

## BREAKING DOWN BARRIERS: SESSION II\*

### MAKING THE BAR MORE INCLUSIVE

*Moderator: Ross Flockerzie\*\**

*Panelists: Melissa R. Allman, Melissa Felder Zappala, Daniel Goldstein, Won Shin, and Neal Suggs<sup>†</sup>*

SANTINO CECCOTTI: Before we begin, I would be remiss not to thank some people, and I'll probably be thanking them throughout the day. But as co-chair of the Legal Professionals with Disabilities here in Delaware, the co-chair label is something I share with everybody on my committee. I see them all as co-chairs. None of this that we have here today would have come together without their help. And if I can just ask, when I name those individuals, if you could please stand so you can be recognized for working on the committee to help shape this.

Judge Andrea Rocanelli from the Superior Court. Jim McGiffin, our past DSBA<sup>1</sup> president. Tim Hitchings is here, and he's on our committee. Ross Flockerzie, who is going to be moderating the next panel. We've also been fortunate to have every DSBA president since Jim McGiffin, who has joined our committee and has had an influence along the way. I would like to thank Richard Forsten for his help and support. Also, I know Richard Herrmann is here. He's extremely influential in giving this program today. And if I missed anybody, I'm sure I'll remember throughout the course of the day.

But we will get started with the next panel. I'm really excited for this panel. I've had the opportunity and the pleasure to work with them in coordinating the discussions and the topics that they will cover. It will be

---

\* The transcript that follows was produced from a contemporaneous audio recording of the *Widener Law Review's* 2016 symposium, *Breaking Down Barriers: The Benefits of a More Inclusive Legal Profession*. The symposium was held on April 8, 2016 at Widener University Delaware Law School. This transcript is based on a panel discussion that focused on how the bar can be made more inclusive, and how to increase professional opportunities for lawyers with disabilities. The transcript has been edited for grammar and clarity. Footnotes have been added throughout to aid in further reading.

\*\* Ross Flockerzie is an Assistant Public Defender at the Delaware Office of the Public Defender.

<sup>†</sup> Melissa R. Allman is a staff attorney at the Fair Housing Clinic of the John Marshall Law School, located in Chicago, Illinois. Melissa Felder Zappala is Partner at Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP, located in Washington, D.C. Daniel Goldstein is Partner at Brown, Goldstein & Levy LLP, located in Baltimore, Maryland. Won Shin is Senior Manager at Ernst & Young, located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Neal Suggs is Vice President and Associate General Counsel for Microsoft's Business, Consumer, and Public Sector division, located in Seattle, Washington.

<sup>1</sup> Delaware State Bar Association.

moderated by Ross Flockerzie. I've known Ross since he graduated here at Delaware Law School and embarked on a career at the Public Defender's Office. He works in the felony trial unit. So, essentially, when Ross loses cases, I appeal them. Usually, we get the same result. Ross recently coached a team from this law school in the Academy of Trial Lawyers of the Allegheny County Mock Trial Competition in Pittsburgh. So, I know they had a great teacher in that respect. Without further ado, I'll let Ross introduce the panel, which will be covering the area of making the bar more inclusive and increasing professional opportunities.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: Alright, thank you, Santino. Thank you for your tireless work on this committee over the past number of years and in putting this together, and for personally serving as a mentor to me these years. I will begin by giving a brief introduction to all of our panelists here, and then we will get right into it.

Directly to my left is Won Shin. Won is a tax senior manager in the transaction advisory services group with Ernst & Young in Philadelphia. He focuses on tax transaction structuring, tax due diligence, mergers and acquisitions, tax attribute analysis, and transaction cost analysis. Won was previously a trial attorney and a former Assistant Deputy Mayor in the City of Philadelphia, and served as the Executive Director of the Mayor's Commission on People with Disabilities. He earned his J.D. from Southern Methodist University School of Law. He also earned an LLM in taxation with distinction from Georgetown University Law Center, and he holds a BBA in finance from the University of Texas at Arlington.

Next, we have Melissa Allman who, until very recently, was at CLASI.<sup>2</sup> She worked at CLASI for ten years representing and litigating on behalf of primarily low income clients in civil matters, including appeals of social security application denials; landlord-tenant matters, such as evictions and Section 8 voucher determination; voucher terminations; and fair-housing matters. She also served on a fair housing task force that collaborated member agencies to address fair housing, and in October 2011, she received a community service award presented by the Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Coalition. Until very recently, not only was she here at CLASI, but she was on our committee planning this event, as well as the survey that you will hear about later. We are sorry to see her go, but she has recently joined John Marshall Law School in Chicago this past January as a staff attorney in its Fair Housing Clinic. Melissa graduated from Georgetown University, her master's degree from Ohio State University is in Russian Literature, and she earned her law degree from Temple University.

---

<sup>2</sup> "CLASI" is Delaware's Community Legal Aid Society, Inc.

Neal Suggs is the Vice President and Associate General Counsel for the Business Consumer and Public Sector team at Microsoft. Neal has served as Microsoft's lead commercial attorney since September 2010. Neal also led the diversity efforts for Microsoft's corporate external and legal affair groups from 2007 to 2010. Prior to joining Microsoft, Neal practiced in various firms in the Seattle area and in London. Neal graduated from Harvard University and the University of Michigan Law School.

Daniel Goldstein is an attorney with the Baltimore, Maryland law firm Brown, Goldstein & Levy. He established his private practice in 1982 and became involved in the field of disability rights law a few years later at the behest of the National Federation of the Blind. In a lawsuit alleging that mass digitization of library collections constituted copyright infringement, Daniel, the National Federation of the Blind, and certain blind scholars intervened as defendants and were successful in getting the court to rule that the making and distributing of copyrighted content for use by persons with print disabilities is a fair use. Dan believes this is the most significant victory of his career. Brown, Goldstein & Levy also created the Disability Rights Fellowship, which is a fellowship for a law school graduate with a disability who has up to three years of legal experience. It provides mentoring to a new generation of lawyers with disabilities as they enter the workplace.

Melissa Felder Zappala specializes in complex commercial litigation. She has extensive experience in a variety of legal areas, including securities, antitrust, class actions, and business torts on both the trial and appellate level. In recent pro bono work, Melissa brought suit against the District of Columbia on behalf of a deaf individual, alleging that videos posted on the District Court's website either had no captions or had captions that were not intelligible. As a result of this litigation, which appears to be one of the first of its kind in the country, the District of Columbia agreed to issue a mayoral order requiring that the District caption or provide transcripts for videos it posted on its website and on third-party websites. Melissa graduated from Yale University and earned her law degree from Georgetown University Law Center.

