐ Employees of the college/university (with additional work responsibilities outside of the mediation program)
☐ Student employees of the college/university
☐ Student volunteers
☐ Outside volunteers (not student)

Q9 Number of mediation center employees dedicated only to the program:

________________________________________________________________________

Q10 Number of mediation center employees with additional work responsibilities outside of the mediation program:

________________________________________________________________________

Q11 Number of mediation center student employees:

________________________________________________________________________

Q12 Number of mediation center student volunteers:

________________________________________________________________________

Q13 Number of mediation center volunteers (not students):

________________________________________________________________________
Services:

Q14 Which customer services does your center provide? (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided for</th>
<th>Provided for</th>
<th>Provided for</th>
<th>Provided for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation (Facilitation may be defined as moderating meetings between groups/individuals in conflict and/or working toward a defined goal.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation (Conciliation may be defined as an ADR method where the parties seldom meet face-to-face, with the conciliator utilizing separate meetings and/or phone calls to communicate among parties—could be referred to as &quot;shuttle diplomacy&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (on campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (off campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15 Other customer services (please list)

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Q16 Are your services offered as part of (or available to): (check all that apply)

- [ ] A student judiciary process
- [ ] A faculty/staff grievance process (non-union)
- [ ] A faculty/staff grievance process (union)

Funding:

Q17 How is your program funded? (check all that apply)

- [ ] Fees for service
- [ ] As part of a non-academic department budget
- [ ] As part of an academic department budget
- [ ] Grant funded
- [ ] Other funding sources
Staff Training:

(If your staff members (mediators and/or facilitators) who provide services are not required to complete specific training defined and/or offered by your program, skip to "Standard Process Steps")

Q18 How many hours of training must they receive before they are able to provide services?

☐ 1-5
☐ 10-20
☐ 21-30
☐ 31-40
☐ 40+

Q19 How many hours of post-training supervision/internship are required before they provide services?

☐ 1-5
☐ 10-20
☐ 21-30
☐ 31-40
☐ 40+

Q20 How many hours of continuing education are required annually so that staff may continue to provide services?

☐ 1-5
☐ 10-20
☐ 21-30
☐ 31-40
☐ 40+

Q21 Has your training process been: (check one)

☐ Developed internally
☐ Developed externally (an existing training program/system)
☐ Some combination of outside and internally developed content
Some mediation processes believe in a strong, interactive role for the mediator. In this case the mediator will direct all the process steps, freely make suggestions, frequently use private meetings, and focus on achieving the "agreement." This may be referred to as a more "directive" approach. Terms like "problem solving" and "settlement-oriented" have also been used as descriptors for this style.

"Non-directive" approaches differ by offering a more restricted (minimum) mediator interaction and by allowing a greater freedom for the disputants to define the process and the outcome for themselves. These approaches are often less concerned with reaching an agreement and more concerned with the relationships (current and future) of the disputants and the development of their particular problem solving skills. Terms like "transformative" and "restorative" have also been used as descriptors for this style.

Q22 By these definitions, is the process supported by your training program for mediators/facilitators:  
- Directive  
- Somewhat Directive  
- Not Particularly Directive or Non-directive  
- Somewhat Non-directive  
- Non-directive  
- Not Sure/Not Applicable

Mediation process differences have also been described with the terms "evaluative" and "facilitative." Some mediation processes encourage the mediator to actively narrow the topic for discussion, push hard for settlement, offer disputants opinions of what seems "fair" and what a legal decision might be worth, and work toward the development of a "settlement range." This style has been referred to as "evaluative."

"Facilitative" approaches focus less on the mediator determining the choice of topics and do not usually involve the mediator offering opinions or the evaluation of options, leaving these topics to the discretion of the disputants.

Q23 By these definitions, is the process that your mediators/facilitators are required to follow:  
- Evaluative  
- Somewhat Evaluative  
- Not Particularly Evaluative or Facilitative  
- Somewhat Facilitative  
- Facilitative  
- Not Sure/Not Applicable
Measurements of Success:

Q24 Have you been able to formally document any improvements (from some initial base measurement) in any of the following areas? (check all that apply)

- Reduction in employee complaints
- Reduction in formal grievances
- Reduction in outside agency claims/charges (EEOC, Civil Rights, etc.)
- Reduction in student judicial actions
- Positive responses (improvement) in faculty/staff opinion surveys
- Positive responses (improvement in student opinion surveys
- Other measurements of success
Please explain

Q25 Some programs maintain statistics measuring whether or not an agreement was reached during the course of mediation. If your program maintains such statistics, at what percentage level do your mediation result in a formal agreement among disputants?

