



Collaborative Professionals of Washington

Collaborative Practice NW

1. On this case your role was:

- Lawyer
- Mental Health Professional
- Child Specialist
- Financial Specialist

2. Who was on the team? Check all that apply.

- 2 Lawyers
- 1 Mental Health Professional (serving in a role other than Child Specialist)
- 2 Mental Health Professionals (serving in a role other than Child Specialist)
- Child Specialist
- Financial Specialist
- Other

Other (please specify)

3. If professionals in addition to lawyers were part of the team, how were the other professionals chosen?

- The lawyers recommended or chose other professionals for the team, who the clients then met/ interviewed and retained
- Before retaining lawyers, the clients met with a mental health professional, who then recommended other professionals to work on the team
- Before retaining lawyers, the clients met with a financial professional, who then recommended other professionals to work on the team
- Other

Other (please specify)

4. How many months did it take to complete the case?

- Less than 3 months
- 4-6 months
- 7-9 months
- 10-12 months
- 13-18 months
- 19-24 months
- More than 24 months

5. What was the outcome of the case?

- Completed case with settlement agreement
- The Collaborative process terminated prior to completion of a full settlement
- Reconciliation
- Other

Other (please specify)

6. What were the total fees paid to Party 1's lawyer (excluding experts such as appraisers, pension valuation experts, etc.)?

- \$0 - \$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- \$30,000 - \$35,000
- \$35,000 - \$40,000
- \$45,000 - \$45,000
- \$45,000 - \$50,000
- Over \$50,000

7. What hourly rate was charged by Party 1's Attorney? (Please select the closest rate)

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Pro Bono | <input type="radio"/> \$250.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$375.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$150.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$275.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$400.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$175.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$300.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Over \$400.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$200.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$325.00 per hour | |
| <input type="radio"/> \$225.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$350.00 per hour | |

8. What were the total fees paid to Party 2's lawyer (excluding experts such as appraisers, pension valuation experts, etc.)?

- \$0-\$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- \$30,000 - \$35,000
- \$35,000 - \$40,000
- \$40,000 - \$45,000
- \$45,000 - \$50,000
- Over \$50,000

9. What hourly rate was charged by Party 2's Attorney? (Please select the closest rate)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> \$250.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$375.00 per hour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$150.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$275.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$400.00 per hour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$175.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$300.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$400.00 per hour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$200.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$325.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> Pro Bono |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$225.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$350.00 per hour | |

10. What were the total fees paid to the first Mental Health Professional (serving in a role other than Child Specialist)?

- Not Applicable
- \$0 - \$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- Over \$30,000

11. What hourly rate was charged by the first Mental Health Practitioner? (Please select the closest rate)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> \$150.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$275.00 per hour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$50.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$175.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$300.00 per hour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$75.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$200.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> Pro Bono |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$100.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$225.00 per hour | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$125.00 per hour | <input type="checkbox"/> \$250.00 per hour | |

12. What were the total fees paid to the 2nd Mental Health Professional (serving in a role other than Child Specialist)?

- Not Applicable
- \$0 - \$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- Over \$30,000

13. What hourly rate was charged by the second Mental Health Practitioner? (Please select the closest rate)

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Not Applicable | <input type="radio"/> \$150.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$275.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$50.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$175.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Over \$300.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$75.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$200.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Pro Bono |
| <input type="radio"/> \$100.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$225.00 per hour | |
| <input type="radio"/> \$125.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$250.00 per hour | |

14. What were the total fees paid to the Child Specialist?

- Not Applicable
- \$0 - \$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- Over \$30,000

15. What hourly rate was charged by the Child Specialist? (Please select the closest rate)

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Not Applicable | <input type="radio"/> \$150.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$275.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$50.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$175.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Over \$300.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$75.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$200.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Pro Bono |
| <input type="radio"/> \$100.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$225.00 per hour | |
| <input type="radio"/> \$125.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$250.00 per hour | |

16. What were the total fees paid to the Financial Professional?

- Not Applicable
- \$0 - \$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- Over \$30,000

17. What hourly rate was charged by the Financial Professional? (Please select the closest rate)

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Not Applicable | <input type="radio"/> \$150.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$275.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$50.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$175.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Over \$300.00 per hour |
| <input type="radio"/> \$75.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$200.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> Pro Bono |
| <input type="radio"/> \$100.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$225.00 per hour | |
| <input type="radio"/> \$125.00 per hour | <input type="radio"/> \$250.00 per hour | |

18. What were the total fees paid to Collaborative professionals?

- \$0 - \$2,500
- \$2,501 - \$5,000
- \$5,001 - \$7,500
- \$7,501 - \$10,000
- \$10,001 - \$12,500
- \$12,501 - \$15,000
- \$15,001 - \$20,000
- \$20,001 - \$25,000
- \$25,001 - \$30,000
- \$30,001 - \$40,000
- \$40,001 - \$50,000
- \$50,001 - \$75,000
- \$75,001 - \$100,000
- Over \$100,000

