

HUNTER-GATHERER COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE

Laura Banks¹, Lorna Bigsby, Maureen Conroyd, Cynthia First, Celia Griffin, Billie Grissom, Brad Lancaster, Deb Millar, Anne Perry, Kevin Scudder, and Jeff Shushan

This article describes the development of a practice group based on a hunter-gatherer model, with the mission of providing high quality collaborative divorce services, with an emphasis on protecting children and divorcing partners, and expanding access to middle- and lower-income families. The practice group professional disciplines include law, mental health divorce coaching, co-parent coaching, financial analysis, and case administration. These professionals have collectively associated their individual practices to address challenges facing their collaborative practices. With common purpose, the practice group builds skills, generates client base, nurtures trust, and lays a common knowledge base. Collaborative divorce teams formed from its members serve divorcing families with efficient, cost-conscious, interest-based negotiation processes that protect children and help parties productively move on with their lives.

Keywords: *Collaborative law; divorce; theory; practice; low-income families; increased access*

WALKING DOROBO

Collaborative professionals gather. They tend to be “people” people. Collaborators like meeting. Collaborative practice groups² emerge locally, most often with geographical roots, and then flower into larger aggregations as county, state, and international organizations.³ Our individual collaborative skills have been deeply enriched by local practice groups. Nevertheless, we felt something missing in ourselves, and in our collaborative work.

The professionals of Cypress Collaborative Solutions, before we became Cypress, enthusiastically collaborated for divorce clients, helping them transition from distressed to binuclear families.⁴ We advanced our collaborative training. We hoped that more collaborative casework would follow. And it did. But none among us engaged the number of collaborative cases desired or felt the public, judiciary, or attorney bar was being adequately educated about the collaborative process. We hoped that our efforts, combined with the efforts of others in our collaborative community, would mainstream collaboration, making it as well known and accepted as mediation. We hoped the public would come to consider collaboration a serious alternative to litigation. And we hoped that our services would prove more transformative for our collaborating clients. Our individual efforts proved insufficient.

We paused and took stock. We scrutinized our professional practice model. We asked, how can we better carry the collaborative message to the public? We determined that we collaborated for others, but resisted fully collaborating with one another. We negotiated parenting plans and asset divisions of others, but resisted collaborating our business practices, personal quirks, and visions of the future. When first forming, we had difficulty making decisions and reaching agreement on Cypress’s organizational structure. We had differing visions of the meaning of collaboration. Emotions often ran high. We suffered some strife and interpersonal rifts. We labored over whether there should be a period at the end of our logo tag line. Pauline Tesler had warned and challenged us: collaborators resist collaborating with one another.⁵ The Cypress structure is our attempt to address the constellation of challenges we unearthed in ourselves and in our separate practices. Through the Cypress vision and

Correspondence: laura.banks@renibanks.com; lorna@lbigsbylaw.com; moconroyd@comcast.net; cynthia@everettlawyers.com; celia@celiagriffinpc.com; billie@billiegrissomlaw.com; brad@lancasterlawoffice.com; paralegal@wavecable.com; anneperry116@comcast.net; kscudderlaw@speakeasy.net; legacycounstrain@mac.com

disciplines, we endeavor to rely upon one another more deeply, and to engage a practice model linked to primordial hunter-gatherer origins.

In *The Tree Where Man Was Born*, Peter Matthiessen recounts a relict tribe of African hunter-gatherers, the Dorobo, plying the mists of Mount Kenya's forested foothills. The Dorobo merged with their mountain, sequestering themselves. Kikuyu and Masai tribes derided these primitives as "dorobo," literally, "people without cattle." Dorobo bartered bush meat and wild honey for beads and blades. Except for trade forays, the Dorobo relished their closeted forests. Dorobo did not fight. They left war to agricultural cousins. Dorobo studied their woodland companions, from retiring bongos to prowling leopards. They dug and harvested what fruits and roots the mountain yielded. The greatest Dorobo joy lay in feasts of raw elephant, beasts fallen to Dorobo bows. Dorobo believed themselves friends of the forest and its denizens. They suffered little of the greed and imagined permanence that domestication inflicted on their neighbors. Dorobo revered what they ate, and silently embraced the forest law that Dorobo themselves would sometimes be prey. Dorobo legends exalt the affinity of all created things.⁶

Cypress walks after the Dorobo, if imperfectly. This article describes, from the perspectives of its members, our task of learning to hunt and gather *together* in the service of collaborating families and their children.

