by explaining the long history of the conflict; how deeply engrained it was in the lives of the people; and how no one believed in the possibility of peace, including Collins’ father, who dissuaded him from attempting to work on an agreement and said they would “never, ever get peace.”

“There were no words to describe the carnage that was taking place,” Collins said, referring to the violence faced by the region for almost 30 years. He also stated that Northern Ireland could do little to prevent violence, as it didn’t communicate with the Irish Revolutionary Army (IRA), or Sinn Féin.

He added that U.S. involvement in a possible cease-fire was a crucial part of the process. The United States brought Gerry Adams, leader of Sinn Féin, to visit the country and be exposed to our views. Collins thought the visit facilitated by then-President Bill Clinton was very helpful to the peace talks.

This was extremely controversial, as it went against the wishes of the British government, Collins said. A few months later, however, the risk paid off as the IRA ceased fire and the governments of the United Kingdom and Ireland were finally able to engage with Sinn Féin.

“It is important to salute the role that the United States played because it did make a difference,” Collins said. “… By bringing the American dimension, it opened a window which wasn't always there.”

The Good Friday Agreement, or Belfast Agreement, was signed in 1998. Unfortunately, the agreement

Bringing peace to Northern Ireland was a long and painful process accomplished with determination and cooperation, said Michael Collins, Ireland’s Ambassador to the U.S., during a May 22 lecture.

“Northern Ireland: The Path from Conflict to Peace” was Ambassador Collins’ topic for his Peace in the Desert lecture. He addressed the long-running conflict between the political parties of Northern Ireland, the governments of Ireland and the United Kingdom, and how political conflict was resolved to achieve peace within the territory.

“We like to bring speakers to Nevada to share with the public their expert insights as to conflict around the world,” said Saltman Center Director Jean Sternlight, who introduced Collins.

Collins, who was heavily involved in implementing the peace accords in Northern Ireland, began the lecture
did not have an infrastructure for implementation and the peace process collapsed in 2003 due to unresolved issues.

“It was critical for us never to let the process drift backward,” Collins said. “We were stalled but determined to move forward.”

After a bank robbery blamed on the IRA left Sinn Féin in a bad public light, its leaders had to take action to preserve its position, and the Independent Monitoring Commission ensured the decommissioning of IRA weapons, Collins said.

In 2007, as a final attempt in the peace process, the parties and the governments united in a conference in Scotland, where a final agreement was signed, leaving no outstanding issues.

“It took many years to bring the negotiations to the point where, in 2007, we finally had an agreement... it is something that works to this day,” Collins said.

Welcome, Professor Abramson!

The Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution is pleased to welcome Professor Hal Abramson, who will be visiting the William S. Boyd School of Law in the fall of both 2012 and 2013. Professor Abramson, a full-time faculty member of the Touro Law Center and an adjunct at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, is well known as the author of the award-winning text “Mediation Representation.” Not only is he an active mediator, facilitator and arbitrator, but Professor Abramson is also a well-respected ADR trainer.

This year, he will be teaching two sections of Settling Legal Disputes: Negotiation and Mediation Advocacy.

Richard Birke on Neuroscience and the Law

On Oct. 13, 2011 the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution was fortunate to have Professor Richard Birke speak to students and faculty on the application of neuroscience research to dispute resolution and other legal matters.

Birke, Director of the Center for Dispute Resolution at Willamette University College of Law, is a well-known speaker on how the brain affects people’s ability to negotiate. In his talk at Boyd, he focused on the role of amygdala in overriding the logical thinking that takes place in the prefrontal cortex when a person feels fear or the possibility of loss.

Thus, in a negotiation, if one of the participants fears he is giving up something of great value, a logical argument is often unlikely to persuade him to continue the process—a situation lawyers may run into on a regular basis.
Looking back, Wertheimer selected two key events that, although separated by 20 years, were responsible for the marked change in civility in politics that we see around us today. Those two events were Watergate and the 1994 midterm elections.

Prior to the break-in at the Watergate hotel offices of the Democratic National Committee, she pointed out that members of Congress developed friendships with each other.

Wertheimer noted that her colleague at NPR, Cokie Roberts, remembered that when her father, Hale Boggs, Democratic majority leader in the House, died in a plane crash in Alaska, it was Republican Gerry Ford and his wife Betty who moved into her house to help her mother cope with the tragedy. The Fords stayed for days because the two families were friends. Wertheimer pointed out that such cross-the-aisle friendships are rare today.

