Want Change? Get Involved!

Welcome to *The Business of Diversity*, the newsletter of the ABA Business Law Section’s Diversity Committee. This newsletter is one of the many ways that the Diversity Committee is striving to strengthen the diversity efforts of our Section. This issue is the work of the Subcommittee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Involvement and focuses on matters of importance to the LGBT community.

The Subcommittee’s primary goals are to promote LGBT diversity within Section membership and leadership, and to bring to the forefront topics impacting the LGBT community. We welcome membership to all who are supportive of increased involvement of LGBT attorneys both in our Section and throughout the ABA. Over the past several years, with the support of Meg Milroy, outgoing Chair of the Diversity Committee, and other Section leadership, the Subcommittee has succeeded in increasing its membership by more than 100%. Of course, there is always more work to be done and we look forward to continued progress during the next year.

I hope you enjoy this edition of *The Business of Diversity* featuring articles written by attorneys practicing throughout the United States and Canada on matters of great importance to LGBT attorneys and the community at large. It is our hope that these articles will educate and also inspire you to support inclusiveness of LGBT persons inside and outside of the profession.

Vice Chair, Sarita Nair, and I have enjoyed leading the Subcommittee since 2010. We are confident that we leave these positions in the capable hands of John Clifford and Adonica Wada, 2013-2014 Chair and Vice Chair, respectively. Please join them and our Subcommittee to support ongoing efforts to promote diversity within the Section of Business Law and beyond.

Christine Young — Chair, LGBT Involvement Subcommittee

Delaware Permits Same-Sex Marriage, Enacts Gender-Identity Protections

By: Evangelos Andy Kostoulas

In 2013, the “First State” became the first state to pass a marriage equality bill and a gender identity bill in the same year, thanks in part to the lobbying efforts of Equality Delaware, Inc.

Marriage Equality

On May 7, 2013, Delaware Governor Jack Markell signed into law the Civil Marriage Equality and Religious Freedom Act of 2013 (the “Marriage Act”), just minutes after it was passed by the State Senate. Although the Marriage Act was signed into law less than one month after being introduced in the State House of Repre-
sentatives, it took a considerable amount of effort to get the bill passed. According to Equality Delaware’s President, Lisa Goodman, a substantial amount of money was raised to assist with the organization’s lobbying efforts in connection with the bill. And even though the Marriage Act states that it shall not be construed in a manner that would interfere with any person’s rights of freedom of religion, and explicitly permits clergy to refuse to solemnize any marriage without any penalty, a large part of the discussion on the floor of the State Senate was devoted to religious opposition to the bill. During the debates, Delaware State Senator Karen Peterson came out publicly on the floor of the Senate.

The Marriage Act, which became effective July 1, 2013, made same-sex marriage permissible in Delaware. Prior to the Marriage Act becoming law, Delaware had permitted civil unions between members of the same sex under a law passed in 2011. A civil union is a legal union between two individuals that grants those individuals the same rights, protections, and benefits, and subjects them to the same responsibilities, obligations, and duties, as those enjoyed by or imposed upon married spouses.

While Delaware law had permitted civil unions, it expressly prohibited same-sex couples from entering into a marriage. Not only did the Marriage Act eliminate that prohibition, it provided that all legal unions entered into by same-sex couples in the State of Delaware on or after July 1, 2013 shall be marriages. Those individuals who entered into a civil union before July 1, 2013 may apply to have a marriage license issued to them and have their civil union converted to a marriage. On July 1, 2014, any remaining civil unions will automatically be converted into marriages under Delaware law. Like the civil union law that preceded it, the Marriage Act recognizes same-sex unions entered into in other jurisdictions. Under the Marriage Act, if a couple validly enters into a legal union (whether a civil union, domestic partnership, or other type of union) in another jurisdiction, and their legal union grants that couple substantially the same rights and obligations as a marriage under the laws of that jurisdiction, the couple will be treated as married under Delaware law.