EMERGENCE

The core group that became Cypress met years ago in their initial collaborative training: war-weary litigators, an over-taxed CPA, and mental health practitioners ready for divorce challenges beyond therapy or guardian *ad litem* reports. We developed into a practice group, encouraged one another, struggled learning our skills, and, generally, lacked sufficient casework to leap from litigative case-loads to collaborative work once and for all. Two years passed. Discouragement set in—scarce collaborative work, minimal public awareness, the erosion of confidence that slogging difficult terrain brings. We wanted to help families, and to keep their children safer.⁷ We made fundamental changes—to meet much more often, to expand our scope of discussion to include personal and practice habits, to study together, to require significant financial contributions, to establish a point system for participation, to develop a brand and joint marketing, to troubleshoot cases, and to aim to open collaborative divorce to separating partners of moderate means. We decided to deepen our involvement so we might become an intimate tribe of people who trust, depend upon, and support one another in peacemaking lives. Cypress emerged.

Cypress meets weekly over breakfast for more than two hours at a bookstore generous with its space. Participation is mandatory, measured by a point system that requires each member's activity in meeting, studying, promoting collaboration, social events, administration, and casework. We designate part of every meeting for communal study. We study technical work⁸, practical guides⁹, and assessment materials¹⁰. We have spent untold hours developing written protocols, which state our aspirational goals, best practices, and rules governing membership. These protocols are in constant revision. Each meeting includes time to practice reframing and reflective listening skills. We discuss our collaborative cases, celebrating successes and brainstorming solutions to problems. We pay monthly dues, each member paying the dollar value of one billable hour at that person's billing rate, which sum represents our anticipated costs of establishing our market presence and group administration. Our joint marketing plan weaves a program to put collaboration in the public vocabulary with bus billboards, movie theater ads, radio, print, and social media viral marketing. As a result of our efforts, we all have more collaborative cases. Perhaps we have grown more confident, and perhaps we have become more skilled collaborative practitioners. Perhaps our public education efforts are paying dividends. Whatever the reason, we imagine emerging as consciously competent practitioners and occasional artists of our craft.¹¹ We aspire to one day offer the best interdisciplinary divorce services in our community, and to be the sort of deeply compassionate people who make such goals attainable.

ACCESS

Collaboration (and all of law) faces a crisis of access. To date, collaboration has been most accessible to high- and high-middle two-income families. Most middle-income families believe collaboration (and litigation) beyond their means, and elect to proceed as their own counsels (*pro se*). Even those who could afford legal services are electing, in large numbers, to avoid lawyers.¹²

Cypress is addressing the crisis of access. First, we have deconstructed legal representation, offering its components *a la carte*. Clients may purchase Cypress services in small packages specifically designed to that client's needs and purse. Cypress's approach is consistent with the wider "unbundling" movement in legal service delivery.¹³ Second, Cypress is offering services graded to clients' pocketbooks and level of conflict. Cypress offers "Cypress Family," which is full-team standard collaboration, including two attorneys, a divorce coach, a child specialist, and a financial expert. Cypress also offers "Cypress Simplified," in which two collaborative attorneys and their clients add what allied professionals they deem necessary, but otherwise negotiate without additional support. "Cypress Mediation" offers collaboratively trained attorneys or financial or mental health professionals who sit with separating partners to negotiate their issues using an interest-based approach. An attorney mediator may prepare final pleadings for the partners. "Cypress Unbundled" allows the client to purchase the writing of a letter, or a single mediation session, or legal advice, or a bit of financial analysis. Third, Cypress has created a virtual collaborative law center (which we hope will one day become bricks and mortar). Under the Cypress "roof," clients can purchase most services they may require. We are drafting a schedule of collaborative events and their costs to educate clients about the duration and schedule of their collaboration, and where expenses lie. Fourth, we screen. Some clients simply are not well suited to collaboration. We seek to redirect them to a process that may be successful for them. Fifth, a paralegal case administrator, who has an independent paralegal business, oversees the nuts and bolts of Cypress collaborative cases, to reduce client costs. Our administrator sets meetings for teams, collects and distributes meeting notes, and ensures that clients' billings are consistent. Collaborations lack court-imposed deadlines; the case administrator keeps case schedules on track. Case administration reduces total attorney time expended, reducing costs. Finally, Cypress generates efficiencies by offering collaborative teams familiar with one another, who have already established deep trust and worked out their operational details. By these measures, Cypress believes our model will make collaboration accessible to middle income families.