19. Please rate the difficulty of this case:

- Very difficult
- Difficult
- Moderate
- Easy
- Very easy

20. From the perspective of the Collaborative professionals on this case, what factors, if any, regarding the clients caused the case to be difficult or to terminate? (Check all that apply)

- No factors regarding the clients caused the case to be difficult or to terminate
- Not applicable as case settled and was moderate or easy
- One or both clients had a mental health issue
- The case involved substance abuse
- The case involved verbal abuse
- The case involved domestic violence
- Lack of trust between clients
- One or both clients invaded the privacy of the other (i.e., read the other's emails or taped their phone conversations)
- One or both clients had an extreme lack of empathy for the other client
- Cooperation between the clients was always or almost always impossible
- There was an imbalance of power between the clients
- One or both clients acted unilaterally
- One or both clients' expectations about the process were unrealistic
- One or both clients' expectations about outcome were unrealistic
- One or both clients refused to disclose relevant information/documents
- One or both clients had unresolved feelings or lack of acceptance of divorce
- Other

Other (please specify)

21. From the perspective of the Collaborative professionals on the case, what substantive factors, if any, caused the case to be difficult or to terminate? (Check all that apply)

- No substantive factors caused the case to be difficult or to terminate
- Not applicable as case settled and was moderate or easy
- Spousal maintenance
- Child support and/or sharing of children's expenses
- Parenting time
- Custody
- Division of assets
- Division of debts
- Disposition of marital home
- Determination of nonmarital or separate property
- Other

Other (please specify)

22. From the perspective of the Collaborative professionals on this case, what factors, if any, regarding the Collaborative professionals on the case, caused the case to be difficult or to terminate? (Check all that apply)

- No factors regarding Collaborative professionals caused the case to be difficult or to terminate
- Not applicable as case settled and was moderate or easy
- One or more professionals acted unilaterally
- One or more professionals was unwilling to disclose relevant information/documents
- Lack of trust among two or more Collaborative professionals
- One or more Collaborative professionals withdrew
- One or both lawyers threatened to go to court
- Two or more Collaborative professionals had very different approaches or styles of Advocacy
- Lack of teamwork among the Collaborative professionals
- Other

Other (please specify)

23. Please specify the genders of the clients in this case:

- Male/Female
- Male/Male
- Female/Female
- Other (please specify)

24. What was the race of Party 1?

- Caucasian
- American Indian
- Hispanic
- Black or African American
- Asian
- Other

Other (please specify)

25. What was the race of Party 2?

- Caucasian
- American Indian
- Hispanic
- Black or African American
- Asian
- Other

Other (please specify)

26. What was the age of Party 1?

- 20 – 30
- 31 – 35
- 36 – 40
- 41 – 45
- 46 – 50
- 51 – 55
- 56 – 60
- 61 – 65
- 66 – 70
- 71 – 80
- 81 or older

27. What was the age of Party 2?

- 20 – 30
- 31 – 35
- 36 – 40
- 41 – 45
- 46 – 50
- 51 – 55
- 56 – 60
- 61 – 65
- 66 – 70
- 71 – 80
- 81 or older

28. What was the highest level of education reached by Party 1?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> High School | <input type="radio"/> 4 year College Degree |
| <input type="radio"/> GED | <input type="radio"/> Some graduate work |
| <input type="radio"/> Some 4-year College | <input type="radio"/> Masters |
| <input type="radio"/> Some 2-year College | <input type="radio"/> Ph.D. |
| <input type="radio"/> AA Degree | <input type="radio"/> Other advanced degree. |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify) | |

29. What was the highest level of education reached by Party 2?

- High School
- AA Degree
- Ph.D.
- GED
- 4 year College Degree
- Other Advanced Degree
- Some 4-year College
- Some graduate work
- Some 2-year College
- Masters
- Other (please specify)

30. What is the zip code of the marital residence? If no residence, put a zip code of where the case primarily took place.

31. Do the clients have children?

- Yes
- No

32. How many children were subject to the legal process?

- None
- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- Other

Other (please specify)

33. How many children were in the household but not subject to the legal process?

- None
- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- Other

Other (please specify)

34. What was the gross annual income of Party 1 at the beginning of the case?

- Less than \$18,000
- \$18,000-\$34,999
- \$35,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$74,999
- \$75,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000 - \$199,999
- \$200,000 - \$499,999
- More than \$500,000

35. What was the gross annual income of Party 2 at the beginning of the case?

- Less than \$18,000
- \$18,000-\$34,999
- \$35,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$74,999
- \$75,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000 - \$199,999
- \$200,000 - \$499,999
- More than \$500,000

36. What was the net value of the marital estate the year of the divorce (value of marital assets less the liabilities owed)?