This recognition allows Delaware, long viewed as a preferred jurisdiction for the formation of legal entities, to provide some unique asset-protection advantages to same-sex couples that have entered into a legally recognized union in another state. Delaware recognizes three forms of joint ownership of property: tenancy in common, joint tenancy, and tenancy by the entirety. Tenancy by the entirety, a form of ownership reserved for spouses, provides greater protections against creditors than the other forms of joint ownership. The Delaware Court of Chancery has recognized that personal property, which includes limited liability company interests, can be held in a tenancy by the entirety. Thus, a same-sex couple who has entered into a legally recognized union and owns property in a state that does not recognize that union could potentially set up a Delaware LLC to own that property, while owning their interests in the LLC as tenants by the entirety where Delaware law applies.

Gender Identity

Shortly after the Marriage Act was signed into law, the Gender Identity Nondiscrimination Act of 2013 (the “Gender Identity Act”) was introduced in the Delaware State Senate. It was swiftly passed by both chambers
of the Delaware legislature, and, on June 19, 2013, was signed into law. Gender identity is defined under the Gender Identity Act as “gender-related identity, appearance, expression or behavior of a person, regardless of the person’s assigned sex at birth.” The Gender Identity Act added gender identity as a class protected from discrimination in housing, employment, public works contracting, public accommodations, and insurance under state law. The Gender Identity Act also expanded Delaware’s hate-crime law to include those crimes in which the victim was targeted on the basis of the victim’s gender

delaware has now joined 12 other states, the District of Columbia, and several Native American tribes in recognizing same-sex marriages, and has ensured that individuals in the State of Delaware will have the same legal protections against discrimination based on gender identity that they have against discrimination based on race, age, marital status, creed, color, sex, handicap, sexual orientation, and national origin.

My law school classmate and personal heroine, Kelly Spegon, passed away nearly two years ago on August 4, 2011. I was at the ABA Annual Meeting in Toronto, Canada when I received the terrible news. Although we did not see much of each other after law school, I never stopped admiring Kelly because she possessed more courage, character, conviction, and compassion than most of the people I have met in my life. She single-handedly resurrected our law school’s long-abandoned LGBT (i.e., Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender) student organization because she saw a need for LGBT students to have a safe place to discuss the issues affecting them and their families. Kelly also set out to promote a more visible LGBT community on campus because at that time, most LGBT law students lived under a cloud of fear that to identify openly as LGBT would be tantamount to academic and career suicide. Kelly’s approach to overcoming these barriers was simple: Live life openly and visibly so that in time, the straight (i.e., heterosexual) community will see LGBT people as they are—people. Writing this article in the wake of the United States Supreme Court’s historic decision on DOMA, I am convinced now more than ever that Kelly’s approach was both correct and wise.

I think of Kelly’s enduring example often when I attend bar association functions because I believe LGBT lawyers face particular barriers to meaningful, long-term bar involvement that are, to me, reminiscent of the barriers we struggled to overcome more than a decade ago in law school. What I find encouraging, however, is that most of the present barriers to bar association involvement are not the result of deliberate exclusion or intentional discrimination. Rather, I believe they are the byproduct of a curable lack of awareness on the part of otherwise well-meaning bar members and leaders concerning the particular issues that LGBT lawyers face when deciding whether and how to invest their time and energy in bar activities.

To be sure, LGBT lawyers weigh most, if not all, of the same factors as non-LGBT lawyers when deciding whether to become an active member of a particular bar association — e.g., professional networking opportunities, business-development and marketing potential, continuing legal education, professional competency and credibility, publishing opportunities, speaking opportunities, leadership opportunities, lobbying and policy-development opportunities, etc.

For LGBT lawyers, however, there are a host of other significant factors to consider, including but not limited to:
The LGBT community is unlike other diverse demographics in at least one very important respect: the process of self-identification or “coming out of the closet.”

Does this appear to be an organization in which I will feel safe and comfortable whether or not I openly identify as LGBT?

Will I feel safe and comfortable bringing my same-sex spouse, domestic partner, or significant other and our children to the association’s meetings and social events?

Does the association meet in LGBT-friendly cities and venues?