In addition, the rules of the Senate and House enforced a civility unheard of today. Wertheimer related a story about House Speaker John McCormack (D-Mass. 1962-1971) that illustrated that civility.

During one particular session, when a representative had apparently annoyed the Speaker, he left the Speaker’s chair and went down into the well of the House where he noted that he wanted his esteemed colleague to know that he held him “in minimum high regard.”

Contrast this, Wertheimer noted, with Joe Wilson’s (R-South Carolina) shouted comment, “You lie!” during President Barack Obama’s State of the Union speech. Times certainly have changed, she said.

Her solutions to the problem of how we treat each other in the public arena included (1) fix the economy; (2) get members of Congress to talk to each other; and (3) try the Australian method, where voting is mandatory and citizens are fined if they fail to do their duty.

Pictured below (left to right): Mark and Nevada Public Radio Board Member Susan Brennan, NVPR Program Director Dave Becker, NPR’s Linda Wertheimer, and KNPR President Florence Rogers.
Some of the best minds in labor and employment law shared thoughtful and provocative ideas about the connection between workplace voice and democracy at the Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution’s Democracy and the Workplace Symposium, held Feb. 24-25, 2012.

Visiting Professor Lisa Blomgren Bingham and William S. Boyd School of Law Professor Ruben Garcia, who were concerned that America was at the “crossroads of democratic capitalism or economic feudalism,” conceived the symposium.

Describing those crossroads, renowned legal and political science theorist and activist Joel Rogers articulated a vision of productive democracy to achieve progressive ideals and resolve 21st century problems under competitive market conditions. Within the broad ideal of productive democracy, labor and employment law scholar Cynthia Estlund proposed companies provide representation to the vast majority of the workforce lacking voice through unions.

These stellar keynote speakers, among other distinguished academics, presented the latest thinking on workplace democracy.

It is the “best and worst of times” for workplace democracy, according to Rogers. Rogers is a professor of law, political science, public affairs, and sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, as well as one of Newsweek’s 100 living Americans most likely to shape U.S. politics and culture in the 21st century.

He provided political and economic context for the symposium, documenting pervasive inequality and a massive shift in the balance of power between labor and capital. Rogers’ Wisconsin-honed strategy calls for employers to take “the high road” of equitable, sustainable democracy.

He proposed a three-part strategy of reducing waste, adding value, and capturing and sharing the benefits of doing both to rebuild America.

“We have extraordinary 21st century problems, problems which don’t care about ideology and are not going to be solved by deregulated markets and conventional politics, but by a more organized, democratic public,” Rogers said.

In his view, successful workplace democracy will not be like the old worker organizations. Rather, it will serve the new worker, humanize standards, equip workers with skills and attributes, seek allies everywhere, and be both more political and spatial.
Estlund had a provocative response to the demise of industrial democracy since the 1935 National Labor Relations Act. The NYU School of Law professor writes extensively on workplace governance and democracy and believes that with private sector unionization below 7 percent, ideals of workplace democracy and citizenship are barely entertained today.

But, Estlund noted, while 30 to 40 percent of workers want union-like independent representation, 85 percent prefer less adversarial, more cooperative representation run jointly by management and employees.

She said the right to unions and collective representation would always be fundamental, but in the face of aggressive employer opposition to unions, the only other robust vehicle for employee voice may well be corporate social responsibility programs.

Estlund pointed to the embrace of diversity programs by corporate America as an instructive template to achieve the broader goals of voice and citizenship for the majority of employees in their working lives.

The symposium presented papers and commentary from 42 scholars and practitioners in six panels exploring contemporary legal workplace issues. Challenging times for both workers and employers inspired bold ideas to boost workplace voice, a necessary catalyst for the fullest embodiment of a democratic society.

To view webcasts of the conference, go to https://vimeo.com/album/1875796.

---

Every student at the William S. Boyd School of Law is required to perform some type of community service in order to graduate. Many fulfill that requirement by teaching classes to the public on how to navigate the legal system in areas like Guardianship, Bankruptcy, and Foreclosure Mediation.

But they may also do this by participating in special programs, including Mediation In Nevada Today (MINT).

MINT allows students to develop their own projects to educate the public about mediation opportunities and programs throughout Clark County.

This past semester, however, a group consisting of the leaders of local government mediation programs submitted a request. They wanted a guide for starting a non-profit.