With that, we will get into the heart of this, and I think there are four general topics that I'd like the panelists to weigh in on today, the first being the tone and approach necessary to hire individuals with disabilities; the second are the economics of this and the bottom-line impact of hiring individuals with disabilities; third, recruiting, interviewing, and accommodating lawyers with disabilities; and four, advancement and opportunities.

Dan Atkins, in his section panel, talked about creating a culture of accommodation, and I think that flows nicely into discussing the most effective tone and approach when it comes to diversity and hiring lawyers with disabilities. And so, with that, I will open it up to the panel.

NEAL SUGGS: As we think about it, one of the things that we've worked on since Brad Smith became our Chief Legal Officer, he very quickly asserted that we have to drive diversity not only in our department, not only for our company, but for the profession, and that was a key and important moment. And so, since he's been in the role of leading our legal department, it has been very clear that in addition to the ground-up effort, which, many of us have all been a part of, it's super important to ensure that you have a top-down push. And he has been a true leader in that space.

Extrapolating that down to this particular issue: how do you drive a culture that is going to incorporate hiring and, not merely hiring, but making sure that people with disabilities thrive in your organization. I think the first thing that we try to drive throughout the department and the company and the profession is every single person in the world has something that separates them from others. The term "disability" is in some respects loaded.

I think we all know what's intended to be meant, but the reality is that all of us have to overcome something, and that basic understanding that everybody has something to deal with (and some have more than others) really drives the approach that we're trying to take, which is that we have to, in a competitive environment, find the best people to do the jobs they can do in the best way they can do it. It does not matter what they look like. It does not matter what language they speak or what country they come from. It does not matter what religion they are. It does not matter if they have a physical or mental disability. We need the best people doing the best things to remain competitive. And once you establish that tone, and once you recognize that this is not a community that should be avoided but is like any other community that you would attract talent from, it then follows that we are going to move quickly, we're going to learn fast, we're going to make mistakes out of effort and intent, and it is intended that we learn from those mistakes and get better and, most importantly, listen from those in the community that can help us be better. That's what we focused on in every aspect of diversity.

One of the great things that has happened over the years that I've been doing, both as a law student and in my professional career, is that the word "inclusion" has come along to kind of augment the word "diversity." There are too many times that I have seen very qualified people we hire who then wither on the vine because we expect once they're hired that they will assimilate, rather than us learning from them and adapting to what they can bring. I think inclusion has been that other piece of the puzzle that's really allowed us to flourish and start driving with our partner firms that we work with. This idea that if you're going to really make this work, if you're going to really create that culture, it has to be a learning culture. It has to be a culture that accepts people for who they are and what they bring, and ensures that those talents can help your department flourish and grow. That's what I think we focus on at Microsoft.

MELISSA ALLMAN: I would like to capitalize on what Neal said in a couple of ways. One of the things that Neal said I think that's important is that so many times we look at this diversity, and sometimes in terms of people with disabilities, as sort of this obligation. How do we fulfill this obligation that we have to meet? But it needs to be viewed as an opportunity rather than an obligation. Because like Neal was saying, if you're not looking at someone for what they can bring to the table, and all you're seeing is their disability and the accommodations that they might need, and you're thinking, "Oh, then we have to do this," then that's really missing half of the picture.

In terms of what Neal said about how we all have something about us that is different from others, I think that's 100 percent true. I think people get very comfortable when thinking that they don't. That people who do not necessarily fall within the legal definition or any other definition of disability can sometimes think, "Well, that person with the disability, they've got something wrong with them, something broken about them, something about them that isn't easy so I don't want to deal with it." That can become a very comfortable thing to hide behind in not recognizing that we all have something that we need assistance with.

The good news about that is if we recognize that and admit that, we can use that as an opportunity to build community, because community is created when you have people who are working together, who are relying on each other, who are drawing on each other's talents, who are celebrating each other's talents instead of thinking about how this person is going to make me have to step out of my comfort zone or create some sort of burden for me. I have a friend who once said to me, when I was whining about a situation where I felt I was perceived as a burden due to my disability, that we are all burdens. So I would like to take that phrase, "We are all burdens," and sort of turn it on its head and think about it in a positive context. We are all gifts.

MELISSA FELDER ZAPPALA: If I could follow up on that, I think Melissa and Neal made some very good points. I started to think about the point Melissa just made. I am a litigator and I'm constantly working on deadlines. My background is that I'm hard of hearing, and so that's my disability that qualifies me to be on this panel. But my disability requires certain accommodations. For example, I need, when I project in a setting like this, a court reporter next to me to provide captioning. When I take a phone call and I speak to opposing counsel, I need someone to write down what's going on in the phone call so that I can respond.

So yes, that can be perceived as some kind of a burden or accommodation that my employer needs to make for me. But, I get all of my work done well before the midnight filing deadline, when you have to file something on ECF.<sup>3</sup> For a lot of cases, many of my colleagues will work up until that

---

<sup>3</sup> "ECF" is "Electronic Case Files," the Federal Judiciary's comprehensive case

midnight filing deadline and require everyone else to do their work at the last minute. That is something that can be perceived as a burden, but that is not a burden that is necessarily considered to need an accommodation of some kind. But requiring people to stay up late so that people can edit work for the midnight filing deadline, that is an accommodation of some kind. So, when thinking about hiring people with disabilities, you just need to focus on the concept of an accommodation as not just something unique to a person with a disability.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: I'm going to talk at a little more mundane level. Near the end of March, the Office of Disability Employment Policy at the Department of Labor issued a guide called "Talent Works." That's a guide for hiring people with disabilities, and it noted that a survey had disclosed that forty-six percent of people with disabilities found the application process to be difficult or impossible.<sup>4</sup> I didn't get to see what that broke down to, but certainly, for blind applicants I suspect, it was probably an inaccessible website, like an image PDF application form, or perhaps an online job assessment test that was completely inaccessible. So, one thing about making yourself a welcoming place to hire is to be sure that your application process is accessible.

Second, I learned when I was at Microsoft that our employment process is absolutely a nightmare for anybody who's on the autism spectrum. Basically, if you're applying there as an attorney, you're there for the day, you're meeting with maybe five or six people in a room and then some more people, and you're meeting with the associates to get the real story about what it's like to work there. And I learned that the interviewing process at Microsoft is a good way to drive away anybody on the autism spectrum.