Am I likely to meet other LGBT or LGBT-friendly lawyers within the association?

Does the association’s website contain any marketing information whatsoever for LGBT lawyers and prospective LGBT lawyer members?

Are the association’s marketing efforts toward prospective LGBT lawyer members conspicuous and consistent, as opposed to giving the impression of a mere afterthought to other diversity initiatives?

Does the association have a diversity and non-discrimination policy?

Are LGBT lawyers expressly included in the association’s diversity and non-discrimination policy and consistently included in all public restatements thereof?

Are one or more of the categories of LGBT lawyers inexplicably omitted from the association’s diversity and non-discrimination policy (e.g., are bisexual or transgender lawyers not mentioned)?

Is the association’s commitment to LGBT lawyer membership meaningful or superficial?

Is the association’s commitment to LGBT lawyer membership on par with its commitment to lawyers of color, women lawyers, disabled lawyers, and young lawyers, or is there an implicit or explicit prioritization between or among each of those demographics?

Are there active and visible subgroups within the association dedicated to LGBT issues?

Does the association seek to obtain and utilize LGBT demographic information from its membership to the same extent as other diverse demographics?

Will my status as an LGBT lawyer be a barrier to networking, leadership, speaking, or publishing opportunities?

Does the association routinely sponsor and promote programming and publications that focus on or include LGBT issues?

Does the association promote, support, or sponsor other LGBT-focused organizations or causes (or any anti-LGBT organizations or causes)?
In my experience, the answers to these questions are generally good indicia of whether a bar association is sufficiently welcoming of LGBT lawyers to justify the time, effort, and expense of long-term involvement.

Most of these considerations flow from two core concepts: (1) creating an environment conducive to self-identification; and (2) promoting general LGBT visibility within the association. As a practical matter, these concepts are functionally intertwined. Without some degree of individual self-identification, achieving LGBT visibility is improbable. Likewise, without some degree of LGBT visibility, fostering an environment conducive to self-identification is difficult. This presents a significant practical challenge for bar associations that have made or wish to make a genuine and meaningful commitment to LGBT inclusion, but that cannot overcome the initial hurdle of attracting and retaining a critical mass of active, self-identified LGBT members.

Many bar associations are seemingly content not to pay attention to the needs of LGBT lawyers unless or until those needs are affirmatively brought to the leadership’s attention, usually by an LGBT or LGBT-friendly champion (like my friend Kelly) who takes action to raise awareness and effectuate necessary change. I personally believe, however, that the onus rests with bar leaders to make a sincere and deliberate effort to anticipate and to eliminate artificial barriers to meaningful bar involvement for all diverse lawyers, including LGBT lawyers, without waiting for someone else who is affected by those barriers to draw attention to the problem.

In honor of Kelly’s memory and in keeping with the lessons she taught me more than a decade ago, the remainder of this article offers five suggestions for addressing the practical challenges associated with LGBT self-identification and visibility in bar associations. These suggestions, which are based on my personal experiences and observations, are intended primarily for non-LGBT bar leaders who may lack an adequate frame of reference to serve as a starting point on this subject. It is my hope that these modest suggestions will raise awareness by and among bar association leaders and members concerning some of the barriers their LGBT colleagues face to meaningful, long-term bar involvement.

1. **Self-Identification Is a Personal Journey.**

The LGBT community is unlike other diverse demographics in at least one very important respect: the process of self-identification or “coming out of the closet.” This process is a deeply personal journey and, thus, every LGBT person approaches it differently depending upon their own individual experience, circumstances, and comfort level. For some, self-identification is a relatively effortless decision. For others, the process can be extremely difficult, painful, and sometimes even life-threatening. Of course, there are myriad permutations between those extremes.

For LGBT attorneys, the process of self-identification has both a personal and a professional dimension. Many LGBT attorneys freely self-identify as LGBT in both their personal and professional spheres. Other LGBT attorneys may self-identify in their personal lives, but they may choose (for any number of reasons, including but not limited to the fear of discrimination by employers or clients) not to self-identify as LGBT in their professional lives. Still other LGBT attorneys may elect to remain completely closeted for reasons entirely personal to them. Again, there are many permutations even between these examples.

