Wed 21/10/2015 12:14 PM **4.2.4**

Thanks again Sharon. I see also that it's fully covered in the TOR for both committees:

Individually and collectively, the [Designation Committee] will ensure the complete confidentiality of all application reviews, and exclude themselves from any decisions in which they played an assessment role or may be perceived as having a conflict of interest.

Similarly, should an MDC or ADC decision be appealed to the Board, any Board member who might be in, or could be perceived as being in, a conflict of interest would recuse themselves from the appeal process in accordance with Board policy.

Paul Conway | ***Executive Director***

780-433-4881 ext 111

ADR Institute of Alberta (ADRIA)
The Professional Association for Mediators, Arbitrators & ADR Practitioners in Alberta.
Over 500 members and still growing!

From: Sharon Wilson [mailto:resources2020@gmail.com]
Sent: October-14-15 1:15 PM
To: Paul Conway
Cc: debbie schmidt; John Souman; Alasdair MacKinnon; Tammy Borowiecki; Truus Souman
Subject: Designation Committee - Conflict of Interest

Hi Paul

Further to your request to write a paper at this time, I am very busy with projects at the moment and must put my efforts elsewhere. Just as a quick response, here is a few points I can make off the top of my head.

There are a very small number of applications that are refused recommendation to the National for a designation, once they are vetted by Truus in the office. We only review applications now once Truus has vetted the applications using the checklist and only when substantive objective information missing is there a question. She doesn't send us applications with obvious gaps. She does her job well. As a committee I know we have all been very pleased with her thoroughness and the time she has saved us with the reviews.

In discerning recommendation for a designation, there is little room for subjective judgement. Rather it is more about the objective substantive requirements being met. In summary here is a current listing:

1) current experience within the past 2 years,

2) required mediation training current (within 2 years) for the designation meeting the required hours for the designation plus an ssessment or evaluation as appropriate to the designation. i.e a

competent standing on an assessment (within past 2 years) for C. Med , the evaluation from the 10 days of training is acceptable for the Q. Med designation only,

3) appropriate references which speak to their current skills and experience.

4) we no longer accept the grandfathering (decided by Committee and recommended to the Board in about 2009)

5) interviews are no longer an option as of (Unanimous committee decision in 2012 and brought to the Board as far as I know by the Exec. Director)

6) the education must be current mediation training and not negotiation or collaborative short courses here and there in a mishmash which may add up to the hours

7) only the full programs with well rounded training and assessments qualify for the C. Med Designation.

8) the evaluation and the 2- 5 day ADRIA Courses qualify for the (80 hours) educational component only (not experience) for the Q. Med designation.

9)grandfathering was stopped by vote and a recommendation to the Board in about 2008

10) one is expected to recuse themselves when there is a question based upon integrity. Be clear the practice has always been to recuse yourself if you have a relationship or personal connection that puts an application in question for you. I and others have done that in the past. Also as committee members, if you have written a reference for an applicant, you are expected to recuse yourself.

12) in the past, the committee formation, as a requirement of the Board included someone who understands the education standards and what various programs include and require i.e. assessments etc). From the start of the C. Med. designations here in Alberta, we always had someone on the committee who understands the educational component (i.e. Debra Howes, Marlene Roza, Jim Wilson, Paula Drouin, Elaine Seifert and myself. We all Instruct and understand the educational component and requirements.

With these pieces in place, there is little room for subjectivity. Applicants refused a recommendation for a designation have been weak in at least one of these areas. Any applicant meeting this criteria, if there is full documentation, has never been refused, to my knowledge. Sometimes there has been appeals and when additional information was provided, they were recommended based upon the follow-up information and discernment relative to the additional information. We usually work from a unanimous agreement as a committee and before we move on with a decision in question, we would have a conference call and discuss the decision as a committee.

For example the question you and Tammy posed to me regarding the C. MEd Applicant interview (Young); she did not have current mediation training, rather it was

negotiation training at Harvard, plus she told me she had only completed one real mediation (that is not acceptable for a C. Med Designation). I meant to actually talk to you about that Paul, as when you called me - I was going off the top of my head and didn't have the details. In 2012 the Committee had agreed that an interview was no longer acceptable, and Young slipped through the cracks-I have a stream of about 20 emails over the Young application in my system if you would like further verification.

We have had a few applicants appeal our decisions. In a couple of cases when the gap was identified and more information provided, they were approved. In other cases, they were not approved because they did not fully meet the criteria.

This is a quick summary and I could be missing some details. I hope this is helpful. I am CCing Jon and the current committee members in the event this information has not been made clear to the new members.

Sincerely,
--
Sharon Wilson,
Facilitator, Mediator, Trainer, Coach

Phone: 780 464-0283