## Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

JOHN A. CLARKE EXECUTIVE OFFICER/CLERK ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESÖLÜTION JULIE L. BRONSON • ADMINISTRATOR 111 NORTH HILL STREET • ROOM 113 LOS ANGELES • CALIFORNIA • 90012

Recently, you participated in an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process administered by the Los Angeles Superior Court, in an effort to ensure the quality of services, we would appreciate if you would take a few minutes to complete the following questionnaire and return it to us in the enclosed envelope. All information will remain entirely confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

, CASE INFORMATION
Date of ADR Process:
Case Name: State Number: KC. 2999
ADR Process: Mediation © Settlement Conference © Arbitration  How was ADR selection process made?
In the case of arbitration, was a trial de novo filed? □ Yes □ No State reason for filing a trial de novo: □ Result of trial de novo: □ Resolved prior to trial □ Trial □ Referred back to arbitration
Amount in Dispute: \$0-25,000 \$250,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$750,000 \$750,000
Length of ADR Process: 3.25 hours.
Was there more than 1 session? □ Yee, after the first 3 hours ☑ No
Were fees charged? □ Yes, at the Initial session □ Yes, after the first 3 hours No
You represented: Plaintiff Defendant Defendant Dother (specify):
Case Type: □ Lendlord/Tenent □ Bueiness/Contract □ PI/PD Auto □ PI/PD Products □ PI/PD Premise □ Real Estate □ Consumer/Merchant □ Employment □ Malpractice □ Family/Domestic □ Other (specify): □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □
Result of ADR process:  □ Resolved □ Partially Resolved □ Unresolved □ Award □ Clarified Issues □ Resolved prior to process □ Resolved after process □ Moved case significantly toward settlement
ADR ASSESSMENT FACTORS
Have you had any previous experience with Court ADR services? Destensive - Some - None
Dld you want to participate in the ADR process? ☐ es □ No
Which of the following factors contributed to selecting an ADR process?  Court-ordered.  It would be more private than a trial.  It would result in a faster resolution than trial.  It would save clients money in terms of my fee.  It would result in a fairer resolution than trial.  The process allows for more flexibility in the range of possible solutions for disputes.  Other (specify):
Did your client attend the ADR process? Yes □ No □ By phone

(Over please)

CASE ADMINISTRATION	7				
Please check box best reflecting your opinion (5 = strongly agree and 1 = 'strongly				DISAGREE	
disagree').	5	4	3	2	1
The information received in advance of the ADR session was helpful.	\			0	0
The ADR Court staff were knowledgeable about the services.	<b>₽</b> ≶				0
The ADR Court staff were courteous.			_	<u> </u>	
The ADR Court staff were efficient.  The stage at which this case was referred to ADR was appropriate.	( <del>Z</del>	0		0	0
The problems of the case were sufficiently explored during the session.	2	_	_		
The ADR process revealed case facts that helped move parties toward resolution.		_	_	_	_
The outcome, either positive or negative for your client was errived at fairly.	%			0	
In your opinion, your client(s) felt they had been dealt with fairly in the ADR process.	YXXXXXXX		₽		
The ADR process was successful in narrowing the issues.  There was sufficient time allowed for the conference to be effective.		_		Ξ.	_
The process provided an important settlement opportunity.		0		0	0
The agreement/settlement was compiled with by all parties.		0	_		_
Although no settlement was reached, the ADR process clarified and narrowed issues.				_	_
The following factors contributed to the case not settling:	•				
Parties' relationship very hostile		_			<u></u>
Complex legal factors Complex factual issues		0	0	0	0
Other side uncooperative: □ Client □ Attorney □ Both				0	_
Skills and expertise of neutral		_	_	_	_
Credibility issues			Ф	0	
Other	¢				
A different ADR process would have been better suited for this case.		<u>-</u>	Ö	<u> </u>	<u>×&lt;</u>
ASSESSMENT OF NEUTRAL					
Neutral: Mediator, Arbitretor or Settlement Officer	AGREE			DISAC	REE
	5	4	3	2	1
The neutral made useful suggestions that moved the parties toward settlement.  The neutral acted in a fair, impartial manner.	<b>3</b>	0	0	0	
The neutral was courteous.	☆	_		0	0
The neutral was knowledgeable about the case.	🛣	_	_	_	_
The neutral was knowledgeable about the ADR process.	<i>≯</i> {				
The neutral possessed the skills and competency needed to handle the case.	52	ø,			
The neutral maintained confidentiality.  The neutral explained the ADR process clearly so I knew what to expect,	් <b>ර</b> ්		0		
The neutral reated all parties equally.	<b>₩</b>			0	0
The neutral gave his/her opinion about whether or not the case should settle.	-∰2	0	_	0	0 1
The neutral allowed me or my attorney to fully explain the case.	. <b>≥</b>	0	_	_	<u></u>
Overall I was satisfied with the way the neutral handled the case.	_X;`_			0	
In my opinion, if this case had not been referred to an ADR process, the result would have					
□ lower total cost □ about the same total □ shortened court process □ lengthened court process	cost .		-		
Would you be willing to use our services again? Yes □ No	•				
Would you be willing to recommend our services to others? Yes □ No					
May we share your comments with the neutral? Yes □ No					
41.4 / 44.4 /		<u> </u>	A		
dditional Comments:	- (~ <del>e</del> =	<u>~&gt;</u>			
The only seeson - my	<u>مىلات</u>	<u>~ +</u>	<del>-</del>		
entired into This partia	سکتے کا	<u> </u>	<i>ر في ا</i>	مهعم	<u>,</u>
OPTIONAL					
0 ) /				. ,	
lame: Michael Wadding Ton Pl	none: <u> </u>	<u>(c)</u>	ي ر يم	-4	00
9/01 12/-1-01 4/55					•
ooress:					
BH CX 90210					

ADD FOLLOW-TID STIDVEY