It is important for bar leaders and other bar members to understand that not every LGBT attorney will necessarily choose to self-identify as LGBT—or at least not right away. The most a bar association can do is foster a culture in which a person’s decision to self-identify as an LGBT lawyer is made easier by dispelling the perception that self-identification will in any way preclude or detract from the many benefits to be had from long-term bar involvement.

One way to accomplish this is to make a deliberate effort to include openly LGBT lawyers in bar association leadership and provide them with a platform for telling their personal and professional stories to other members of the association. LGBT professionals are particularly inclined to take
notice when other openly LGBT professionals are able to succeed and prosper within an organization. It sends a clear signal that one’s status as an LGBT person is not a barrier to meaningful participation and advancement.

Another way to create an environment conducive to self-identification is to establish subgroups within the bar association focused on LGBT issues and empower those subgroups to do the necessary to promote more meaningful involvement by LGBT lawyers within the association at-large.

2. Be Cautious About Assumptions.

At the time I accepted my appointment to chair the Business Law Section’s Young Lawyer Committee, I was told by more than one trusted source that I would be in good company because there were openly LGBT lawyers already serving in Section leadership. I was given names of people I could and should reach out to for advice. When I approached some of those individuals, however, I quickly realized that they were straight, not LGBT.

I was glad not to have embarrassed myself or anyone else, but I wondered how I could have been so terribly misinformed. The answer was simple: My sources had made incorrect assumptions about the sexual orientation of those individuals or had themselves been misinformed by others who had made incorrect assumptions. My advice to non-LGBT lawyers is to avoid making or acting on assumptions about the sexual orientation of others, no matter how well-intentioned you may be. Instead, allow LGBT lawyers the latitude they may need to identify themselves in their own way and in their own time. In my view, practicing such deference creates an atmosphere of trust in which LGBT lawyers are far more likely to feel confident in their decision to self-identify.


Many bar associations include LGBT lawyers in their diversity and non-discrimination policies, but routinely fail to include any LGBT focus in their diversity programming or events. This gives an impression that the association’s commitment to LGBT inclusion is ancillary to or less important than its commitment to other diverse groups.

Examples that I have personally observed on several occasions are diversity-themed CLE programs that consistently omit any discussion of LGBT-related issues. Shortly after being elected to shareholder status at my firm, I attended a bar association conference marketed to new law firm partners. One of the CLE programs presented during that conference focused on diversity within the profession. More than halfway through the program, I realized that none of the program faculty had mentioned LGBT inclusion as a diversity issue. This prompted me to raise my hand and ask the speakers to share their thoughts on the specific challenges LGBT lawyers face within the profession. Much to my surprise, there were audible gasps from the audience and the program chair—who had become visibly anxious—essentially explained that none of the program faculty were prepared to speak to those issues. I was flummoxed and disheartened.

At a different bar association meeting, I attended a CLE program at which a group of diverse in-house counsel shared their professional experiences and views on diversity in the profession. Someone in the audience asked the panelists to comment on LGBT inclusion. None of the speakers said anything meaningful in response. One of the speakers commented that he did not know any LGBT lawyers and, therefore, did not know what issues LGBT lawyers face. Again, I found this disheartening.

If a bar association desires to make a meaningful commitment to LGBT inclusion, that commitment should be regularly reflected in (of all places) its diversity-related programming and events and treated in parity with its commitment to other diverse demographics. This requires the program chair to give active consideration to whether any speaker(s) selected to participate on the program panel can confidently and competently offer an LGBT or LGBT-friendly perspective on the program topic.


