2017 SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

NJWLA has established a scholarship program to benefit students who are pursuing juris doctorate degrees. In 2017, NJWLA intends to award grants of $5,000 each, to one student from each of New Jersey’s law schools: Rutgers University Law School – Camden, Rutgers University Law School – Newark, and Seton Hall University Law School.

In order to qualify, each applicant must be a matriculating law school student who:
- Has completed at least twelve (12) credits at the time of application;
- Is carrying a minimum of six (6) credits per term; and
- Has been recommended by a professor, an instructor, an adjunct faculty member, a clinical instructor, a Dean, a Director of their law school or a lawyer or a judge (either needs to have at least ten (10) years’ experience) with whom the applicant has worked as a clerk or intern for at least three (3) months during the past two (2) years.

SELECTION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

In addition to these requirements, applicants will be judged according to their commitment and dedication to their law school, dedication to the mission of NJWLA, and the practice of law as well as his/her essay.

Scholarship awards may be used for tuition, fees, books, and personal expenses, and are given directly to the students.

Applicants who work for companies that offer tuition reimbursement are eligible to apply.

Scholarship application forms are available from the Deans of each New Jersey law school and are also available on our website at www.njwla.org.

PREVIOUS WINNERS ARE NOT ELIGIBLE.

All applications must be received by January 17, 2017 at 5:00 pm. NO EXCEPTIONS.
- Incomplete applications and/or applications received after the deadline WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.

1 Please note that for purposes of this scholarship process NJWLA treats Rutgers – Newark and Rutgers – Camden as separate schools.

DEDICATED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION
APPLICATION SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

Multiple reviewers will evaluate each application. For an application to be considered complete and eligible for consideration, we must receive from you by the deadline your:

- Application
- Essay
- Letter of recommendation
- Law school transcript (first year students should submit undergraduate transcript)
- Resume

Means of Submission:

The application and essay can be submitted by mail (see below) or by email (pdf format) to cskinner@njwla.org and mschaap@csglaw.com.

Mailing address:  
NJWLA  
633 Franklin Avenue  
PMB # 118  
Nutley, New Jersey 07110.

Letters of Recommendation and transcripts must be in original, hard copy, and the recommendations, if sent by the applicant (and not the party providing the recommendation directly) must be in sealed envelope from the party providing the recommendation.

TIMELINE

January 17, 2017 5:00 pm – Deadline for submission of all materials to ARRIVE at NJWLA Mailbox and/or email addresses provided above. MATERIALS POSTMARKED JANUARY 17, 2017, BUT RECEIVED THEREAFTER ARE NOT TIMELY SUBMISSIONS AND WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED.

February, 2017 – All candidates and Deans will be notified of the outcome of the application review.

The scholarships will be publicly recognized on March 28, 2017 at The Grove in Cedar Grove, NJ. Winners are expected to attend. This is a truly inspirational evening not to be missed.
SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION FORM

DEADLINE JANUARY 17, 2017 at 5:00 pm

I. Student Information (Please type or print neatly)

Name: ____________________________________________________________________
(Last)                (First)                          (M)

Email: _____________________________________________________________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________________

City: ___________________________     State:  ____________  Zip: _______________

Telephone:_________________________________________________________________

Employer ___ Current or ____Previous

____________________________________________________________________________

Date of Employment: __________________________  Position: ______________________

Address: ___________________________________________________________________

City: ______________________________    State: __________   Zip:  _____________

Telephone: _________________________________________________________________

Number of hours worked per week during the 2015/2016 academic year _____________

Anticipated hours to be worked per week during the 2016/2017 academic year _________

How did you hear about the NJWLA Scholarship award? ____________________________

Name and email of your local newspaper for press release:

____________________________________________________________________________
II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

High School Graduation (Year): ________________________________________________

Undergraduate Degree: ___________________ Year: _______ Major: __________

College or University: ________________________________________________________

Law School Information:

Name of Law School: _________________________________________________________

Date of Matriculation: ________________ Number of credits completed: _____________

Expected date of completion: ________ Total credits required for law degree: _______

Student Status: Full Time: ___________ Part Time: ___________

Number of Credits to be taken during the academic year:
(Minimum is six (6) per term, but you do not need to be enrolled all terms.)

Fall 2016 __________ Winter 2017 ___________ Summer 2017 _____________

Total Credits for the Academic Year 2016-2017: ____________________________

By submitting this application, applicant hereby grants to NJWLA the right to use, publish, exhibit and/or reproduce the applicant’s name, law school information and scholarship essay in any and all media now known or later developed, and for any and all purposes, without the payment of any royalty or compensation of any kind. Further, if applicant is selected as one of the grant recipients, then applicant further agrees that NJWLA may use images, including photographs and videos, of applicant from the NJWLA gala in any and all media now known or later developed, and for any and all purposes, without the payment of any royalty or compensation of any kind. The applicant herein releases NJWLA, its officers, directors, employees and agents and any affiliated or related persons or entities from any and all claims and causes of action based upon NJWLA’s use of the essay. By signing this application, applicant warrants that he/she is the sole owner of the rights granted and that the essay submitted does not infringe upon the copyright or rights of anyone.