What's interesting to me about that is that we had a disability rights fellow, a wonderful disability rights fellow. She was autistic, and yet apparently never felt comfortable telling us that our interview process had been horrible. And I was glad to finally learn that. But, the other thing I would say about being a welcoming place is that there are problems upstream, and that's true. So, when you're looking for things that the prospective employee has great strengths and talents in because there's a good chance they were not adequately accommodated in college and law school, you may also find that that person has some great strengths and passions in certain areas that is going to make that person a crackerjack lawyer down the road, and you don't want to miss out on that.

And then the one other thing I would mention about being a welcoming place is that the person with the disability that you're interviewing probably

---

management system, which is used to file all case-related motions and documents.

<sup>4</sup> See *Talent Works – Is HR Hurting Your Bottom Line?*, PEAT, <http://www.peatworks.org/talentworks/resources/survey-report> (last visited Mar. 9, 2017).

has a lot more experience dealing with people without disabilities than you do with that disability. So don't be shy about asking questions. If you just said, "It's so nice to see you," and then you thought, "Oh my God, am I supposed to say that to a blind person," you can ask that person. Haben Girma, who's an attorney and the first deafblind graduate of Harvard Law School,<sup>5</sup> came to visit me and I'm thinking, "I don't know how to sign, much less sign on somebody's hand, how am I going to communicate with Haben?" I walked into the room. She handed me a Bluetooth keyboard and said, "Hi, Daniel." And I went, "Hi, Haben, good to meet you." And what I was typing on the keyboard was coming up on her refreshable Braille display. She knew how to communicate with me and educated me in the process. So don't be shy about asking those questions so that you can offer a welcoming place.

WON SHIN: I guess that leaves me. It's always hard to follow people as impressive as my fellow panelists. At Ernst & Young, we do have a culture from the top down. It goes back to our founder, Arthur Young, who was deaf and had low vision, and realized that he couldn't practice as a courtroom lawyer in England and moved over to the United States to become an innovator and entrepreneur in the field of accounting. So, our history with inclusiveness and diversity and accommodations goes back to our founding. And our Americas Vice Chair, Steve Howe, is also very committed to what we do in a day-in-day-out basis, because it's a business imperative that you go out and hire the best people that you can hire. Clients demand it. And your business needs it. And the way we look at it is that our mission in including people with disabilities is driven by the companies that we serve, and those that lead our company.

As long as you have the leadership committed to this type of mission and the clients out there committed to this type of mission, it really requires the professional service providers, of which Ernst & Young is one, to distinguish itself and the others out there and follow that mission. We've been called a purpose-driven company, and it's because we believe that you bring in the people, the best talented people that you can, and to provide the best service that you can. It's really a win for everybody. And the way we view accommodations at Ernst & Young is that we accommodate everyone. Whether you have a disability or not, to be able to come to work every day and do the best that you can do, whether it's providing a stand-up table for someone who just has a hard time sitting all day, providing better ergonomics, or just removing perceptions on a daily basis of what people can and cannot do.

---

<sup>5</sup> See generally Joseph Shapiro, *She Owes Her Activism to a Brave Mom, the ADA, and Chocolate Cake*, NPR (July 31, 2015, 12:54 PM), <http://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2015/07/31/428075935/she-owes-her-activism-to-a-brave-mom-the-ada-and-chocolate-cake> (giving a brief background about Haben Girma).

It's hard to capture in a five-minute kind of statement. But I think what I am geared to do here more than anything is answer questions that people may have. I acquired my disability when I was eighteen years old, two months before my nineteenth birthday, diving in the ocean. And I remember meeting my wife, when we had our first date, and she asked how deep was the water, and I told her, "Obviously not deep enough." And so, I've gone through college and law school and got my masters in law and entered the workforce, and one thing I would like to bring up as a topic for us to discuss is that we all talk about issues of hiring people with disabilities and those extreme numbers of those with disabilities that are unemployed, but how do we move that needle and hire more people with disabilities into the workforce? I think one question that we have to ask ourselves on a daily basis is, "What is it that we are willing to do?" I think it's easier to hire a Neal or a Melissa or someone like myself in a job, because we kind of fit in.

But what about those that need help? Disability is an extreme factor in driving poverty. There are so many people with disabilities that are in a position where they're forced to make a choice between working and losing their benefits that they receive from the state and federal government. And often, the benefits of working and the economics of working don't cover the cost of losing those benefits, and so when they have to make that choice, and they have an offer of employment sitting on the table, and they have to decide, "Can I afford to take this job," and the answer is no, what can we do? Employers in the workforce say, "How do you bridge that gap?" If we can bridge that gap, I guarantee you that we'll move that needle.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: I think that kind of segues into the next topic about the economics of this: the bottom-line value. I'd like you to talk about the economics of this and whether this is something to do because it is an inherently good thing to do, or because there is a concrete fiscal incentive to do it, or perhaps both.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: Well, I will start off by saying that as an employer with our Disability Rights Fellowship—and by the way, if the disability rights fellow we hire really doesn't want to do disability rights, which is understandable; I don't want to be the guy in the wheelchair who does disability rights, we really don't care, because it's about mentoring a lawyer with a disability—the first year we offered it, we were this tiny firm in Baltimore. We had applicants from Harvard Law School, Stanford Law School, Georgetown, and University of Texas. I've forgotten where else, but we were overwhelmed and I kept thinking that there are some federal judges missing out on potential law clerks because they are turning their nose up at folks with disabilities. One reason to do it is to get some fabulous candidates.



A second reason is that nobody knows the statistics on unemployment among people with disabilities better than people with disabilities. So, you will be able to be incredibly exploitative as an employer. That person will be there when there is three-and-a-half-feet of snow on the ground, and none of your other employees will be there. And I think a more significant reason is that if you have gotten that far along in life as a person with a disability, you are one hell of a problem solver, because that's really what being a person with a disability in this country means. You've got to find alternative techniques and ways to get things done when you don't have that accommodation to be a success. And the practice of law is nothing if not problem solving.