- <20%
- 20-40%
- 41-60%
- 61-80%
- 81%

(If you do not offer post-mediation/services surveys to parties (disputants), skip to "Best Practices")

Q26 To what extent do you agree that your campus community (faculty, staff, and students) is aware of your program and the services it provides?

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral or "Don't Know"
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q27 To what extent do you agree that your campus community (faculty, staff, and students) who have participated in/benefited from your programs recognize your services as "valuable" and meeting their needs?

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral or "Don't Know"
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q28 To what extent do you agree that your post services surveys to parties recognize your services as "valuable" and "meeting their needs"?

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral or "Don't Know"
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Best Practices:

Q29 Some programs offer methods to assure the ongoing quality of services provided by staff members/volunteers. These may include the use of observers, the offering of ongoing training programs, and/or the requirement for hours of training or experience on an annual basis. Please describe any methods that you may use to assure the quality of your services on a continuing basis.

Q30 Some programs may have unique and/or very successful aspects of their organization, process, and/or services. As those exist for your program, please identify and briefly explain why you believe those to be "best practices".

Voluntary Identification:

Q31 Please identify any future plans that you have for your mediation center including new directions, services, etc.

Q32 Do you have any comments and/or questions regarding this survey?

Voluntary Identification:

Q33 name

Q34 relationship to mediation/ADR center

Q35 Would you like to receive the results of this survey?

□ Yes
□ No

Q36 Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up telephone interview, scheduled at your convenience?

□ Yes
□ No

Q37 daytime telephone number

Q38 e-mail address
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>Consent to participate</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
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<td>Full-Time Employees</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
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<td>5</td>
<td>Mediation Program Years in Existence</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Program Affiliation</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Administrative Program Affiliation</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Dedicated Employees</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Part-Time Employees</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Student Employees</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Student Volunteers</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Outside Volunteers</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dedicated Employees (Count)</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Part-Time Employees (Count)</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student Employees (Count)</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Student Volunteers (Count)</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Outside Volunteers (Count)</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.1</td>
<td>Mediation for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.2</td>
<td>Mediation for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.3</td>
<td>Mediation for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.a.4</td>
<td>Mediation for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.1</td>
<td>Facilitation for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.2</td>
<td>Facilitation for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.3</td>
<td>Facilitation for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.b.4</td>
<td>Facilitation for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.1</td>
<td>Conciliation for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.2</td>
<td>Conciliation for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.3</td>
<td>Conciliation for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.c.4</td>
<td>Conciliation for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.1</td>
<td>On-Campus Training for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.2</td>
<td>On-Campus Training for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.3</td>
<td>On-Campus Training for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.d.4</td>
<td>On-Campus Training for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.1</td>
<td>Off-Campus Training for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
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<td>Survey Question</td>
<td>Factor(s)</td>
<td>Research Question(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
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<td>14.e.2</td>
<td>Off-Campus Training for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.3</td>
<td>Off-Campus Training for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.e.4</td>
<td>Off-Campus Training for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.1</td>
<td>Referrals for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.2</td>
<td>Referrals for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.3</td>
<td>Referrals for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.f.4</td>
<td>Referrals for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.g.1</td>
<td>Ombuds Services for Students</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.g.2</td>
<td>Ombuds Services for Faculty</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.g.3</td>
<td>Ombuds Services for Staff</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.g.4</td>
<td>Ombuds Services for Public</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Other Customer Services</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Part of a Student Judiciary Process</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Part of a Non-Union Grievance Proc</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Part of a Union Grievance Proc</td>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Funded by Fees for Service</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Funded by Non-Academic Dept Budget</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>Funded by Academic Dept Budget</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Funded by Grants</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Other Funding Sources</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Basic Training Hours</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Post Training Internship Hours</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Continuing Ed (Annual) Training Hours</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Training Source (Internal, External)</td>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Training Theory</td>
<td>Research Questions 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Process Theory</td>
<td>Research Question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Reduction in complaints</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>Reduction in grievances</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>Reduction in agency complaints</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>Reduction in student judicial actions</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>Improve Faculty/Staff surveys</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>Improve Student surveys</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>Other measurements of success</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.a</td>
<td>Describe other measurements of success</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Formal agreements in mediation</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Campus Awareness</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Campus recognize value in services</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Post-Services surveys recognize value</td>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Identify quality assurance practices</td>
<td>Research Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Identify &quot;best practices&quot;</td>
<td>Research Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Identify future plans</td>
<td>Research Question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Descriptives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consent Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public/Private</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Full Time Employees</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Years of Program Existence</td>
<td>Freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Department</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-Academic Department</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Staff Demographics (x5)</td>
<td>Freq, %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dedicated Employees</td>
<td>Freq, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Part-time Employees</td>
<td>Freq, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student Employees</td>
<td>Freq, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Student Volunteers</td>
<td>Freq, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other Volunteers</td>
<td>Freq, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Types of Services (x28)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Part of Other Process (x3)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pre-Training Hours</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Training Hours</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Post-Training Hours</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Training Matl Source</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Directive v Non-Directive</td>
<td>Freq, %, M, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Evaluative v Non-Evaluative</td>
<td>Freq, %, M, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Improvement Factors (x7)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24a</td>
<td>Other Improvement Factors</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mediations = Agreements</td>
<td>Freq, %, M, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Campus Awareness</td>
<td>Freq, %, M, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Campus Value</td>
<td>Freq, %, M, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Post Services Surveys</td>
<td>Freq, %, M, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Best Practices</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Questions About This Survey</td>
<td>List</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Letter/E-Mail of Transmittal
Campus Mediation Center Survey