Frequently, a bar association’s openness to LGBT lawyers is not easily determined or gleaned from information presented in its marketing materials, on its website, or on its social media presences. This lack of accessible information forces an LGBT lawyer to make a hard choice between joining the association to test the waters or simply walking away under the assumption that membership and participation are not likely to be worth the effort. If a bar association does not affirmatively, conspicuously, publicly, and consistently promote the fact that it is LGBT-friendly, many LGBT lawyers will simply conclude that the bar association does not warrant even an attempt at involvement. In other words, remaining silent or ambiguous on the issue of LGBT inclusion implies to LGBT lawyers that the bar
association is not interested in attracting and retaining them as members. Bar associations can, therefore, remove barriers to LGBT lawyer involvement simply by ensuring that their promotional publications, marketing materials, and recruitment and membership efforts affirmatively and consistently include information of interest to LGBT lawyers.

5. **No Laughing Matter.**

Shortly after I entered private practice, I attended a popular annual event sponsored by a local voluntary bar association. This event featured a series of skits written, acted, and in some instances sung by local lawyers on a variety of current events and topics. I was disturbed to see that the first few skits involved blatantly homophobic attempts at humor. One of the skits used the word “homos” to refer to the LGBT community. Another skit mocked the marriage equality movement and insinuated that LGBT Floridians would be better off moving to Vermont (the only state at the time that recognized same-sex civil unions). I vowed never to attend another social function sponsored by that bar association.

Nearly a decade later, I attended the meeting of a different bar association during which one of the association’s leaders gave a speech about the importance of promoting diversity within the profession. Part of the speech involved a reference to a male lawyer who underwent sex reassignment surgery to live as a woman. When half the room erupted in laughter at the mere suggestion of a man wanting to live life as a woman, it was clear to me that the audience viewed the remark as a punch line, not as the inspiring message of acceptance that I believe the speaker had intended. A transgender person in that situation would undoubtedly have felt the sting of the audience’s laughter.

The lesson to be learned from these examples is that LGBT lawyers deserve to be treated with the same level of professionalism and respect as non-LGBT lawyers. Poking fun at any segment of the LGBT community or making light of the serious issues LGBT people face in their daily lives sends a clear message that LGBT lawyers are not genuinely valued as bar members. Bar leaders and bar members who wish to create an environment conducive to self-identification and to support greater LGBT visibility must take care to send an appropriate message of professionalism and respect.

**Conclusion**

Let me also share one of my favorite uplifting bar association moments. Nearly two years ago, while attending a luncheon of the ABA Business Law Section, I struck up a conversation with the woman sitting next to me whom I had never met. In the course of our conversation, I learned that her family was originally from Pakistan, that she was Muslim, that she and her fiancé were getting married soon in a very traditional ceremony, and that she was excited for the upcoming nuptials. When she asked me if I was married or dating, I politely answered in the negative, but explained that my life partner and I had been together for (at that time) fifteen years. Without missing a beat, she smiled and replied "That's wonderful! I truly hope that you will one day have the right to marry your life partner." I have considered her a dear friend ever since and she is one of the people whom I look for at every association meeting. Kelly would have been proud.

Business lawyers anticipate risk and try to address, minimize or allocate the risk as appropriate. LGBT business lawyers have a unique opportunity to raise awareness about the risks of contracts that are not drafted to meet the expectations of LGBT clients and companies with LGBT constituents. Further, by alerting colleagues to and addressing these risks, lawyers can reduce the risk of litigation for all clients.

Like much of what we address in a contract, assumptions based on sexuality and gender "aren't a problem until they are." And when assumptions create lack of clarity or undermine enforceability, it is usually too late to fix the problem in a meaningful way. This article discusses just a few examples of the contract drafting issues that affect the LGBT community, and how lawyers can raise awareness of these issues within their firms and legal departments.

**Stock or equity interest transfer restrictions**

In a closely held business, stock restriction agreements often have special provisions pertaining to the transfer...
of stock by a "spouse" or incident to "divorce." Those provisions may give the stockholder-spouse or member-spouse the right to purchase the interests of his or her ex-spouse, or may permit a transfer to a surviving spouse. In addition, the definition of "spouse" may carry through into other provisions, like the definition of an *inter vivos* trust. At least two approaches can make these provisions friendlier to same-sex couples. First, practitioners may consider broadening the definition of "spouse" to include persons married under the laws of any nation or state, and broadening the definition of divorce similarly. Second, practitioners may consider broadening those definitions to include domestic partnership, civil union, or a similar committed relationship that can be reasonably demonstrated to the company or its shareholders or members.