MELISSA ALLMAN: I would like to follow that because as a person with a disability, I have spent my entire life having to solve problems. Yes, some of them were of my own making, but many times they weren't. And you get very creative. One of my favorite parts of my job as a lawyer is problem solving, because I'm good at it. I've had to do it a lot. I think that that's something that the employers need. They need people with those skills, and they also need people who are adaptable. It's amazing when you are working somewhere when something is going to change. People see change and they panic. As a person with a disability, you don't have time to panic. You just have to figure out how you're going to deal with the next thing that's thrown at you and you just have to get moving. So, if you have employees who are capable of doing that, your organization can be more nimble, flexible, and prepared for the changes that need to occur within it and that it will face.

In terms of the economics, I am in a situation right now with my current employer where there are accommodations that I need, but it's a legal clinic in a law school, and you know how law schools have been hit hard by the economy during the recession. So, we have to come up with creative solutions. One of those is having students who are volunteers assist and provide some of those accommodations like helping to make documents accessible, and in situations where they're not, I have three student volunteers right now who always show up. They are putting in these hours to provide accommodations for me on top of their regular student obligations, and I am so thankful for them.

But one of the things that they are gaining from that experience is they are getting to work directly with case files in the Fair Housing Clinic, instead of just being in their law school classes hearing about it. Their hands are in it. If there is a client meeting and there is a likelihood that the client will bring documents, I'm not going to be able to read during that meeting because they are just in print. Students get to sit in on a client meeting where they might not have otherwise gotten to do so, especially if they're not at a point in their law school career where they're eligible to be in a clinic. And the other thing is that they can put something on their resume that they might not have

otherwise. In the rare situation, we are able to pay someone to help provide that assistance.

MELLISSA FELDER ZAPPALA: In terms of the economic benefit of hiring people with disabilities, I think it's important to realize what Neal said before: anytime you increase diversity in any business, you are going to increase the profitability and success of that business. Law firms are businesses, in many ways. They stay in business only if they are profitable.

One good example of how increased diversity is useful in the litigation context, although not disability specific, but we do jury trials and if you had, for example, an all-male set of litigators, they might not realize that they can relate to a jury that has a lot of women. The same concept applies to disability as well, and I also want to think of some other concrete examples with respect to disabilities. Now, I personally require my law firm to expend resources: paying for a captioner for phone calls, which means that whenever I have a phone call with opposing council or with the court, I have a court reporter like this woman next to me provide captioning remotely. So, there is a computer screen that looks like any computer screen, and it has a transcript of what is being said because a court reporter is listening in. That service, on an annual basis, does require my law firm to spend thousands of dollars.

However, as an associate, I regularly billed over 3,000 hours per year, and the amount of time and profit that I generated for my law firm far exceeded the cost of providing the service, and what my law firm got by hiring me was an associate that was willing to spend over 3,000 hours a year on their matters. That might go a little bit to what Daniel said, which is that job opportunities for people with disabilities is lower, so I was determined to do a good job for my law firm. I also had the opportunity to work with and for attorneys that are dyslexic. Attorneys that are dyslexic obviously are slower in reading, and require things to be presented more simply in writing. What that means as a litigator is that as a junior associate, you are forced to translate concepts from cases into clear and concise terms, and provide the dyslexic attorney with a very simple yet compelling summary of the key points in the case, because the dyslexic attorney cannot read as quickly or as much.

Also, I think Melissa mentioned in an email correspondence that we had about the fact that someone who is blind might require a different type of filing system in the office. That has an economic benefit by making it easier for all employees in the office to more efficiently access files. So, there are economic benefits to hiring individuals with disabilities, and it is not merely something to do out of the goodness of your heart.

WON SHIN: I am still getting over the 3,000 hours. I did that math in my head and I am astounded. I mean, everybody has made a compelling case . . .

MELISSA ALLMAN: Some of us are amazed you can do that math in your head.

WON SHIN: Hence why I work at Ernst & Young. But everyone makes a compelling case, and compelling cases have been made for a long time on the benefits of hiring people with disabilities, especially the economics of it. I think there are many studies out there saying that the cost of accommodations is relatively low. I think the average figure often thrown out there is a \$500 cost, and most costs of accommodation are well under \$1,000, with most of them being a one-time cost.<sup>6</sup>

And there are other costs incurred with respect to hiring people with disabilities, but I think what you've heard today is that the benefit clearly outweighs the cost. I think another way to look at it from an economic standpoint is what Melissa said about the economic benefit. If Neal has a meeting at Microsoft where he is interviewing a team of outside attorneys to come in and handle a very exclusive matter for him, and the first team that comes in there are all white males, what do you think Neal is going to think? If another team comes in and they are all another group, what is he going to think? If he sees a team come in where the person on the team is a qualified individual with a disability, what is he going to think?

We've seen this throughout history with women and minorities entering the workforce. At least in my world and likely Neal's world, clients drive a lot of this, and their demands on their service providers provide a lot of this. So when we talk about hiring people with disabilities and what's going to cause that demand, I always respond that the clients cause that demand. Our clients are going to demand it in their service providers, and when we see that, you're going to see the numbers go up.

NEAL SUGGS: I have a couple of thoughts, and I am also going to agree with Won on a couple of points. One, it's really hard to go last on this group. It's very hard. The other thing is that I can get your hours down if you come to Microsoft. We'll talk later. But a couple of thoughts. The first is, if I think about our company, we were at one point the most famous, determined monopolist in the world. We were actually doing some okay things with accessibility. We weren't perfect, but we recognized that when you have your software on ninety-five percent of the machines around the world, you have to make sure that you can be accessible. We, for lots of reasons, lost our way on competition, and I think that happens. If you look at most major monopoly cases, it becomes hard for them to get back into a competitive mind frame, and as new technologies came on board, we lost our way a little

---

<sup>6</sup> See Beth Joy, *Workplace Accommodation: Low Cost, High Impact*, JOB ACCOMMODATION NETWORK (Sept. 1, 2016), <http://askjan.org/media/lowcosthighimpact.html>.

bit on our approach to accessibility. Accessibility became something nice to have. And that became directly related to not having enough people with disabilities making leadership decisions, and that is actually a competitive disadvantage for us. We have to have more people with disabilities in the company in leadership positions so we are making the right choices on all of the products we are offering. Our mission is a bold one. We want everybody on the planet to be able to achieve more. It's that simple; that's what we are trying to do. There's nobody excluded from that. So, we have to have people who think that this is not a nice thing to have, but that this is an absolute.

