Preparing Trauma-Affected Clients for Mediation: A Practitioner's Guide
The New York Law Journal
March 16, 2026

By Ramsey C. Hinkle

Before mediation, lawyers must assess if a trauma survivor is emotionally ready and understands the process's limits, like confidentiality and no public acknowledgment. Choosing an experienced mediator and setting clear expectations helps clients navigate the session. When clients are prepared and the process is handled carefully, mediation can be a useful resolution tool—not a substitute for therapy or justice.

Before you bring a client to the mediation table, know whether the table is right for them—and how to make it work if it is.

Mediation has become a fixture in employment litigation. It saves time, controls costs, and keeps outcomes out of the hands of unpredictable juries. Courts routinely encourage or require alternative dispute resolution, and many litigants prefer the efficiency and confidentiality that mediation can offer. For many clients, it is the right path. But for clients who have experienced sexual assault, harassment, or other forms of trauma—including the growing volume of cases that have emerged in the wake of the #MeToo movement—the conventional mediation playbook can fall dangerously short.

Practitioners who regularly represent these clients know that the calculus is different. The litigation goals are intertwined with psychological ones. A mediation that produces a settlement but leaves a client feeling re-traumatized, silenced, or blindsided by the process can't really be seen as a complete success.

A client who enters mediation without a realistic understanding of what it can and cannot deliver is a client primed for disappointment. What follows is a framework for managing client expectations before and during mediation when trauma is a key element. It is organized around three practical tasks: screening clients for mediation readiness, selecting the right mediator, and managing the emotional arc of the session itself.

Screening Clients Before Mediation: Is This the Right Forum?

The first question is not "can we settle this case?" but "can this client survive this process?" These are not the same question. Mediation requires a client to interact with the person who harmed them, even if it is at arm's length. They will likely have to be in the same building as that person, listen to that person's representatives minimize or deny the harm, and make real-time decisions under emotional pressure.

For a client who has not yet worked through their trauma to a point of relative stability, this environment can be extremely difficult, if not impossible. For this reason, counsel should have a candid conversation with a prospective client that answers several threshold questions:

Is the client emotionally ready to participate without being overwhelmed? There is a difference between being distressed by the process (which is normal and manageable) and being dysregulated in a way that impairs decision-making. A client in acute crisis, or one who is still in the early stages of trauma processing, may not be in a position to engage meaningfully.

Does the client understand—genuinely—what mediation will and will not produce? Many trauma survivors come to litigation with goals that mediation cannot satisfy: a public reckoning, an acknowledgment of wrongdoing, a formal finding of liability. Settlement discussions, by their nature, are private. Defendants do not "admit" anything. If a client's primary need is validation or public accountability, they should understand before they walk into that room that mediation is unlikely to satisfy that.

Can the client tolerate the adversarial framing without it compounding the harm? Opposing counsel will likely present a version of events that challenges or minimizes the client's account. A client who is not prepared for this—who expects the process to be more neutral or validating than it will be—may experience hearing the defense narrative as a second injury.

If the answers to these questions raise genuine concerns, counsel should consider whether to delay mediation, pursue other resolution mechanisms first, or ensure that additional support, such as having a therapist or advocate available, is in place before proceeding.

Setting Expectations: What Mediation Is (and Is Not)

Even clients who are emotionally ready for mediation often arrive with misaligned expectations. Part of counsel's job is to correct those misalignments before the session begins—not during it, when emotions are already running high.

Key points to address in pre-mediation discussions with clients:

Confidentiality and the absence of a public record. Settlements reached in mediation are almost universally confidential. The defendant will not be publicly named or shamed as a result of this process. This can be a significant disappointment for clients who see litigation as a vehicle for public accountability. Counsel must address this early and directly.

No admission of liability. Settlement agreements typically contain explicit non-admission clauses. The defendant will not say "We were wrong," or "We harmed you, we're sorry."

For clients who need that acknowledgment as part of their healing, this absence can feel like a profound loss. Counsel should explain this limitation plainly, help clients distinguish between

legal vindication and personal validation, and invite them to think about what their goals for resolution are.

