

## FOUR DIVORCE PARADIGMS

“Kitchen Table” Divorce	Mediation	Litigation	Collaborative Divorce
<p>Spouses prepare and file paperwork on their own</p> <p>Highly recommended that each party have an attorney review the final documents</p>	<p>Uses a neutral third-party to help the couple reach an agreement</p> <p>Parties may or may not be represented by attorneys</p> <p>Not binding</p> <p>Confidential</p> <p>Sometimes it does not resolve all of the issues</p>	<p>Each party is represented by an attorney</p> <p>Whatever is not resolved in mediation is decided by a judge in court</p> <p>Most expensive option</p> <p>Only deals with legal issues; exacerbates emotional issues</p>	<p>Team approach</p> <p>Both parties are represented by attorneys trained in the Collaborative Divorce process</p> <p>Seeks a win/win for the whole family</p> <p>Stays out of court</p> <p>Team can include: Coaches, Mental Health Professionals, Attorneys, Financial Specialists, Realtor, Appraiser, Mortgage Professional and Child Specialists</p>
Works Best When the Parties are:	Works Best When the Parties are:	Works Best When the Parties are:	Works Best When the Parties are:
<p>Agreeable</p> <p>Able to consider the best interests of the whole family</p> <p>Little to no assets</p> <p>Parties have similar incomes; no maintenance needed</p> <p>Able to resolve conflict well</p>	<p>Agreeable</p> <p>Able to consider the best interests of the whole family</p> <p>Needing a third-party reality check</p> <p>Able to resolve conflict</p>	<p>Adversarial and hostile</p> <p>Unwilling to compromise</p>	<p>Open to full and honest disclosure</p> <p>Solution-oriented and forward-thinking</p> <p>Committed to reaching an agreement</p>

<b>“Kitchen Table” Divorce</b>	<b>Mediation</b>	<b>Litigation</b>	<b>Collaborative Divorce</b>
<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Pros:</b>	<b>Pros:</b>
Least expensive  Fastest option	Cheaper than litigation  Minimizes damage of going to court  Minimizes conflict faster than litigation  More discrete; mediation is private, litigation is public  Gives parties control of the outcome	The court’s timetable will keep things moving forward  May be necessary if the other party is unreasonable  May be necessary for cases where there are safety concerns, abuse, or drug/alcohol addiction	Parties agree not to go to court  Flexibility; customize the agreement to meet the needs of the whole family and considers long-term financial implications  The team of neutral professionals makes this a comprehensive approach to divorce  Addressing financial and emotional issues is built into the process  Quicker and less expensive than litigation  Facilitates post-divorce healing and recovery
<b>Cons:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>	<b>Cons:</b>
Mistakes can easily be made  Doesn’t address long-term financial consequences	Outcome can be unfair to one spouse  Mediator can be inexperienced or biased  Can reinforce patterns and allow one party to dominate the other  No guarantee that a settlement will be reached  Issues can be overlooked; agreement may be incomplete	Judge who knows very little about you and your family makes the final decisions  Most expensive option and time-consuming  Can be more emotionally detrimental to you and your children  All information is public	Parties lose their attorneys if they do not settle