Cypress is exploring, but has not adopted, a flat fee structure.¹⁴ This approach, which gives a fixed price for anticipated collaborative services, shifts the risk of purchase from the consumer to the provider. This scheme may falter as well. Clients might over-utilize services to the professionals' detriment. Perhaps Cypress will compromise with pricing that balances risks between separating partners and their professional collaboration team. The price-uncertainty that attends hourly billing remains one reason for client aversion to professional divorce assistance. Some version of flat fee structure may tame those concerns.

PROTOCOLS

Our written practice standards, the Cypress Protocols, balance two competing values: transformation and transaction. Transactionally, we process the partners' divorce, helping them reach needed agreements, shape appropriate pleadings, and complete the legal aspect of divorce. Transformationally, we encourage partners to embrace this transition work deeply as an opportunity for renewal and planning, with the goal that they should grow in resilience and compassion. Transactional and transformational values sometimes clash. Separating partners may disagree about what is worth doing.

The Cypress Protocols contain prefatory statements of purpose. We promise to avoid litigation, provide safe places to negotiate, work in good faith by interest-based processes, to employ best practices, to be a learning community, to recognize that wealth is more than money, to create trust, to

promote resilience in ourselves and clients, to make peace, and to seek professional excellence. The Cypress Protocols were not created from thin air. They lean for their substance on multiple pillars: IACP materials,¹⁵ protocols of and training by King County Collaborative Law,¹⁶ international training provided by Collaborative Professionals of Washington,¹⁷ excellent local trainers,¹⁸ Alison Taylor's mediation handbook,¹⁹ Pauline Tesler's works,²⁰ Forrest "Woody" Mosten's works,²¹ the foresight of the proposed Uniform Collaborative Law Act,²² and (of course) Stu Webb's and Ron Ousky's pioneering legacy.²³

The Cypress Protocols contain provisions requiring: 1) attendance and participation, governed by a point system that establishes values for meetings, reading, promoting collaboration, ongoing professional education, case work, administration, and socials,²⁴ 2) referral of Cypress-generated leads to Cypress professionals (excepting non-lawyer professionals;²⁵ the protocols also provide for referral to non-Cypress professionals when reasonable considerations so indicate), 3) graduated levels of service geared to clients' conflict level and financial resources, 4) admission criteria, 5) financial obligations, 6) joint marketing requirements, 7) priorities regarding hybrid (mixed litigation and collaborative) practices, 8) communication preferences (face-to-face, then telephone, then email), and 9) case administration by a dedicated case administrator. The Cypress Protocols remain very much a work in progress.²⁶

COMMON EDUCATION AND GROWTH

Effective teamwork demands a common conceptual base. Cypress recognizes that to form efficient teams we must share a view of our task and communicate well. We use common reading (see works mentioned in the preceding section) and discussion to facilitate unity and ease communication. Conjoined with personal sharing, input from highly qualified national writers promotes intimacy, growth, and needed skills. This intellectual and social process generates a group identity to which each member contributes.

We cannot say our educative process has been placid. Our tribe boasts many potential chiefs. Conversations are often hilarious or poignant, but sometimes awkward. Business needs have occasionally pushed joint learning to the foot of agendas. In the formation of our group identity, Cypress has experienced the process of "forming, storming, norming, performing."²⁷ We began with egalitarian principles. When we found ourselves unable to make decisions efficiently, we appointed a strong business manager from among our members. Cypress governance and identity continue very much in flux.