The mediator is not the client's advocate. Some clients expect the mediator to function as a neutral arbiter who will, if they hear the full story, naturally side with the more compelling party. The mediator's actual role—to facilitate a negotiated resolution—can feel cold or indifferent to someone who arrived hoping for an empathetic listener. Explaining the mediator's neutrality in advance helps manage the emotional response when that reality sets in.

The likely shape of the day. Walk clients through the logistics: the opening joint session (and whether one is planned), the caucus structure, the physical environment, and who will be in the room on the other side. Surprises in high-stress situations compound distress. Predictability is a form of safety.

Selecting the Right Mediator

Mediator selection is always important. In trauma-involved cases, it is critical. The wrong mediator—one who is transactional in style, impatient with emotional expression, or inexperienced with survivor psychology—can derail not only the session but the client's capacity to continue with the case at all.

When evaluating potential mediators for these cases, consider the following:

Experience with trauma and survivor dynamics. Ask directly whether the mediator has experience with sexual harassment, assault, or discrimination cases involving survivors of

trauma. Ask how they handle it when a party becomes distressed during a session. Their answer—and their fluency in answering—is telling.

Patience with emotional processing. Experienced employment mediators understand that in these cases, the negotiation cannot move faster than the client's emotional state will allow. A mediator who presses for numbers before a client feels heard is a mediator who will lose the client's trust—and potentially the settlement.

Credibility with defense counsel. The mediator also has to move the other side. In cases involving institutional defendants—employers, law firms, entertainment companies—defense counsel often come to the table confident in their litigation position. A mediator who commands respect from sophisticated defense lawyers is an asset.

Willingness to structure the session for the client's needs. In many cases, it will be important to limit or eliminate joint sessions, schedule breaks, or agree that the mediator will communicate with the client directly rather than through counsel. Discuss these logistics with the mediator in advance, and choose one who sees this kind of procedural flexibility as standard rather than burdensome.

Managing Emotions and Expectations During the Session

Even a well-prepared client can be caught off guard by the emotional intensity of the mediation itself. The presence of the defendant's representatives, the abstract negotiation over a deeply personal harm, the long silences between caucuses—all of it can destabilize a client who arrived feeling steady.

A few practical tools:

Establish a signal system. Before the session, agree with your client on a way to signal when they need a break—without having to say so in front of others. A simple word, gesture, or text message can give a client a measure of control over their environment, which is particularly important for survivors of conduct in which they were rendered powerless.

Reframe the defense narrative in advance. Prepare your client to hear a version of events that will be distressing. Explain that the defense will minimize, deny, and reframe. Discuss what that is likely to sound like. A client who has been inoculated against the defense narrative is better able to hear it without being destabilized.

Anchor the client to their goals, not their grievances. During difficult moments, help the client reconnect with what resolution looks like for them—not just what happened to them. This reorientation is not about minimizing the harm; it is about keeping the client functional and decision-capable during the session.

Know when to walk away. If a client reaches a point where they are no longer able to make clear-headed decisions—whether from emotional exhaustion, distress, or overwhelm—the right answer may be to stop and continue on another day. A settlement reached by a client in a dissociative or destabilized state may not hold, legally or emotionally. Counsel's obligation is to the client's genuine interests, which includes protecting their capacity to participate meaningfully in decisions that will shape the rest of their lives.

Conclusion

Mediation works—when the client is ready for it, when the mediator is the right fit, and when expectations have been calibrated to what the process can actually deliver. In cases involving trauma, these conditions require counsel's patience, understanding, and selectivity. The practitioner who carefully screens their clients to ensure mediation is appropriate and continues to guide them through the mediation process is the one most likely to get a result that actually serves the client.

Mediation is not therapy, and it is not justice in the traditional sense. It is a negotiated resolution. Our job is to help clients understand that distinction—and then to use the process as skillfully as possible within those limits.

Ramsey C. Hinkle is a partner with Clayman Rosenberg Kirshner & Linder.