The group hopes to develop a new non-profit organization that would provide educational resources for mediators and lobby government representatives, including the courts, to use mediation more as a less costly, more efficient means of resolving disputes. It is the goal to have the MINT students participate.

The MINT students — Michael Esposito, Tess Johnson, Kandis McClure, and Julianne Unite — did a fantastic job. It will take the government mediation program leaders many months to digest and implement the guide, even with the students supplying forms and web links to all important sites.

You can find the guide at http://law.unlv.edu/free-legal-education.html.

---
Each semester, fall and spring, the Strasser Mediation Clinic takes 12 novice law students and turns them into mediators in the course of 14 weeks. Last fall, clinic members worked only in Clark County’s Family Courts, but in the spring some students worked on small claims court cases at our local Neighborhood Justice Center.

For the first time, every student had encounters with represented clients and the chance to see lawyers, both good and bad, at work. For many, this proved to be an eye-opening experience.

While in conversation with Family Court Judge Gayle Nathan at the end of the semester, Professor Ray Patterson learned that there were quite a few cases ready for mediation but there were no mediators to handle them. Budgetary cuts had limited the number of senior judges available in the summer, too.

Patterson offered to poll the graduates of this past year’s clinics to see if any would be willing to volunteer their services to mediate during the summer.

Amazingly, given that most of the graduates were studying for the bar, almost a third of them volunteered, giving the court 32 possible mediation slots for the summer. Judge Nathan, Judge Jennifer Elliott, and Director of the Family Court’s Family Mediation Center Joyce Gallina agreed to supervise the students, who were considered postgraduate externs for the summer.

For the students, it was a remarkable opportunity to continue working as mediators, and in an area in which they have developed expertise. For the courts, the mediators helped winnow down their dockets. For the litigants, it meant their divorces might be less painful and stressful, in addition to taking less time.

This summer, everyone turned out to be a winner.

Saltman Classes and Programs Add International Element to Boyd

The Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution offered a variety of unique classes over the past year that focused on international arbitration and mediation.

One of the classes concentrated on international commercial arbitration law and was taught by Adjunct Professor John Garman.

“The course’s main function is to introduce students to international arbitration as an alternative to dispute resolution,” Garman said.

Garman added that he generally divided the course into three portions: introducing the concepts, providing situations where the students would act as arbitrators, and then going over how to conduct arbitration.

“[The students] are allowed to choose sides of a case and argue against one another,” he said, adding that concepts like arbitration bias can be seen through this method.

“I think students are very enthralled,” he said. “I try to get students involved from day one of the process. I try to get them to start acting like lawyers.”

Courses involving international dispute resolution can be of great service to the students at Boyd, Garman said. He pointed out that because gaming and other industries in Las Vegas now need an international focus to draw in more business, the ability to conduct an arbitration would be a valuable skill.

Additionally, it allows students’ horizons to be broadened to an international scale.

“On a global scale, I think [this class] opens students up to the prospect of international arbitration and to not be afraid of it,” Garman said. “I try to get them involved and get them to start thinking constructively and really acting like lawyers.”

Garman expects his course to continue and is even in talks to add another one.

“The new dean seems enthusiastic
about [the class],” he said. “The students should not be flabbergasted when asked to do an arbitration agreement contract. There are lots of benefits of knowing how to draft an arbitration clause.”

Boyd has had other international arbitration work besides the classes. The Chartered Institute of Arbitrators partnered with Boyd for a training program from Nov. 18-20, 2011 at the Paris Hotel and Casino.

The public interest U.K.-registered charity provides education and training for arbitrators, mediators and adjudicators. The program had international commercial arbitration workshops, as well as an accelerated route to their member program and fellowship program.

---

**Review: Sternlight & Robbennolt – Psychology for Lawyers**

*Jeffrey Stempel, Professor of Law, UNLV William S. Boyd School of Law*

*Psychology for Lawyers* is, in part, a succinct hornbook about cognitive science that can be a valuable primer and desk reference. It can also serve well as the central text of a new and different “stand-alone” course.

In addition, by applying psychological learning throughout the range of the legal curriculum and the aspects of lawyering, the book can be a valuable adjunct text for any law school course, particularly first-year and litigation-related courses.

The book is a welcome arrival at a time of increasing desire for legal education relevant to actual practice, but it also goes far beyond the sometimes uninspired “how to” treatises too heavily focused on largely pro forma lawyering tasks.