Western Michigan University, Department of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership

Principal Investigator: Dr. Louann Bierlein Palmer
Student Investigator: Warren Hills
Title: Campus Mediation Center Survey

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All responses will remain confidential and in submitting your survey responses no personally identifiable information (i.e. your e-mail address) will remain attached to your survey responses.

During the course of the survey, you may choose to not answer any question, and leave it blank. If you choose not to participate in the survey you may close out of the program at any time prior to hitting the 'submit' button and your answers will not be recorded.

Completing this survey indicates your consent for the researcher to use your answers. The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board has approved this consent document for use for a period of one year. The document was approved on March 1, 2006. Do not participate in this study after -----

If you have any questions or problems, please contact the researcher, Warren Hills at 231-591-3879 or at hillsw@ferris.edu. You may also contact the dissertation Chair, Louann Bierlein Palmer at 269-387-3465 or at l.bierleinpalmer@wmich.edu; the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University at 269-387-8293; or the Vice President for Research at Western Michigan University at 269-387-8298 if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.
APPENDIX D

Telephone Interview Questionnaire
Telephone Interview Questionnaire

Date of Interview: _______________________

Mediation Center: _____________________________________________________

Name of Interviewee: __________________________________________________

Relationship to the Mediation Center: _____________________________________

(Script for interview questions)

1) “Your center was selected for further interview based your responses to the ‘Campus Mediation Center Survey’. Specifically, your center identified documented improvements since the introduction of your program (and/or) methods within your program that could be identified as a ‘best practice’. I would like to ask more detailed questions regarding your responses, but first, may I have permission to record this conversation – it will help me with my analysis as I proceed with this portion of the study?

___ OK to record    ___ Do not record – notes only

2) Looking at your survey results, I see that you responded as follows . . . (cite survey responses). I would like you to elaborate on some specifics,

   a. Documented improvement(s)

   b. Designated ‘best practice(s)’

3) Does your center have any particular (improvement) plans for change or growth in the immediate future?

4) Are there any specific questions I could answer for you regarding this project?

I appreciate your center’s participation in the Campus Mediation Center Survey and your willingness to be interviewed today. As soon as the study results are complete, they will be available through (identify source or method for distribution). Thanks again for your participation today and please let me know if you have further questions.”

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX E

Western Michigan University HSIRB Approval Letter
Date: February 27, 2006

To: Louann Bierlein-Palmer, Principal Investigator
    Warren Hills, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair

Re: Approval not needed for Protocol 06-02-36

This letter will serve as confirmation that your project “Campus Mediation Programs: Best Practices in Mediation Processes” has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB). Based on that review, the HSIRB has determined that approval is not required for you to conduct this project because you are analyzing data about organizations and not about individuals. Thank you for your concerns about protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects.