Cypress plans a three-step process to address these stresses. First, we have assessed our individual strengths and weaknesses, using Rath and Conchie's *Strengths Based Leadership* tools.²⁸ We plan to use these assessments to integrate our diverse personalities into cohesive teams. A second event, a short retreat led by an outside sociometry²⁹ consultant, follows shortly. Our goal is to better understand the inner structure of our group, deepen our personal connections, and "clear the air" regarding our substantial personal and philosophical differences. The third event addresses visioning and strategic planning. Here, too, our process will be guided by an outside consultant with a deep appreciation for peace and collaboration. We aim to clarify our goals and strengthen our commitment to make peace among separating partners and to protect children.

INTERPERSONAL DYNAMICS

Cypress doubled in size in just a few months in 2010. Once we had developed a hunter-gatherer model, we sought like-minded professionals in the collaborative community with whom at least one of us had worked. We took them to coffee, gave them an epitome of our protocols, and asked if they would like to sit in on meetings. As our cadre grew, its dynamic became more complicated. Our decision-making has been protracted, though not often directly conflicted. Uncomfortable discord belabored some casework.

Cypress actively engages these struggles. If each Cypress member were identical, sporting the same moral mettle, ethics, intellect, and social conscience, we would be a very boring group indeed. Failure as a collaborative practice group would be inevitable. We consider these struggles with one another essential. Cypress cannot be sugarcoated. Cypress is invaluable (and great fun), but not easy.

Cypress rubs the edges of our generosity. We imagine the Dorobo knew this well, dogged by scarcity and hostile neighbors. Dorobo survived by sharing. After all, in Dorobo forests, sharing and survival were mostly synonymous. We ask clients to share honestly. Honest sharing creates some conflict. We collaborators claim to help others move beyond impasse. Collaborators must put their feet upon the bare soil of that path. The way is rarely smooth. Sharp objects protrude—ideas and methodological quagmires and blunt evaluations. Paradoxically, the collaborative path is sometimes painful and lonely.

Dorobo fires warmed the tribe, not only the fire-starter. We share our frustrations in ways that bring us through conflicts. The sage embraces his mistakes, sucks more marrow from those bones than ordinary people. Wisdom, like the honey gathered from wild hives, often comes at the price of being stung. Our errors and ignorance sting. Still, there remains the sweetness of captured honey.

Collaborative lessons are paradoxical. We teach riddles, if we have learned ourselves. Humility in error breeds good faith. War defeats its winners. Embracing uncertainty builds confidence. Conflict encrusts sacred moments of peace. Sufficing springs from sacrificing. We cannot ask clients to go where we fear to tread.

HUNTER-GATHERER COLLABORATIVE PRACTICE GROUPS

The Dorobo dwelt for unknown centuries on Mt. Kenya's foothills, honing their hunter-gatherer dance with the forest. Cypress has walked behind the Dorobo for only one year, learning our metropolitan forest. Ours is a time of financial constraints. Were we Dorobo, we would be suffering seasons of drought. Dorobo persevered in their woodland cloister far into the modern era. Rainless skies did not defeat them. What lay within posed real danger. We imagine the Dorobo vanished by long sequences of minuscule compromises.

The Cypress disciplines ask that each member be "all in." When members falter, Cypress sputters. Collaboration without requires collaboration within. We need more than lofty aspirations. We need rules and disciplines and intimacy and correction and affection and visions and plans. We suspect we are not alone in these needs. Others will find the rigors of hunting and gathering attractive.

The bottom line appears to be: peacemaking demands commitment and growth. The faint of heart need not begin. Dorobo hunting and gathering is hand-to-mouth existence, at least metaphorically. Today's efforts suffice today. We focus on what stands before us.