Instead, *Psychology for Lawyers* provides a broad and deep base of knowledge that reflective practitioners can use to better serve clients and society no matter what the nature of counsel’s particular field of expertise.

The book also provides valuable intellectual tools for lawyers of all types and melds theory, research and application of academic learning “in the trenches” of actual practice.

As the authors have noted, good lawyers need to also be good psychologists – and this book will be an invaluable tool in accomplishing that goal.
On Sept. 15, 2006, Professor Jennifer Gerarda Brown (Quinnipiac Law School) spoke to the Boyd community on the "Promise and Paradox of Restorative Discipline." She subsequently developed the talk into a paper, written with attorney Liana G.T. Wolf, arguing that restorative justice approaches may usefully be applied to attorney discipline matters.

Director Jean Sternlight saw that paper as the centerpiece of a symposium issue of the Nevada Law Journal, and she invited four prominent academics in the United States and Australia to respond to it: Linda Haller, John Braithwaite, Katherine Kruse, and Jeffrey Stempel. The resulting issue, Volume 12, Number 2, is now available. In it, Brown and Wolf suggest that a restorative approach to attorney discipline – inviting participation from clients, other interested parties, and members of the public – may be better than a standard prosecutorial approach. They urge that such a restorative model might improve damaged attorney-client relationships, whereas the traditional approach often instead “adds insult to injury and further estranges the parties.”

While noting the “paradox” of trying to use a restorative process to discipline errant attorneys, the authors find that a restorative process is consistent with the “fundamental meaning of ‘discipline,’ a word that connotes a rich set of traditions with strong emphasis on concepts of growth, development and education.”

They go on to offer specific design suggestions for how attorney disciplinary bodies might draw on uses of restorative justice in criminal law, juvenile justice, and educational settings.

While the commentators largely applaud Brown and Wolf’s essential idea and creativity, they do also raise some practical concerns.

Linda Haller, a senior lecturer at Melbourne Law School in Australia, finds that while in Australia, “legislative support for consumer protection and restorative responses to complaints about lawyers are well established... The melding of these on top of a disciplinary system has proven problematic.”

Specifically, Haller questions whose interests are served by such a change, whether restorative justice reduces recidivism, and whether a restorative justice approach is appropriate to deal with the many disciplinary matters that stem from mental health problems.

John Braithwaite, a researcher at the Australian National University and one of the founders of the restorative justice movement, finds that “Brown and... Wolf do a wonderfully incisive job of drawing out the promise of restorative attorney discipline.”

Focusing his comment on what he sees as three paradoxes inherent in attorney discipline – impunity, injustice and consumerism – Braithwaite finds that a restorative approach can help dissolve all three.

Commentator Kate Kruse, an expert in professional responsibility who, sadly for UNLV, has just moved to Hamline University School of Law, is somewhat less sanguine about the prospects of applying restorative justice to attorney discipline matters. While applauding the idea of incorporating more client participation into attorney discipline matters, Kruse fears the impracticality of adding new and complex processes to an already overburdened system.

She does, however, see real potential for adding more client voice to existing mediation and diversion programs.

Finally, our UNLV colleague, Professor Jeffrey Stempel, a self-proclaimed “realist-cum-cynic” who is expert in professional responsibility as well as litigation and insurance, sees promise in the Brown/Wolf proposal.

He states that “[w]hen applied to the merely errant attorney rather than actually unscrupulous attorney, restorative discipline makes perfect sense... and provides a useful adjunct to or expansion of the traditional formal methods of attorney regulation.”

At the same time, Stempel cautions that “restorative discipline must not become an end in itself or a tool for those simply wishing to erect procedural barriers to discipline.”

To read the symposium in its entirety, see http://scholars.law.unlv.edu/nlj/.
The Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution hosted its third annual Summer Institute in Dispute Resolution this past summer. This year’s courses, which offered either one or two law school credits or 12-24 hours of Nevada CLE credit, focused on Divorce Mediation, Negotiation, International Commercial Arbitration, and Dealing with Difficult Clients.

The Negotiation class was taught by James Coben, a professor of law at Hamline University School of Law in St. Paul, Minn.

This course examined the skills, constraints and dynamics of the negotiation process “by teaching systematic, thorough negotiation prep work and achieving optimal agreements while considering legal and ethical issues in each situation.”

Adrienne Cass, Boyd student and member of all four summer courses, said that she gained a lot out of the Negotiation class.