**Powers of Attorney**

Powers of attorney may define a person's relationship to his or her agent as "my sister," "my son" or "my nephew." When a person is transitioning or presenting as a different gender than he or she was at birth, this could cause enforcement issues. For example, a hospital that wishes to discriminate may refuse visitation or decision-making authority to a person named in a legal document as a "son" if that person is presenting as a woman. A simple fix is to describe everyone's relationships using gender-neutral terms such as "my sibling," "my child" or "my sibling's child."

**Conflict of Interest Policies**

While marriage carries many rights, it also carries certain responsibilities. One area where those rights arise in the business world is in a conflict of interest policy. These policies may require the disclosure of familial relationships with vendors, customers, and regulators, so that a company may screen, monitor or supervise those relationships to prevent improper dealing or favoritism. Improperly drafted, these policies may fail to require disclosure of committed relationships that do not involve marriage, whether same-sex or opposite-sex. Practitioners may consider revisions to the policy's definition of "family" to include committed relationships and relationships that include co-habitation, in addition to including persons married or party to a domestic partnership or civil union under the laws of any nation or state.

**Releases**

A release generally includes a laundry list of the parties who are giving and receiving the benefit of the release. When the release affects an individual, it may require extra effort to include people whom the releasee considers to be family, such as a domestic partner or the children of a partner.

---

**Connecting with Your Diversity**

**By: John F. Clifford**

I came out as a gay man in the late 1990s, not long after I was made partner at a large business law firm in Toronto. As I became more comfortable professionally in my new (and improved) skin, I naturally sought to build a professional network in the LGBT community. This was influenced, in part, by some great LGBT - albeit mostly “G” - business events that I attended in New York City, where I met a number of potential clients as well as like-minded attorneys. These events offered the prospect to meet a great peer network of individuals similarly situated in the legal and business community. But they were located far from me.

Returning home I discovered a problem: Toronto did not, at the time, have a well-developed network of LGBT executives and business leaders. While there was a provincial gay and lesbian Chamber of Commerce with a Toronto chapter, its members tended to be entrepreneurs and small business owners who are not likely to need the services (or pay the high billing rates) of a large firm such as mine. The same was true of the other visible community organization I then found at home: it was and remains focused on small businesses, with an agenda dominated by socializing and topics not related to business. In addition, its members were entirely gay men. So I decided to form a new and more inclusive group.

With the need identified, I reached out to five individuals to help germinate my idea – three men and two women; two lawyers and three senior executives; three friends and two individuals who I “cold-called” because they were known in the community and I presumed (rightly) that they had well-developed professional and social networks.

Through its discussion, the working group coalesced around the idea that the businesses and careers of LGBT business leaders – including LGBT partners at big law firms - could benefit from better networking and professional development opportunities in an LGBT-focused environment. The group also recognized
that, given their business successes, those leaders also often wanted to give back to their communities.

And so, exeQutive was born, with a mission to “promote, support and strengthen the careers and businesses of Toronto-based LGBT executives and business leaders; support young LGBT business and professional aspirants; and financially support LGBT community groups.” We thought exeQutive could achieve this mission by:

- Hosting networking events for members of exeQutive and their invited guests, featuring speakers and discussion, with ample opportunity for members to network. We planned networking events to be our principal activity, but also recognized that the business leaders and executives whom we were targeting for membership have full calendars and likely didn’t have much time for additional generic professional development. We therefore decided to limit our events to three per year, and to focus discussions on LGBT-themed topics relevant to business leaders.

- Mentoring younger LGBT business and professional aspirants. We developed a program to match exeQutive members with non-executive LGBTers who wanted experienced mentor support for their career advancement.

- Contributing a portion of exeQutive’s annual membership revenue to a local LGBT community group, with a new group selected each year.

It also was a key consideration from the outset that we build a group that included and welcomed the full LGBT community.