The second thing I would say, which is something I think is super important, and it's important about driving diversity and inclusion. I started working on diversity when I came to the company in 2003. And I have worked on diversity my entire career. My cousin Dan Atkins, the fine gentleman who had the seat before me who speaks far better than I do, we were very close growing up and we had this very interesting world where Danny, my mom, and his dad were brother and sister. And Danny was family to me. Yet, I had this other part of my family, this other life in which I was a black person and I was not actually really a black person. You have to look at the *Loving*<sup>7</sup> case to recognize that as late as 1967, there were states where I would not have been welcome. My parents' marriage would not have been appreciated, valued or recognized under the law. And so, I've kind of lived my entire life in this really interesting space where I am part of a great loving family, and then I'm also kind of part of two different ethnic groups, racial distinctions, and religions. Interestingly enough, I belong and yet don't belong. It's an interesting thing to live in that world. What you find is that the people who have these kinds of distinctions that society wants to pay attention to, of course it's a good thing to do this. But if you're going to get results, you have to start tying people's economic outcomes to the results that you want to drive. That's what we discovered. That's what we decided upon.

And so our general counsel, who has no particularly good reason to have to care about diversity in any form, created a program which at the time was not as much focused on people with disabilities, although we have expanded it. But, we created a program with our law firms where we said, "We're going to give you three different ways to show us that you care about diversity. You're going to show it with growth in your absolute numbers. You're going to show it with the people who are doing work on our matters, and you're going to show it with the advancement in your firm," like moving people from associate to partner. And, if you move the dial, you can be more diverse than us.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967) (invalidating Virginia's anti-miscegenation statute).

Our department at the time was probably about thirty-eight percent women. And we are about ten or eleven percent diverse. Not where we wanted to be, but pretty good. If you look at the numbers, if you look at partners at law firms, we were far exceeding those numbers, even with associates at law firms. What we said is, "If you show us growth or you can beat us, we'll pay you a bonus on your hours with us." So, we'll give you more money for just being diverse. But then we took it a step further. We said to the leaders and the leaders of the department, "If our law firms don't get the bonus, five percent of our bonus is going to be taken away from us." The first year we did this, our law firms didn't make the numbers. Not enough of them did. So, five percent of a bonus of about thirty people in the department was put into some scholarships and programs that we were interested in. We haven't missed since. That's where we recognized that if you work in a corporation, the language of a corporation is revenue, profit, and making sure that people get paid. If you can start translating some of this effort into something like that, that's when you start making differences.

You have to take risks. There were a lot of discussions with a lot of the employment lawyers in our company about whether we could do what we did, and we said, "Let's do it and see what happens." We haven't been sued yet. Hopefully we won't. But on this particular one, it's a suit that we would welcome and would fight vigorously because we think it is the right thing to do. Unfortunately, some of our movement is gated by understanding the law and recognizing you can't say, "I want to move the numbers five to ten percent a year," so you have to move at incremental points. But fifteen years later, we've moved the dial at least five to ten percentage points in each of the groups, and we're going to keep at it until we get to where we want to get to. That's how we think about it.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Neal, can I just ask: was disability part of the diversity?

NEAL SUGGS: It wasn't at the time we launched that program. It is today. What we're trying to figure out is, what's the baseline number we should be using? We are letting our firm self-report on that diversity, and we've added that, as a feature that they can report on, we're going to have a clear definition for us of what the baseline is and where we want that needle to move and how quickly. But that's been added to it absolutely.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: What's striking to me, just by way observation, is when Professor Hayman talked earlier about Chief Justice Rehnquist and how he noted that it would be reasonable not to hire someone with a disability if it could save you money. And what we're hearing over and over is that, in fact, is the inverse in the practice. Daniel talked earlier about the interviewing process. If we're at a point where we are saying it's a sound financial decision to hire individuals with disabilities, the next question becomes the

recruitment, the interviewing, and the accommodation part of this. Daniel touched on it earlier, but I would like everyone to weigh in as to this process of getting people in the door, hiring them, and accommodating them.

NEAL SUGGS: I'll start because I don't want to go last again. One of the biggest challenges to the hiring process are the interviewers, who are so uncomfortable. They don't want to make mistakes, and so rather than face that fear, they choose not to engage. We have a couple of different things we're doing.

The first is on autism. There used to be legendary stories about Microsoft interviews and one question you would get was, "Why is a manhole cover round?" There's actually a reason why. It's round so the top doesn't fall into the hole. But, it's kind of a stupid question if you're asking somebody to do legal work for you. Yet the interviews used to be six to ten hours long, there was about a half-dozen of them, you'd talk to five people in a room for an hour, and then you'd have a lunch with somebody and go through the Microsoft campus, which is about as big as the state of Delaware. It's just an incredibly painful process, and it's an unfair process. They cannot do their best work. They can't shine through because you've created an environment where they can't be unsuccessful.

One of the things we've done is we've worked with experts to help us tune our process so that we can find the talent with folks with autism, and not put them in a place where they're at a disadvantage. Another thing we've done is we've worked with outside experts to make sure that, as part of the interview process, we're training interviewers so they know what questions to ask and when it is appropriate for them to ask specifically of the interviewee, "What is your preference?" We did all the legal basic training that people have, what questions you can and should ask, and what you legally can't ask. But the idea is that we're trying to create an interview process where we want everybody who comes through, regardless of their condition, to have a world-class experience. And it starts with the people at the company making sure that happens. We all have a responsibility to make that work.

The other thing I would say is that we also work very hard to make sure that we're identifying roles where people can be successful. There's been great books about how one should think about developing people. Marcus Buckingham, who wrote a few books with the Gallop Institution,<sup>8</sup> really drives the concept of playing to people's strength, and the concept is that most people who are successful double down on their good parts and they

---

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Marcus Buckingham & Curt Coffman, *FIRST, BREAK ALL THE RULES: WHAT THE WORLD'S GREATEST MANAGERS DO DIFFERENTLY* 1 (2016); Marcus Buckingham, *GO PUT YOUR STRENGTHS TO WORK: 6 POWERFUL STEPS TO ACHIEVE OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE* 1 (2010); Marcus Buckingham & Donald O. Clifton, *NOW, DISCOVER YOUR STRENGTHS* 1 (2001).

minimize the parts that are not so good. And in that case, you recognize that, as Melissa said earlier, everybody has to overcome something, and you have to make accommodations for what people do well and don't do well.