A copy of your protocol and a copy of this letter will be maintained in the HSIRB files.
APPENDIX F

Survey Respondents' Verbatim Open-Ended Responses
Survey Respondents’ Verbatim Open-Ended Responses

Survey Question 6 – Academic Department Affiliation

Peace Studies
None
Social Sciences/Teacher Education Division

student services
Communication Studies - Department of Communication/

Student Affairs (joint venture)
Coalition for Peace Education
Law School
Law School
Graduate Certificate in Mediation & Negotiation, Peace Studies
Institute of Environmental Negotiation
NONE
NA
Communication Studies
Academic Affairs, Campus Academic Life
Law and Graduate Schools
peace studies program

Survey Question 7 – Administrative Department Affiliation

This program no longer exist
Student Affairs
Judicial Affairs
Office of the Dean of Students
Vice President of Academic Affairs, Social Sciences/Teacher Education Division
Campus Life
Assoc VP Student Services
student affairs
Academic Human Resources
Student Affairs
HR and Affirmative Action
Deputy Chancellor's Office
ADR Clinic
none
Office Of Campus Diversity and Equity
Student Affairs
Office of Student Life
human resources
Dean of Students Office
Provost Office
Human Resources
Ombuds Office
Human Resources
Ombudsman
Central Administration
Survey Question 15 – Other Customer Services Available from the Campus Center

Can Film Festival, Outreach, Restorative Justice

Website with monthly articles on mediation and/or conflict-resolution skills, etc

Note: While services are student focused, all members of the university community (and parents) may . . .

Student mediation offered through a separate outreach communication

Conflict management training, coaching, diversity training

Conflict Coaching for individuals in a conflict consultation/coaching

Circles and Community Conferencing

Other services include helping folks strategize an approach to deal with . . . Consultation - problem-solving and decision-making as well as preparation for handling

One on one coaching

Conflict "coaching" with one party to a conflict situation
One-on-one meetings with students in conflict with trained student mediators. The mediators offer conflict coaching, conflict management education, restorative justice based services (conferences . . .

Survey Question 24(a) – Explanation for “Other Measurements of Success”

It's difficult to measure some of these due to the university not maintaining records in a manner . . .

We haven't really documented improvements.

Reduction in Off Campus noise complaints client evaluations - we don't do enough mediations to show impact in other ways listed.

Faculty complete a feedback form about their experience in the mediation process.

We have not evaluated our program but receive positive feedback from employee organizations.

Each mediation is evaluated by the participants.

No, we do not assess this.

we track the resolution rate and attempt to do follow up surveys to assess durability of the agreement
Survey Question 29 – Methods/Processes for Quality Assurance

In Services on campus and work with campus consortium to announce other training opportunities

Simply require volunteer mediators to participate in the 20 hour training observation case reviews offer monthly professional development trainings to mediators offer in-service mediator cert

This has not been developed yet due to the fact that the program is run by one person.

In addition to ongoing education in the field of conflict resolution and communication, feedback is received regarding . . .

Each student/staff member must complete the 30 hours training program, plus 6 office hours and 3 mock mediations.

Monthly continuing education opportunities. Periodic co-mediation with program director.

Students are supervised by a faculty member who is an experienced mediator and trainer.

We have cut back offering mediation services and have concentrated on training and administering the certificates in . . .

we have mock mediations to have our mediators practice, we offer an annual training, we encourage members to participate external and internal evaluation process, ongoing training, mentorship/observing.

ongoing training and one to one debriefing after mediations

Ongoing Training Programs Ongoing Role-plays
use co-mediation offer in-service workshops on mediation topics two-three times a semester

Participant exit surveys, ongoing training

on-going training, new mediators shadow more experienced mediators in learning process

Periodic observation/evaluation, constant evaluation by consultees, regular training

Mediators are usually mentored and their is ongoing conversation between the Director of Mediation and the Faculty and Staff

All active mediators secure at least 90 hours of training, observe & evaluate videotaped cases and get the feedback from

N/A

Brown bags, refresher sessions

I meet periodically with the student mediators in supervision. Student mediators also are asked to fill out post-mediation

We have regular meetings to discuss mediations that have occurred.