- Less than \$0
- \$0 - \$100,000
- \$100,001 - \$200,000
- \$200,001 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$750,000
- \$750,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$2,000,000
- More than \$2,000,000

37. Did a client in your case agree to accept less/pay more than he/she/they would have been entitled to/required to under a strict application of your jurisdiction's child support standards?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

38. If a client in your case agreed to accept less/pay more than he/she/they would have been entitled to/required to under a strict application of your jurisdiction's child support standards, please identify the primary reason for doing so.

- As a tradeoff for a more favorable spousal maintenance or property award
- To preserve the ongoing familial relationship
- The agreed upon level of child support more accurately reflected the need for child support
- Not Applicable
- Other

Other (please specify)

39. How would you rate the success of the case?

- It was highly successful
- It was successful
- It was somewhat successful
- It was somewhat unsuccessful
- It was completely unsuccessful

40. On a scale of one to five, how well was the process tailored to the parties and their needs? (One is very poor, two is somewhat poor, three is neutral, four is somewhat well, and five is quite well.)

1 2 3 4 5

41. What process factors, if any, contributed to the successfulness of your case? (Check all that apply)

- The case involved an appropriate combination of professionals
- Meetings were scheduled in a timely fashion
- The Collaborative professionals successfully adapted their styles to one another
- All Collaborative professionals performed their roles competently and professionally
- Other

Other (please specify)

42. What process factors, if any, contributed to a lack of success of your case? (Check all that apply)

- The case did not involve an appropriate combination of professionals
- Meetings were not scheduled on a timely basis
- Two or more Collaborative professionals styles were different and contributed to process problems
- One or more Collaborative professionals did not perform their role competently and/or professionally
- Not applicable
- Other

Other (please specify)

43. On a scale of one – five, how acceptable were the substantive outcomes to Party 1? (One is not at all acceptable, two is somewhat unacceptable, three is neutral, four is somewhat acceptable, and five is very acceptable.)

1 2 3 4 5
 Not Applicable

44. On a scale of one – five, how acceptable were the substantive outcomes to Party 2? (One is not at all acceptable, two is somewhat unacceptable, three is neutral, four is somewhat acceptable, and five is very acceptable.)

1 2 3 4 5 Not Applicable

45. Which of the substantive outcomes below, if any, contributed to the successfulness of your case? (Check all that apply)

- Distribution of assets so as to meet the interests of each party
- Distribution of debts so as to meet the interests of each party
- Provision of adequate housing for both parties
- Distribution of nonmarital assets
- The distribution of the incomes of both parties so as to maximize the cash flow of each party
- Development of a parenting plan that met the needs of the parties' children
- How well the interests of the children were served
- Not applicable
- Other

Other (please specify)

46. Which substantive outcomes below, if any, contributed to the lack of successfulness of your case? (Check all that apply)

- Distribution of assets so as to meet the interests of each party
- Distribution of debts so as to meet the interests of each party
- Provision of adequate housing for both parties
- Distribution of nonmarital assets
- The distribution of the incomes of both parties so as to maximize the cash flow of each party
- Development of a parenting plan that met the needs of the parties' children
- How well the interests of the children were served
- Not applicable
- Other

Other (please specify)

47. On a scale of one to five, how acceptable were the relational outcomes to Party 1? (One is not at all acceptable, two is somewhat unacceptable, three is neutral, four is somewhat acceptable, and five is very acceptable.)

- 1 2 3 4 5

48. On a scale of one to five, how acceptable were the relational outcomes to Party 2? (One is not at all acceptable, two is somewhat unacceptable, three is neutral, four is somewhat acceptable, and five is very acceptable.)

- 1 2 3 4 5

49. Which of the relational outcomes below, if any, contributed to the successfulness of your case. (Check all that apply)

- The family was restructured in a constructive way
- The parties developed or maintained constructive/healthy relationships with one another
- Both parties developed or maintained healthy relationships with their children
- The children were not involved in conflict and were able to focus on their needs and interests as children (school, friends, activities, etc.)
- Both parties developed effective co-parenting skills
- Not applicable
- Other

Other (please specify)

50. Which of the relational outcomes below, if any, contributed to the lack of success of your case? (Check all that apply)

- The family was not restructured in a constructive way
- The parties did not develop and maintain constructive/healthy relationships with one another
- One or both parties did not develop and maintain healthy relationships with their children
- The children were involved in conflict
- The parties did not develop effective co-parenting skills
- Not applicable
- Other

Other (please specify)