Cypress aims to hunt and gather together, to build a tribe embedded in our locale, and to serve the broader community together with top-notch collaborative divorce services. Cypress dreams it might become a hunter-gatherer tribe of collaborative professionals offering America's best divorce. Perhaps, as our skills in working together improve, we will one day experience the ultimate result of what it means to be a tribe.

We might, like the Dorobo, fell an elephant.³⁰

NOTES

1. For further information on the authors, see Cypress Collaborative Solutions, <http://www.cypresscollaborative.com>. As in all our collaborative work, some of us contributed more than others to the vision and drafting of this article. The result, however, emerged from our collective efforts and our desire to speak with one voice. We list our names as authors alphabetically to honor that fact.

2. "Collaborative practice groups" are relatively small groups of collaborative professionals, including lawyers, mental health professionals, financial experts, and other allied professionals, who meet regularly, with a frequency that differs substantially from group to group, in numbers from usually less than thirty, for purposes defined by the group, such as education, case consultation, mutual support, professional networking, marketing, and other purposes. Many collaborative

practice groups from across the planet are listed on the website of the International Academy of Collaborative Professionals at http://www.collaborativepractice.com/_t.asp?T=PracticeGroups&J=Y.

3. In the Puget Sound region of Washington State (Olympia, Tacoma, Seattle, Everett), collaborators form closed “pods” (Eastside Collaborative Law, Seattle Collaborative Law, Cypress Collaborative Solutions, among others) or open “pods” (Cascadia Collaborative Alliance, North Sound Collaborative Law, 425 Pod, Curiousing and Ponderment Pod, among others). These are primary practice groups, supporting some or all of the needs of their professional members. At the county level, King County Collaborative Law and Collaborative Law Professionals of Pierce County are umbrella organizations providing best practices and educational resources to members. Collaborative Professionals of Washington is a state-wide umbrella organization providing national opinion-leader training for the collaborators of Washington. The International Academy of Collaborative Professionals is a global umbrella organization linking collaborative groups, providing training and global networking, and setting practice standards for the world-wide collaborative community.

4. The term “binuclear” we have borrowed from CONSTANCE AHRONS, *THE GOOD DIVORCE: KEEPING YOUR FAMILY TOGETHER WHEN YOUR MARRIAGE COMES APART* xi (1994).

5. The authors credit Pauline Tesler for the “hunter-gatherer” concept, as applied to collaborative practice groups, in her oral comments at the annual conference of Collaborative Professionals of Washington, November 2009, at Gig Harbor, Washington. Pauline Tesler also said at the same conference (as we loosely recollect) that the problem with collaborators is that they refuse to collaborate with one another.

6. PETER MATTHIESSEN, *THE TREE WHERE MAN WAS BORN* 38–39 (1972).

7. The risks to children of divorce are debated. Compare CONSTANCE AHRONS, *WE’RE STILL FAMILY: WHAT GROWN CHILDREN HAVE TO SAY ABOUT THEIR PARENTS’ DIVORCE* (2004), and JUDITH WALLERSTEIN, JULIA LEWIS, & SANDRA BLAKESLEE, *THE UNEXPECTED LEGACY OF DIVORCE: A 25 YEAR LANDMARK STUDY* (2000), for divergent viewpoints.

8. *E.g.*, ALISON TAYLOR, *THE HANDBOOK OF FAMILY DISPUTE RESOLUTION: MEDIATION THEORY AND PRACTICE* (2002).

9. *E.g.*, FORREST S. MOSTEN, *COLLABORATIVE DIVORCE [HANDBOOK]* (2009).

10. *E.g.*, TOM RATH & BARRY CONCHIE, *STRENGTHS BASED LEADERSHIP: GREAT LEADERS, TEAMS, AND WHY PEOPLE FOLLOW* (2008).

11. The authors credit Forest S. Mosten for this concept, which he presented orally at the annual conference of Collaborative Professionals of Washington, Gig Harbor, Washington, November 11, 2010.