Close to 100 contacts were invited to our first event in October 2007, mostly friends and professional contacts of the working group. More than 60 attended. They networked over wine and snacks and then heard a facilitated discussion with the CFO of KPMG Canada, a lesbian, and a senior executive from one of Canada’s largest banks, a gay man, about their experiences being out leaders in their organizations. It was a terrific experience, and within a few weeks more than 30 people joined exeQutive.

The interest in exeQutive since its inauguration has been constant. We’ve had a consistent base of 65-70 members since the first year, about one-third of whom are women. Members come from large corporations such as Campbell Soup, Citibank, IBM, Kraft, OpenText, Proctor & Gamble, Rogers Cable and Samsung, as well as from the offices of Toronto area accounting and law firms. Other members are owners of highly successful private companies.

Very soon after our first event we discovered that some of our most well received events were the ones at which members could share their own stories. exeQutive events have covered a wide range of topics that touch on the personal such as “The Business Case for Diversity”, “How Gay is Too Gay in the C-Suite”, “Is There a Pink Generation Gap” and “Different Shades of Pink: The Coming Out Spectrum at Work”, which we’ve often discussed in small facilitated groups. Also popular have been events that feature high-profile members of the LGBT community, like Kathleen Wynne, Ontario’s current Premier and an out lesbian, who have likewise spoken about their personal experiences as out community and business leaders.

And, we’ve connected mentors and mentees and, since 2008, have contributed thousands of dollars to support the important work of numerous Toronto-based charities.

Connecting with my diversity through the creation and growth of exeQutive has been a wonderful personal experience for me. I’m constantly inspired by the positive feedback and interest in what exeQutive does and the many benefits its members enjoy from their active participation. I’ve grown my professional and personal network in a business community that really matters to me, and enhanced my profile in a number of communities. And I’ve met some new clients along the way. So if you identify a need to connect with your diversity in the workplace, consider satisfying that need by building a similar organization that will be a great resource for your community, as well as your practice.
ANNUAL MEETING EVENTS, ETC.

♦ CLE Sponsored by the Commission on Sexual Orientation and Sexual Identity (SOGI): August 9, 2013

   Title: More than an Equal Sign: DOMA, Prop 8, the Supreme Court, and Your Practice
   Location: Moscone Center West, Room 3306
   Time: 2:00pm—3:30pm (Pacific Time) ***Ticketed Event—purchase at ABA Registration Desk

   Moderator and Panelists: Mark E. Wojcik, Professor of Law—The John Marshall Law School; Julie E. Fink, Associate—Paul, Weiss, Rifkin, Wharton & Garrison, LLP; Shannon Minter, Legal Director—National Center for Lesbian Rights; Therese M. Stewart, Chief Deputy City Attorney—City of San Francisco.

♦ Meeting of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Involvement Committee: August 10, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel; International Room
   Time: 9:00am—10:00am (Pacific Time)

♦ Women’s Business Law Network Subcommittee Meeting: August 10, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel, International Room
   Time: 10:00am—11:00am (Pacific Time)

♦ Lawyers of Color Involvement Subcommittee Meeting: August 10, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel, International Room
   Time: 11:00am—12:00pm (Pacific Time)

♦ Lawyers with Disabilities Involvement: August 10, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel, International Room
   Time: 2:30pm—3:30pm (Pacific Time)

♦ Law Student Speed Networking: August 9, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel, Crown Room 24th Floor
   Time: 4:30pm—6:30pm (Pacific Time)

♦ Diversity Committee Meeting: August 10, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel, International Room
   Time: 4:30pm—5:30pm (Pacific Time)

♦ Diversity Networking Reception: August 10, 2013

   Location: Fairmont Hotel, Roof Garden, Lobby Level
   Time: 6:00pm—7:30pm (Pacific Time)

   The Diversity Committee is proud to host the eagerly-anticipated, bi-annual Diversity Networking Reception. This complimentary reception is attended by members who are interested in recruiting and retaining the following lawyers for active Section involvement:

   * Lawyers of color
   * Women lawyers
   * Lawyers with disabilities
   * Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender lawyers
   * Young Lawyers
   * Law Students

♦ ABA Women’s Caucus: August 11, 2013

   Location: Marriott Marquis, Golden Gate Hall B
   Time: 2:15pm—4:30pm (Pacific Time)

   Description: The Women’s Caucus is open to all women and men in the profession. Attend the Caucus and share your ideas and information. Your interest and support are crucial to the continuing pursuit of equality in the legal profession.