When you get into that mind set and start realizing that there are some roles people would be successful in, there are probably some roles that they wouldn't be successful in. That doesn't mean they can't be employed in the company. It just means finding the right role. We spend a fair amount of time doing that. So I think the entire concept of the company is to make sure that the interviewers are not putting the disability in the forefront and really taking that out of the equation, and making it about finding the best talent for the opportunities at the company.

WON SHIN: One other thing that we think about is the mindset of the person looking for the job. Before I came back to Ernst & Young in 2000, I was looking at jobs both in accounting firms and law firms, looking to do tax work. And the reason why I chose to go back to Ernst & Young is because I was introduced to the person who handled our people resource network and understood what the firm was doing with respect to that type of hiring. We focus on that with our recruiters that go out to look for talented people. We focus on making sure that people that are looking at Ernst & Young understand the environment that they're looking at and how we operate.

I think when you look at it from the mindset of a law school student, a 2L or a 3L that's getting ready to enter the workforce, they're looking for a place where they can be successful, not to just be put into an office somewhere in the corner of the fifth floor looking at the computer all day, but really coming into an environment where they're going to be embraced. And they're going to be put into a situation where they're going to succeed, because you want your people to succeed, whether they have a disability or don't. I think that's very important.

MELISSA FELDER ZAPPALA: To follow up on that, I think one of the hardest things to do is to get that first person with a disability through the door. Because people who work there, even if that person gets hired, the people that work there aren't necessarily sure what kind of accommodations they need or how to necessarily interact with that person without offending that person. Once an organization or law firm hires someone with a disability and integrates that person with the disability into the firm, or if we're not talking about a law firm, a non-profit or a state agency of some kind, then it becomes easier to hire the next person with the disability because the employees are more aware of the kinds of questions that can be asked. They're more aware and comfortable interacting with a person with a disability, so it's that initial hire that is the key to hiring more people with disabilities. That is true for any type of diversity.

MELISSA ALLMAN: I think I come from a little bit of a different perspective because I was just recently hired by an employer and I haven't been involved in any hiring decisions there, but I think the responsibility falls both on the employer and on the person with the disability. On both sides, there could be misunderstandings and mistakes, but both must be willing to work through them, overcome them, and learn from them.

When I interviewed with my current employer, I didn't ask for any accommodations in the interviewing process. So the people who were interviewing me did not know that I was blind until I asked one of them if I could take their arm because I didn't know where the conference room was that we're going to be interviewing in. For them, it was really important that I was willing to be upfront about the disability and what the needs were and making them feel more comfortable in terms of what questions they could ask me and what questions weren't really relevant. My hope is that when there is another hiring decision to be made, they'll be a little bit more comfortable with that experience and the discussion about accommodations, because we have educated each other throughout this process. That it is our duty as people with and without disabilities: to learn as much as we can from one another.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: I don't know that I have a whole lot to add here. We've been talking about this within the notion of visible and apparent disabilities. And I think there are a whole bunch of different answers that I don't feel equipped to help out on. I hate it when a blind law student asks me for advice on this and I don't want to say, "Go talk to a blind lawyer." But the sort of the standard advice is: don't disclose your disability in the letter, because you may never get the interview. But then in the interview, you are going to need to put these folks who are now utterly in shock that a blind person is walking in the door at ease, and at some early opportunity you probably want to say you may be wondering how I handle documents at a deposition, or you may be wondering whether you'll be able to find your office on my own each morning.

There is no such thing as a stupid question. Please ask. And of course, they haven't asked anything up to that point, because they are terrified of violating the ADA by asking how you would do this task or another. But it's the elephant in the room, and to leave it unaddressed means you won't get the job. So it really does fall on you to put it out there, and if at that point they're still too shy or incurious to ask, you're not going to get the job.

MELISSA FELDER ZAPPALA: If I could just add to that, it would be that I am hopeful that one day it will get to the point where law students want to disclose the disability on their application because employers will see it as a positive thing, and they will want to bring in that law student for an interview. But we're not quite there yet.



MELISSA ALLMAN: I agree with that. I have never felt comfortable disclosing my disability in any application process for a job. It's always when we get into the interview or when they see me for the first time or however that gets disclosed.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you want me to comment on that? I'm Andy. I'm going to speak at lunch. I have bipolar disorder, which I have been open about throughout my career, and if you Google me, you can find out I am bipolar, so I kind of don't have a choice.<sup>9</sup> Earlier in my career, I was out with my disability in job applications in part because I didn't want to work for employers that were going to have a problem. But I had blue chip credentials and very strong work experience, so to some degree, I had the luxury of taking that risk. And I agree with Daniel; this is not a one-size-fits-all thing. I do think we are very close, Melissa, with some employers, including Microsoft, where it will be viewed as a positive if you identify your disability on an application.

NEAL SUGGS: Well, we are past that point at Microsoft; we are actively recruiting. The other thing I will say is that the area that we are now moving even faster in is the pivot from people with physical or obvious disabilities to people with mental disabilities. It is the one area where people feel very comfortable to discriminate against, and I think we're trying to figure out very quickly how we can break through that.

One of the things we feel, at least in our legal department, is if you take the lawyers out of a society, you destabilize society, and the idea that our profession is not outraged that we are not as diverse as we should be based upon how we are representing society is a travesty. That's one of the things that's driving our department so very hard, and that's why I think you're going to see us pivot much more quickly to how can we expand this in a sensible and thoughtful way to mental disability.

It's great to see in society how we are starting to face the legacy of slavery and being upfront about that. It's disappointing that Princeton is not willing to apparently deal with that.<sup>10</sup> But that's okay, we have time. We're going to keep at this. It's incredibly important that we are living in this magnificent time where the shackles of the right to discriminate against people are being thrown off and we are now starting to see it's not a matter of being politically

---

<sup>9</sup> See David Bernstein, *Mental Illness Can Be a Source of Strength: An Interview with Andy Imparato*, RUDERMAN FAMILY FOUNDATION (Nov. 10, 2015), <http://www.rudermanfoundation.org/blog/article/mental-illness-can-be-a-source-of-strength-an-interview-with-andy-imparato>.