12. JULIE MACFARLANE, *THE NEW LAWYER: HOW SETTLEMENT IS TRANSFORMING THE PRACTICE OF LAW* 2 (2008).

13. *See, e.g.*, Mosten, *supra* note 9, at 59–76. *See also* Office of the State Courts Administrator, Florida Supreme Court, *A National Conference on Pro Se Litigation Florida Team Report*, 5 (January 3, 2000) (advocating increasing affordability of legal services, as follows: “[A]uthorize and encourage ‘unbundled’ legal services (Unbundled legal services will not only make legal services more affordable to more people, but will lead to more informed agreements and, hopefully, less case ‘recidivism.’ Availability of unbundled legal services is a fundamental element of a successful system—it allows the bar to provide services that the court should not.”)

14. Tricia Peters & Marguerite Picard, *Business Competence in Collaborative Practice: A Different Business and Pricing Model for Interdisciplinary Collaborative Practice*, IACP 11th Annual Networking and Educational Forum, Washington D.C., October 2010 (exploring fix-fee pricing in an Australian collaborative practice).

15. International Academy of Collaborative Professionals, <http://www.collaborativepractice.com> (last visited Mar. 25, 2011).

16. King County Collaborative Law, <http://www.kingcountycollab.org> (last visited Mar. 25, 2011).

17. Collaborative Professionals of Washington: <http://www.collaborativepracticewashington.com> (last visited Mar. 25, 2011).

18. Seattle Collaborative Law Training Group: <http://www.collabtraining.com> (last visited Mar. 25, 2011).

19. ALISON TAYLOR, *THE HANDBOOK OF FAMILY DISPUTE RESOLUTION: MEDIATION THEORY AND PRACTICE* (2002).

20. PAULINE TESLER, *COLLABORATIVE LAW: ACHIEVING EFFECTIVE RESOLUTION IN DIVORCE WITHOUT LITIGATION* (2001); PAULINE TESLER & PEGGY THOMPSON, *COLLABORATIVE DIVORCE: THE REVOLUTIONARY NEW WAY TO RESTRUCTURE YOUR FAMILY, RESOLVE LEGAL ISSUES, AND MOVE ON WITH YOUR LIFE* (2006).

21. FORREST S. MOSTEN, *MEDIATION CAREER GUIDE: A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO BUILDING A SUCCESSFUL PRACTICE* (2001); MOSTEN, *supra* note 9.

22. 2010 Uniform Collaborative Law Act, http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/archives/ulc/ucla/2010mar5_cover.pdf (last visited Mar. 25, 2011).

23. STUART G. WEBB & RONALD D. OUSKY, *THE COLLABORATIVE WAY TO DIVORCE: THE REVOLUTIONARY METHOD THAT RESULTS IN LESS STRESS, LOWER COSTS, AND HAPPIER KIDS—WITHOUT GOING TO COURT* (2006).

24. The Cypress participation point system is stated as follows: “No professional shall remain a Cypress member except by ongoing involvement deemed sufficient by the membership to warrant continued Cypress membership. “Sufficient involvement” shall be determined by the Cypress professionals by a point system, which system shall be adjusted annually during the first meeting of each year to reflect the then-existing values and concerns of the members. The Cypress professionals may also adjust the point system at any other time the group determines to do so. Participation in Cypress is a privilege to be earned. In 2010, members shall earn points as follows, with 155 points being required for 2011 Cypress membership:

- **Meetings.** Cypress shall meet each week for two hours on Thursday mornings, commencing at 8:00 a.m. at Third Place Commons in Lake Forest Park, except for the weeks of Thanksgiving and Christmas, for self-education by reading and discussion, planning of marketing activities, discussion of ongoing Cypress collaborative cases, and deepening our interpersonal relationships. A member earns one point for each hour in attendance at a weekly

meeting, and one point for reading the assigned materials before this weekly meeting. Reading only the material epitome (if one is available) shall be insufficient to earn a point. A minimum of 100 such points is required.