Due to the size and staffing of our program, we are . . .

Supervisory responsibility by Director of program, including checking in about what's working and what could be improved

Quarterly in-service trainings/roleplays for all campus mediators
Survey Question 30 – Identification of “Best Practices”

Too young to tell!

Taking the time to develop a strong foundation for a program. From our experiences, it takes about 4-6 yrs to develop a . . .

Over the past year I have used Dr. Dues' Conflict Climate Survey in 3 academic departments and one large division.

We not only offer complete mediation training (the 30 hr. program), but we offer a brief breakdown of conflict resolution . . .

We have an advisory board consisting of 1/3 faculty, 1/3 staff, and 1/3 administrators

We are invested in working with the public school system, boy and girls clubs and service learning projects.

we are part of a larger program known as the Coalition for Peace Education, whereby we sponsor events to develop knowledge . . .

Transformative process

I think the transformative model is very useful on campus where the atmosphere highly values autonomy, so a less directive . . .

We are a community mediation service contracting with the university to provide the service. Our mediators include many . . .

Only University-Wide Mediation Program in the State of Illinois

I doubt that what we do is unique. Ours is a peer mediation program, voluntary and confidential. No records are kept by . . .

The student mediators form a student organization and discuss practices,
needs & concerns.

N/A

As relatively new program, we are still growing and trying new approaches to reach the broader campus community.

We recently implemented a service we call "ARGH" (actively resolving group hostility) that we market mainly to first-year . . .

Our service is housed in the central conduct office which serves as the clearinghouse for all reports documented by camp . . .

Survey Question 31 – Identification of Future Plans for the Campus Mediation Center

Offering conflict coaching training

We are planning on changing our advertising plan to include ways to reach out to faculty. We are also advertising to . . .

Having both academic and practical components to complement the program. Coordinating the associate of arts degree in counseling

I plan on training and using students as peer mediators.

We are starting a restorative justice program, and becoming more involved in diversity initiatives.

We are working with Judicial Affairs to come up with something we have named "Mediation Counseling." For this program . . .

We had a group of senior level students do "market research" for CMS as their class project. We plan to implement some . . .

We currently have a planning grant to see whether there is enough interest
to open a community mediation center.

We hope to develop additional community partnerships and internships.

we are working to expand publicity on our organization and to offer another

training session in the fall semesters in . . .

We do not have a center but an office

the program is being terminated as of June 15th

We hope to become a University recognized "Center of Excellence" and

develop an academic program and expand our services

We are reorganizing our Campus Restorative Justice Program.

continue to grow. Increase outreach to students. Mediation training for off

campus student leaders.

Off-Campus Issues  Landlord/Tenant Cases

Offer training to faculty so that they can be meeting facilitators on campus.

Hoping to survive another round of budget cuts

Student Mediation was only started this year. It is organized in the Office

of Student Affairs and is independent of the

Better materials to attract more clients

N/A

We work with local schools and are looking into working with home owner's

associations. I also would like to have regional . . .

The CRRC, which is an administrative entity, is now spinning off a student

organization, forming now as "The Peace Network"

Our change in direction mostly involves marketing and not a shift in
services. Our goals are to normalize the program’s . . .
establishment of a student mediator club enhanced collaboration withacademic affairs to address classroom related . . .

Survey Question 32 – Questions/Comments Regarding the Campus Mediation Center Survey

Sorry I'm unable to provide more information as I'm not involved with this program.

Contact Peace Studies

The section on training was difficult to complete. My full time position as an Ombuds comes with several hours of media.

If you call for an interview and get the machine, please leave a message

and I will get back to you as soon as possible!

I would like to receive the results.

none

Thanks

I have done a somewhat similar survey, and would be happy to share my results.
good luck. hope you can still use these responses. This is the first day I have

had time to complete it.

There are two addition "mediation centers" on campus, one in HR and one run by law students through the Judicial Office.

Questions 22 and 23 were omitted because we practice some of both.

For instance, issues in grievance or involving major . . .

There was no place to express this. I have no funding and no further training is required after the initial training.
I would love the results.

I was not able to respond to your question about directive vs. transformative style of mediation.

It's difficult to answer questions for this. Our Center is a separate non-profit organization that is affiliated with . . .