“The Negotiation course offered by Professor Coben was helpful in identifying my strengths and opportunities in negotiation matters,” Cass said. “The techniques discussed in the course have not only improved my negotiation skills, but also increased my desire to negotiate all types of matters.”

Professor Bob Collins, director of the Divorce Mediation Clinic at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in New York, taught the Divorce Mediation class.

“The Divorce Mediation course taught by Professor Collins would be helpful to anyone seeking to improve mediation skills as well as general communication skills,” Cass said. “Many of the skills covered in this course are taught by the Neighborhood Justice Center in the Mediation Clinic. This is a good course for anyone interested in mediation or anyone contemplating the Mediation Clinic.”

The class – composed of six days of intensive training – empowers students, civil mediators, and family law practitioners to work effectively as divorce mediators.

Two goals were set for the students: Give them substantive and practical knowledge in family law, finances and personal dynamics, as well as develop procedural skills.

Dwight Golann, professor of law at Suffolk University, Boston, taught the class on Dealing with Difficult Clients.

This course helped participants understand the underlying psychological and tactical reasons why parties will draw conflicts out longer than normal. Much of the class was devoted to exercises and role-plays.

Babak Barin, adjunct professor at the Faculty of Law at the University of Sherbrooke, Quebec, and his wife Marie-Claude Rigaud, assistant professor at the Faculty of Law at the University of Montreal, taught International Commercial Arbitration – A Hands-On Approach.

Cass gave this class a high review and recommendation.

“The International Arbitration course is one of my favorite classes to date! This course enabled students to become familiar with the details of a complex international arbitration case and provided a detailed perspective on International Arbitration practices as a whole,” she said.

The course was designed to help participants who could potentially go into business law and give advice on or participate in a cross-border dispute resolution process.

Having Barin and Rigaud teaching is fitting, as the U.S. is Canada’s largest trading partner.

These courses allow a variety of skills to be developed during the summer. Cass said that taking courses at the institute would be a huge benefit.

“The 2012 summer courses offered by the Saltman Center Institute were highly valuable and would greatly benefit virtually any law student,” she said. “I feel the courses offered through the Saltman Center Institute are a highly beneficial supplement to general BSL course offerings. All students should consider participating in future Saltman Center initiatives to enhance their overall legal education.”
Resolving Disputes Over Bankruptcy Fees

Professor Nancy Rapoport, interim dean of the William S. Boyd School of Law, combines her love of teaching and years of practical experience to resolve disputes in her work as a bankruptcy fee examiner.

Rapoport worked for five and a half years as a bankruptcy attorney before becoming a law professor and later dean at two law schools. However, even working as dean didn’t prevent her from returning to bankruptcy work.

While working at the University of Houston, a bankruptcy judge from Fort Worth called and asked, “I’ve heard you’re good at bankruptcy ethics. I have a very big case, and I need someone else’s set of eyes to help me decide if fees are reasonable. Would you be willing to do it?”

That case, In re Mirant, became the first of several large cases Rapoport worked on as a fee examiner and expert witness.

As a fee examiner, her recommendations are always presented to a judge for review, but the real dispute resolution ideally happens informally between the parties, earlier in the process. Fortunately, she said, everyone is motivated to compromise.

“It’s way more expensive to litigate,” she explained, “so I have a little edge going in.”

Rapoport is proud that she has been able to resolve every one of her fee disputes before presenting it to a judge, and described several negotiating strategies she uses. First, “assume that they’re not going to do anything wrong.” She points out “the presumption is we’re all getting to the same place, so we don’t have to be nasty about it.”

She also recommends “spending a little bit more time listening than talking” and remembering not to take disagreements personally, which leads to an amicable compromise about 98 percent of the time. In the rare instances when disputes become heated, she has other strategies for calming them down again.

“One of the best negotiating strategies is to get calmer and calmer,” she said. “Just start speaking more slowly and more calmly, and after a while they sort of spend themselves out. It’s human nature. It’s very hard to sustain anger if it’s not being fed.”

Rapoport’s dual roles as a fee examiner and professor work well together, both because she hires students and recent graduates to help examine fees, and because her fee work has led to ideas for scholarly papers. She has published two papers on fee examination so far and has become an advocate for establishing benchmarks to help judges and lawyers understand what reasonable fees should be in particular cases.