<sup>10</sup> See Editorial Board, *Should Princeton Dump Woodrow Wilson?*, L.A. TIMES (Nov. 20, 2015 5:00 AM), <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-college-master-20151120-story.html> (discussing the controversy surrounding Princeton University and whether Woodrow Wilson's name should be removed from a residential college and the School of Public Policy and International Affairs).

correct, and it's not a matter of shunning people, it's a matter of saying we want to be the inclusive society that we think we should be and we're going to try to stamp this stuff out wherever we can. So I would say, at Microsoft, please let us know in your application if you have a disability. It will invite a response back.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: I'd like to cover one more topic and I want to make sure we have time for questions. We are at the point where we are hiring individuals with disabilities because it's a sound financial decision. The next question is once this person is in the door, how do we make sure that that person has the opportunity to advance? And is the answer working 3,000 hours? Is the answer making sure that individuals specifically have this opportunity, or is it some combination thereof?

MELISSA FELDER ZAPPALA: If I could take this question because I think Daniel made the interesting observation that I was not aware of until this morning, that one-third of one percent of all law firm partners have a disability.<sup>11</sup> I fall into that category. So, it's obviously a very small number, and I started at my law firm as a summer associate, so I really advanced and moved up the ranks and made partner.

I do have the firsthand experience of how a legal workplace can be successful in making sure that a lawyer with a disability has the opportunity to advance. From what I've observed, the keys are curiosity and openness, both on the part of the law firm and the lawyer. Both parties have to ask the questions. You have to be able to place yourself in an uncomfortable position. Say you're an employer. Say, for example, to a deaf person like myself, I would like you to take a deposition but I'm not entirely sure how you would be able to do it because how are you going to be able to understand what the witness is going to say? And then have the lawyer, myself, say, "I would have the system that I have today, which is a computer system with time captioning." You have to be able to have a conversation, and employers need to be willing to work together to find creative solutions. It goes back to what we were talking about earlier, which is to understand that in every step of the way—from hiring someone junior to promoting them—there are economic benefits for hiring and promoting lawyers with disabilities.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: The inaccessibility of most law practice management software is a major issue when advancing in a law firm. Westlaw and LexisNexis fortunately are accessible. The parts of the Microsoft products

---

<sup>11</sup> *Diversity Numbers at Law Firms Eke Out Small Gains – Numbers for Women Associates Edge Up After Four Years of Decline*, NALP (Feb. 17, 2015), [http://www.nalp.org/lawfirmdiversity\\_feb2015](http://www.nalp.org/lawfirmdiversity_feb2015) (“The information that is available suggests that partners with disabilities (of any race or gender) are scarce, with about one-third of 1 percent of partners reported as having a disability in the three most recent years . . .”).

that I am familiar with in the law school and law firm contexts are accessible. I wish I can say that about other workplace software with Microsoft. I can't yet. But we had to search high and low to find a document management software that we could use, and once we did, we still had to pay someone to make it fully accessible. I know of one database that is accessible. We, for our time in billing, have our blind lawyers enter time on an Excel spreadsheet and then import it because our time and billing software is not accessible. That's a really significant problem for blind lawyers that want to advance and become partners. Hopefully there's a sea change going on there.

The other thing is that very often, dealing with a disability is time consuming, and we measure value a lot. The one thing all of you are going to remember four months from now about this symposium is one of the panelists said she bills 3,000 hours a year. In our business, we value our folks in terms of their time. If you have lupus and have a lot of pain, you're going to work from home as much as you can when you have to. But you may not get anywhere close to 3,000 hours. So one of the other things that has to change in the culture of a law firm is in terms of valuing the contributions of each other, in terms other than time. We look at the issue of having to take time to deal with your disability just the way we look at parental leave and the other things that happen in life that should allow you, rare as it is, to both practice law and have a life, rather than having to choose between the two.

MELISSA ALLMAN: I am so glad Dan has said what he said. I have great admiration for Melissa's 3,000 hours, and she is going to get sick of us talking about it pretty soon. But I would like to see the day come when you don't feel like you have to work harder than everybody else and put in more time than everybody else just because you have a disability, so that you can prove to everyone that you're worth it, because I went through some very difficult things to realize that it was okay to try to have a work-life balance. But you're at a point in your life where things do take longer because the technology is not there or because the accommodations aren't there, so you spend sixteen hours a day instead of eight or ten. That can take a great toll on your mental health, on all sorts of other aspects of your life, and you will burn out. It's important for us to be able to get to that point where there isn't this sense that because you have a disability, you have to work harder to be worth it. I don't want to project that onto people here where that's not accurate, but I've experienced that. I would like to see us get beyond that.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: We have about ten minutes for questions.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Before I get to my question, I just want to say that it has been a privilege to listen to this panel. My employment requires me to attend quite a few CLEs. I can't think of one that's been more interesting, thought provoking or inspiring than what I've listened to today. Thank you.

My question has to do with something you mentioned, Mr. Shin, and that was the extent that a disabled person wants to seek employment and whether they'll lose disability benefits either at the state or federal level.

WON SHIN: That's really a topic for a whole other CLE. It would probably take about a year to complete. I don't think there really is a rationale other than saving money. One thing that I have noticed when I talk to people is that the rule doesn't apply to those veterans that are injured during active service. Those veterans that are injured will be able to continue to collect their benefits while they seek employment and while they're employed. And I think that's a critical factor in seeing a lot of veterans getting back into the workforce after they've been injured or disabled in some form or fashion.

But I think for those people that are not veterans that are on public assistance at the federal and state levels, I don't know why there isn't some type of gap. There are some programs out there that do provide some gap, but it's not sufficient. And they really do have to make that choice. I know there is a story out of California where a teacher who has been teaching in the public-school system for at least twenty years is a high-level quadriplegic, and if she takes a certain pay raise, it will take her above the income threshold and she will lose her benefits. So, she has to think about quitting her job in order to keep her benefits.<sup>12</sup> If I had the answer to that question, we can probably end unemployment. But I don't have the answer to that question.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: I don't have the answer either, but I want to chime in and just say that there was a discussion in the prior panel about the different perceptions of disability. There's the custodial "I will take care of you" view, and there's the civil rights perspective. They're at war with each other. This is a classic example of the two narratives at war with each other. If you are entitled to get paid because you're disabled, how can you be entitled to work? If you're entitled to work, how can you be entitled to be paid? It's a failure to recognize the need to work, and so lawyers who bring Title One cases, for example, end up having to create special needs trusts and all kinds of fancy dances because you won. And you'll lose big time if you just take the check, because you're going to lose all kinds of benefits that you need.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I make a comment on that? One of the things that I think is important to keep in mind is that we don't have coherent public policy. We have competing interests all the time. For example, Governor Markell was here and said things about what the state has done in the area of addressing the rights of people with disabilities, and there are really great

---

<sup>12</sup> See Andrew Westrope, *State Law May Force Quadriplegic Roseville Teacher out of Work*, ROSEVILL & GRANITE BAY PRESS TRIBUNE (Nov. 19, 2014), <http://www.thepresstribune.com/article/11/19/14/state-law-may-force-quadriplegic-oakmont-teacher-out-work>.

things that the state has done.