- **Marketing.** Cypress members shall market Cypress Collaborative Solutions. The group shall determine what method of marketing is appropriate for Cypress each year. In 2010, each member shall educate other referring religious, medical, or psychological and other professionals, follow up with a letter to that professional containing materials which Cypress members shall specify and the business contact details for each Cypress professional. The Cypress professional shall send a copy of that follow up letter to the Cypress administrator. For each such education contact and letter, the member shall earn one point. For each hour spent in preparing written materials for marketing purposes, the Cypress professional shall earn one point. A Cypress professional may, with the group's consent, receive marketing points for other forms of marketing enterprise. A minimum of twenty-five (25) such points is required.
- **Education.** For each hour of continuing education related to any aspect of conflict resolution, a member shall earn one point. Each Cypress professional shall report to Cypress about the content and quality of the continuing education received. A minimum of ten (10) such points is required.
- **Collaborations.** A member shall earn one point for each hour of time the member spends in collaborative team meetings related to a specific client or clients. A minimum of ten (10) points is required. Each member shall keep Thursday afternoons available for collaborative meetings, unless no such meetings are scheduled. Contrary to the foregoing, the minimum point requirement for a child specialist who does not also provide divorce coaching shall be five (5).
- **Cypress Socials.** A member shall earn five points for attending the Cypress socials, which shall be held at locations to be determined at least quarterly. Spouses and significant others shall be welcome at Cypress socials, and they are encouraged to attend. A minimum of ten (10) such points is required.
- **Team Administrator.** A member shall earn one point for each hour of administration.

The Cincinnati Academy of Collaborative Professionals also utilizes a "points and meetings structure." The Cincinnati point system has the following structure:

- 1) General Organizational Meetings to be scheduled three to four times per year,
- 2) General Organizational Meetings may additionally include two socials,
- 3) Monthly practice group meetings,
- 4) Secretary will maintain attendance records for all disciplines.

Current Requirements for Roster Status will be ten points accrued each calendar year. Points will be awarded as follows:

- 1) Attendance at any general/organizational meeting **1point.**
- 2) Attendance at Monthly Practice Group meeting **1point.**
- 3) Training Seminars **1 point for each 3 to 4 hour seminar, i.e.**
 - a) 1 point for each one-half day seminar,
 - b) 2 points for each all day seminar,
 - c) 4 points for a 2 day seminar,
- 4) Attendance at the IACP Conference **3 points.**
- 5) Steering Committee meetings will not award points.

Each member is required to obtain at least one point by attending a general/organizational meeting and one point by attending a study group/pod meeting. There is the potential for as many as 22 to 25 points each year.

25. Washington Court Rules (2011), Volume I—State, at Rules of Professional Conduct, Section 7.2 (in a fit of short-sightedness) declined to adopt the multidisciplinary practice provisions of the national Model Rules of Professional Conduct. From this fact derives the Cypress exception for mental health and financial professionals to our referral rule.

26. Cypress Protocols, <http://www.cypresscollaborative.com/Media/CYPRESS%20PROTOCOLS%20-%205.1.10%20Revised.pdf> (last visited Mar. 25, 2011).

27. Bruce W. Tuckman, *Developmental Sequence in Small Groups*, 63 PSYCHOL. BULL. 384 (1965).

28. TOM RATH & BARRY CONCHIE, *STRENGTHS BASED LEADERSHIP: GREAT LEADERS, TEAMS, AND WHY PEOPLE FOLLOW* (2008). Using 117 questions to assess personal orientation and strengths, this online questionnaire generates a strengths profile which suggests the roles that the participant might play in group enterprise, and ways in which the participant might work with others of different skills and orientations.

29. J.L. Moreno, M.D., established sociometry, which field studies small group dynamics and individual choice, in service of the goal of interlinking small groups into an encompassing global network. Sociometrists help groups understand the impact their decisions have on others using spontaneous activities and drama. Sociometrists value diversity of opinion and integrating differences. For further details concerning sociometry, see <http://www.sociometry.net>.

30. The Cypress "elephant" would likely be a bricks and mortar collaborative law center full of highly effective collaborators mixing and matching their assorted skills and abilities to facilitate families transitioning to binuclear structures.

REFERENCES

Ahrons, C. (1994). *The Good Divorce: Keeping Your Family Together When Your Marriage Comes Apart*, New York: Harper-Collins Publishers, Inc.