Rapoport is now recognized as an expert on this subject and her work has even been quoted in the Wall Street Journal. As a result, Rapoport spoke to the U.S. Trustees in the Department of Justice about this topic in June. In that meeting, one of the Trustees’ questions gave her an idea for another paper—which she will be able to both write about and apply in her continuing work as a fee examiner.

In-House Competitions

The Saltman Center for Conflict Resolution partners with the Clark County Bar Association (CCBA) each year to put on in-house competitions in the areas of Client Counseling and Negotiation.

The CCBA provides local attorneys and judges to judge the competitions and to play clients. Winners of these competitions go to the American Bar Association’s Regional Competition to see if they qualify for the National Competition and, perhaps, the International Competition.

These competitions provide an opportunity for all participants to demonstrate their skills in client counseling and negotiation and to enjoy themselves while doing it.

For the 2011-2012 academic year, law students Cheryl Grames and Deb Amens took first place in the Client Counseling Competition and represented the William S. Boyd School of Law at the regional, while Samantha Mentzel and Bracken Longhurst took second.

In the Negotiation Competition, Zachary Clayton and Lindsay Gassman were the first-place team, and Oscar Peralta and Benjamin Rundall were second. These two teams will represent the law school at the regional competition in November 2012.
This year Saltman Center Director Jean Sternlight continued to focus on both the psychology of lawyering and the problems with mandatory arbitration. After a seven-year gestation period she and co-author Jennifer Robbennolt (Professor of Law and Psychology, University of Illinois College of Law) have finally published their book, *Psychology for Lawyers: Understanding the Human Factors in Negotiation, Litigation and Decision Making* (ABA Publications 2012). They hope this book will be of interest to practicing attorneys, law students, and academics in both law and psychology. Sternlight and Robbennolt are now working on an article that will focus, chiefly, on the psychology of ethics and how this psychology particularly affects attorneys.

With respect to her scholarly interest in mandatory arbitration, Sternlight was very disappointed in the Supreme Court’s decision in *AT&T Mobility v. Concepcion*, 131 S. Ct. 1740 (2011), which liberated companies to use small print adhesion contracts to prevent people from bringing class actions. As Sternlight discusses in her recent article, *Tsunami: AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion Impedes Access to Justice*, 90 Oregon L. Rev. 703 (2012) lower courts are generally interpreting *Concepcion* broadly to preempt all unconscionability arguments that previously might have been used to void arbitral class action prohibitions. Sternlight is now working on another article, tentatively entitled *Mandatory Binding Arbitration Clauses Prevent Consumers from Presenting Procedurally Difficult Claims*. This article will argue that while individual arbitration can be an effective means for consumers to present certain kinds of claims, class actions or government regulation is necessary to protect consumers with respect to injuries of which they were not aware, or which would not be feasible to present individually. Sternlight also presented on this topic at Boyd Law School in the fall, at the AALS Annual Meeting in January, and the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in the spring.

In other news, Sternlight moderated a session on “ADR in Nevada,” for the Nevada Judicial Leadership Summit 2012 and served as a panelist discussing “Approaches to Scholarship in ADR,” at the ABA Section of Dispute Resolution in the spring.

Professor Patterson continues to direct the Strasser Mediation Clinic, where he supervises upper-level law students mediating divorce issues in Clark County’s Family Court. In the spring he added a placement at the Clark County Neighborhood Justice Center, where his students mediated Small Claims Court cases for plaintiffs claiming damages up to $7500. Once again he co-wrote and edited the annual edition of this newsletter, supervised first-year law students fulfilling their community service requirement in the area of mediation, and supervised the Saltman Center’s annual In-House Client Counseling and Negotiation competitions, in partnership with the Clark County Bar Association. Patterson worked on the fall Peace in the Desert presentation by National Public Radio’s Linda Wertheimer. He continued his service as a member of the Clark County Family Court’s Outsource Mediation Committee and the steering committee of the local governmental mediation agencies.
Upcoming Events

Peace in the Desert Series: Streetball Hafla
October 23, 2012
Film screening, panel discussion, Q&A

CLE: Practical Implications of Neuroscience Research for Mediators and Negotiators
November 9, 2012
Speaker: Dan Weitz, New York State Deputy Director, Division of Professional and Court Services and ADR Coordinator, New York State Unified Court System

Is Arbitration Still A Creature of Contract?
February 7, 2013
Speaker: Associate Professor Hiro Aragaki, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles

For more information, visit www.law.unlv.edu/saltman_events.html.