♦ 23rd Annual Margaret Brent Women Lawyers of Achievement Awards Luncheon: August 11, 2013

   Location: Moscone West Convention Center***Ticketed event—purchase at ABA Registration Desk.

   The honorees are: Hon. Marie K. Hirono, United States Senator, Honolulu, HI; Sara Holtz, Founder & CEO, Clientfocus, San Francisco, CA; Hon Gladys Kessler, U.S. District Court Judge for D.C., Washington, D.C.; Marygold Shire Melli, Voss-Bascom Professor Emerita, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, WI; Therese M. Stewart, Chief Deputy City Attorney, San Francisco, CA.
Day of the Woman: August 9, 2013
Location: Marriot Marquis, Golden Gate Hall C2
Time: 5:30pm—7:30pm (Pacific Time)
Description: Join the Commission on Women in the Profession for an all-day series of programming presented by ABA entities on Friday, August 9, 2013, during the Annual Meeting in San Francisco. The Day of the Woman is a celebration of the Commission’s 25th Anniversary, the accomplishments of the ABA Presidential Task Force on Gender Equity over the course of the last year, and the ABA entities that made possible this special day of programming devoted to issues of interest to women lawyers. Be sure to attend the noontime rally featuring giveaways and prizes. All programs will take place in the CLE Center located within Moscone Center West. This reception is complimentary for all Annual Meeting attendees.

2013 Women’s Bar Leadership Summit: August 9, 2013
Description: On August 9, 2013, in San Francisco, ABA Women Rainmakers and the National Conference of Women’s Bar Associations will host the Leadership Summit. Former US Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder will give the keynote speech on gender equity and will also be presented with the NCWBA Trailblazer Award for her advocacy of women’s rights. Additional speakers include: Professor Joan Williams, Hastings and its Center for WorkLife Law; Noreen Farrell, Equal Rights Advocates, Executive Director; Marcia Greenberger, National Women’s Law Center, Co-President and Founder; Nancy Cremins, Past President of the Women’s Bar Association of Massachusetts.

Gender Equity Task Force Launches “Click Your Heels” Virtual March Campaign
The Gender Equity Task Force launched its “Click Your Heels” campaign. In an efforts to replicate the sound of hundreds of thousands of people on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial for the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in 1963, this virtual march encourages members to click their mouse for the basic right of equality. The virtual march started on Equal Pay Day on April 9, 2013 and continues through the ABA’s Day of the Woman on August 9, 2013. Be sure to click your heels in support of gender equality!

## 2013 COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE LEADERSHIP

- **DIVERSITY COMMITTEE:**
  Chair: Meg L. Milroy; mlmilroy@aol.com

- **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Involvement Committee:**
  Chair: Christine Young; cyoung@kuhnyounglaw.com
  Vice Chair: Sarita Nair; sxn@sutinfirm.com

- **Women’s Business Law Network:**
  Chair: Sylvia Chin; schin@whitecase.com
  Vice Chair: Natalie Panossian; nataliepanossian@gmail.com

- **Lawyers of Color Involvement:**
  Chair: Doneene Damon; damon@rlf.com
  Vice Chairs: Lacy Durham; lacydurhamlaw@yahoo.com; Stefanie Moon; smoon@hpslegal.com; Ashley Wicks; awicks@watkinsludlam.com

- **Lawyers with Disabilities Involvement:**
  Chair: Joan Durocher; jdurocher@ncd.gov
  Vice Chair: Jason Goitia; jason.goitia@gmail.com

- **Law Student and Young Lawyer Involvement:**
  Chair: Daria Boxer; dascha_k@yahoo.com