- Collaborative Professionals of Washington, <http://www.collaborativepracticewashington.com>.
- Cypress Collaborative Solutions, <http://www.cypresscollaborative.com>.
- Cypress Protocols, <http://www.cypresscollaborative.com/Media/CYPRESS%20PROTOCOLS%20-%205.1.10%20Revised.pdf>.
- International Academy of Collaborative Professionals, <http://www.collaborativepractice.com>.
- King County Collaborative Law, <http://www.kingcountycollab.org>.
- MacFarlane, J. (2008). *The New Lawyer: How Settlement Is Transforming the Practice of Law*, Vancouver, Canada; UBC Press.
- Matthiessen, P. (1972). *The Tree Where Man Was Born*, New York: Penguin Books.
- Mosten, F. (2001). *Mediation Career Guide: A Strategic Approach to Building a Successful Practice*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mosten, F. (2009). *Collaborative Divorce [Handbook]*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Office of the State Courts Administrator, Florida Supreme Court (January 3, 2000), *A National Conference on Pro Se Litigation Florida Team Report*.
- Peters, T., & Picard, M. (2010). *Business Competence in Collaborative Practice: A Different Business and Pricing Model for Interdisciplinary Collaborative Practice*, IACP 11th Annual Networking and Educational Forum, Washington D.C.
- Rath, T., & Conchie, B. (2008). *Strengths Based Leadership: Great Leaders, Teams, and Why People Follow*, New York: Gallup Press.
- Seattle Collaborative Law Training Group, <http://www.collabtraining.com>.
- Sociometry, <http://www.sociometry.net>.
- Taylor, A. (2002). *The Handbook of Family Dispute Resolution: Mediation Theory and Practice*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tesler, P. (2001). *Collaborative Law: Achieving Effective Resolution in Divorce Without Litigation*, Chicago: ABA Publishing.
- Tesler, P., & Thompson, P. (2006). *Collaborative Divorce: The Revolutionary New Way to Restructure Your Family, Resolve Legal Issues, and Move On With Your Life*, New York: HarperCollins Publisher, Inc.
- Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental Sequence in Small Groups, *Psychological Bulletin*, 63, 384–399.
- Uniform Collaborative Law Act (2010). http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/archives/ulc/ucla/2010_final.htm.
- Wallerstein, J., Lewis, J., & Blakeslee, S. (2000). *The Unexpected Legacy of Divorce: A 25 Year Landmark Study*, New York: Hyperion.
- Washington Court Rules (2011). Volume I—State, *Rules of Professional Conduct*, Section 7.2.
- Webb, S. G., & Ousky, R. D. (2006). *The Collaborative Way to Divorce: The Revolutionary Method That Results in Less Stress, Lower Costs, and Happier Kids—Without Going to Court*, New York: Penguin Group.

The Cypress professionals practice in the north Puget Sound area, the main cities of which are Seattle and Everett, Washington. Laura Banks, J.D., is a partner in Reni Banks, located in Edmonds. Lorna Bigsby, J.D., now conducts an independent family law practice in Everett, Washington, as Lorna L. Bigsby, PLLC, following a career with the well respected Everett lawfirm of Bell & Ingram, P.S. for over thirty years. Maureen Conroyd, LCSW, BCD, provides divorce coaching and co-parent coaching, with offices located in Seattle and Everett. Cynthia First, M.A.En.S., J.D., is a partner at Schwimmer First, P.S., located in Everett. Celia Griffin, C.P.A., C.D.F.A., provides accounting and financial expertise from her office located in Lynnwood. Billie Grissom, J.D., practices family law from her Bothell office. Brad Lancaster, M.A., J.D., practices family, probate, and elder law from his Shoreline office. Deb Millar, paralegal, provides administrative services for Cypress collaborative clients from Stanwood. Anne Perry, Doctor of Educational Leadership, L.M.H.C., provides divorce coaching and co-parent coaching from her West Seattle office. Kevin Scudder, J.D., practices family law from his Seattle office. Jeff Shushan, M.A., L.M.H.C., provides divorce coaching and co-parent coaching from his Seattle office.