On the other hand, during the budget conversation that we had last year, the state decided it was appropriate to cut general assistance benefits.<sup>13</sup> That's about the only cash benefit somebody in Delaware is going to get that comes from the state because they have a disability, right? They get this measly general assistance benefit, which the state decided to make even measlier in an effort to produce a balanced budget. So, it's important to remember that there are always competing interests, one of which is always going to be the financial interest. We sort of have to address these issues on a number of fronts: the philosophical front and the good-for-business front. We also have to address it with the people who represent us in state government in ways that make sense to them so that we can make policy at least a little more consistent.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are there any resources that you would recommend specifically for law firms that are interested in expanding the pool of applicants that are looking for lawyer positions, and also for understanding better the kinds of issues that we have been talking about.

WON SHIN: From my perspective, I would reach out to the career services offices at the law schools. They are going to be familiar with the people in their schools that have disabilities. I know when I was in law school, I reached out to that office, and I think if you're specifically looking for people that are graduating law schools with disabilities, I think that'd be a good place to start.

NEAL SUGGS: On our Microsoft diversity website, we list a couple of partners.<sup>14</sup> There are a couple of partners we work with, and I cannot emphasize enough for potential employers: please work with people who know what they are doing in this area, because they do it really well. And it completely facilitates a very good experience for both the firm and the potential employee.

Once you've gone to the offices of career services and got your applicant pool, there are some excellent experts who can come in and teach you how to make that job work for that person and for your organization so that you can get disability out of the conversation and just start getting people doing their job and having a good time.

---

<sup>13</sup> See Jon Offredo, *Deep in Delaware's Budget, a Cut to the Needy*, DELAWARE ONLINE (Aug. 28, 2015, 9:45 PM), <http://www.delawareonline.com/story/news/local/2015/08/28/deep-delawares-budget-cut-needy/71346644/> (discussing how the Delaware legislature cut the General Assistance program by ten percent).

<sup>14</sup> See *Global Diversity and Inclusion*, MICROSOFT, <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/diversity/inside-microsoft/cross-disability/default.aspx> (last visited Mar. 9, 2017).

AUDIENCE MEMBER: To that point as well, the EOC website is excellent and has a ton of resources explaining the ADA obligations both from an employer perspective and from an employee perspective.<sup>15</sup> It offers practical examples, dos and don'ts, and questions that you can't ask.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The ADA Mid-Atlantic website is a great regional resource.<sup>16</sup> To go off with what was said about the question of benefits, it's not so much the cash benefit; it's the health benefit. I think that it really speaks more to the continuing need for healthcare reform. The only way you can get home-based services for an employee who needs help getting in and out of bed at night is through the Medicaid program, and the Medicaid program is needs-based. You find that private insurers do not provide that kind of benefit, and that is a significant impediment for individuals. That speaks more to the continuing need to address the health insurance situation here in the United States.

WON SHIN: That's right. One of the reasons why I'm sitting at this table today and have a long history of working is because when I left school (where those benefits were provided by the state as long as I was a student) and became employed, I would lose all of those benefits. The only way I could get employed was because I had the assistance of my family to help me with those personal care needs that I have. A dear friend of mine, who is a partner in a big law firm in Philadelphia and who is also a quadriplegic, pays for it out of pocket. That's the only way she can do it. There are not many people that are in that position or have the support that they need to make that transition.

MELISSA ALLMAN: It can be really expensive to be a person with a disability, especially as somebody who has chosen to be in public interest work. In public interest work, it gets difficult sometimes because you're thinking about what your paycheck is, and then you're thinking about these things that you have to pay for sometimes out of pocket that can be really costly. Sometimes, there just isn't a good answer.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: We have time for one more question.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My question is kind of the best practices question. Where I'm coming from, I run the hiring committee where I work and I interviewed several hundred law students for our clerk program for this upcoming summer. So, I spent the fall and the winter interviewing on

---

<sup>15</sup> See *The ADA: Your Responsibilities as an Employer*, EEOC, <https://www.eeoc.gov/facts/ada17.html> (last visited Mar. 9, 2017).

<sup>16</sup> See *Information, Guidance, and Training on the Americans with Disabilities Act*, MID-ATLANTIC ADA CENTER, <http://www.adainfo.org/> (last visited Mar. 9, 2017).

campus, and then through unsolicited e-mails and I made it a point to interview every person. I didn't exclude anyone. My question is: what's the best practice to attract people for diversity purposes or for disability purposes, even before you get to the accommodations once they are hired?

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: There is now something called NALSWD, the National Association of Law Students with Disabilities.<sup>17</sup> If you reach out to NALSWD, their entire membership is law students with disabilities.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: To follow-up: there was not one interview that we had where a disability was disclosed on the cover letter, which you said is probably something that is not done. To the best of my knowledge, I don't know that we even interviewed somebody with a disability.

NEAL SUGGS: I think one of the things that we're doing throughout the company, not just in the legal department, is we are putting the onus on us. For the first time, we have a summer intern program for law students. I think they get a lot of interesting work. But we're not set up like Melissa's firm or any outside firm that could actually have a true summer program where they can expect to be hired when they come out. Typically, in-house counsel prefer people who have some experience before they come to work for us full-time. But we do a summer program, and this year we've explicitly held ourselves accountable to proactively recruit somebody with a disability. It's a small program; it's only about five or six people, but we want to specifically have somebody in a slot. Before, we never turned anybody away, but it wasn't really happening as much. Now we're proactively going to get one in. Once you say that and you announce it and let people know, it is not hard to find people. It's a lot harder to find people if they don't know you are open to it, but once you're open to it, you won't ever have that problem again.

ROSS FLOCKERZIE: I want to thank every one of you for traveling here from all over the country for your candid experiences and for sharing them with all of us, and for your excellent insight. Thank you very much.

---

<sup>17</sup> See *National Association of Law Students with Disabilities*, NALSWD, <http://www.nalswd.org/> (last visited Mar. 9, 2017).