Applicant Signature:_________________________________________________________

Date: __________
III. Your Essay is to respond to one of the following:

1. Please consider the American Bar Association new anti-discrimination Rule 8.4(g) (the “Rule”), and discuss whether (1) the new Rule goes far enough, or whether more should have been addressed here, or (2) are Kim Colby’s concerns, expressed in the attached New York Times article, well founded notwithstanding the last sentence of the Rule? And if you think the Rule should have gone further, please propose your alternative or amendment to the Rule.

   8.4(g)…. engage in conduct that the lawyer knows or reasonably should know is harassment or discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status or socioeconomic status in conduct related to the practice of law. This paragraph does not limit the ability of a lawyer to accept, decline or withdraw from a representation in accordance with Rule 1.16. This paragraph does not preclude legitimate advice or advocacy consistent with these Rules.

   OR

2. As a country, there has been ongoing discussion and debate as to the issues of character, temperament and appearance (outward physical appearance, as well as whether one shows his/her emotions or “wears a poker face”) as important considerations for our leaders. Discuss whether women, as attorneys and as aspiring leaders, are held to a different standard than men in being considered for leadership positions and/or promotions, and if so, (1) how has this impacted you in your chosen path to date, and (2) how you would propose to level the playing field – or not – and if not, why not.

Please use separate pages for your essay (do not print it here).

Please only answer one of the questions.

Your essay is not to exceed 1500 words.

Please note that if you use or refer to cited work, citations should be in Blue Book format.

We reserve the right to edit all essays for publication.
Association Considers Striking ‘Honeys’ From the Courtroom
By ELIZABETH OLSON AUG. 4, 2016

An opposing lawyer was fined and rebuked by a judge for making a sexist remark to Lori Rifkin, who said she was “well accustomed” to such comments. Credit Jason Henry for The New York Times

When Lori Rifkin asked the opposing lawyer to stop interrupting her while she questioned a potential witness, he replied: “Don’t raise your voice at me. It’s not becoming of a woman.” The remark drew a rebuke and fine in January from a federal magistrate who declared that the lawyer had “endorsed the stereotype that women are subject to a different standard of behavior than their fellow attorneys.”

“A sexist remark,” said the judge, Paul S. Grewal of the Federal District Court in San Jose, Calif., “is not just a professional discourtesy, although that in itself is regrettable and all too common.” Many female lawyers would agree. They say that even as more women graduate from law school and represent clients in courtrooms, it is not rare for them to be addressed as “honey” or “darling.” Sometimes they are subject to a grating remark, or an arm around the shoulder, they say.

“I got the pat on the head,” said Jenny Waters, chief executive of the National Association of Women Lawyers, referring to what she encountered while in private practice.

The group, which represents 5,200 women, has been backing an effort to add to the American Bar Association’s model rules of professional conduct an amendment to prohibit harassment and discrimination by lawyers in the course of practicing law. Bar associations in 23 states and the District of Columbia already have some kind of protections against harassment and discrimination by lawyers in the conduct of their profession, but the proposal would establish a standard nationwide.

The A.B.A. policy-making body is scheduled to vote on that amendment on Monday.

But critics of the proposal argue that a rule would inhibit lawyers from speaking freely on behalf of their clients and circumscribing the way they run their practice.

“It would change the attorney-client relationship and impair the ability to zealously represent clients,” said Kim Colby, director of the Center for Law and Religious Freedom at the Christian Legal Society, which opposes the amendment.

Such a change would also have a chilling effect on the ability of lawyers to engage in free speech, religious exercise and other First Amendment rights, Ms. Colby argued. The few times when the amendment punishes misconduct are greatly outweighed by “numerous instances where the rule is wielded as a weapon against lawyers by disgruntled job applicants, rejected clients, opposing parties or opposing counsel,” the society wrote in a 16-page letter to the A.B.A.’s ethics committee.

Most businesses have rules against harassment and discrimination. Yet the legal profession as whole lacks a flat ban on such behavior. “An ethical rule makes us accountable,” said Drucilla S. Ramey, a former executive director of the San Francisco Bar Association. “Lawyers are officers of the court. We’re supposed to set a standard of conduct and that’s a privilege.”

Supporters of the proposal say that while there is no way to track the frequency of such comments and actions, they happen often. Lawyers, they say, use such behavior as a tactic to fluster or intimidate opposing counsel.

Leslie Richards-Yellen, president of the National Association of Women Lawyers, described what she said had happened to a young African-American associate at a firm where she once practiced.

“The opposing counsel called her a racially insulting name, trying to throw sand in her face and get her off balance,” said Ms. Richards-Yellen, a partner at the law firm Hinshaw & Culbertson. “She called me trying to decide whether she should fight back or stay calm and just complete the job for the client — which is what she decided to do.”

Typically, women say, they ignore insults or sexist comments for fear of imperiling their careers or being labeled less than a team player.
"You either run with the nannies or you run with the wolves’ is the way one male partner at a San Francisco law firm described the choices to a pregnant associate,” said Ms. Ramey, who is also a former dean of the Golden Gate School of Law in San Francisco.

Ms. Ramey testified at a bar association public hearing in February in favor of the amendment, which would bar lawyers from harassing or discriminating “on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, marital status or socioeconomic status in conduct related to the practice of law.”

If the amendment is adopted, any punishment for such discrimination would be meted out by participating state bar associations and could range from fines to suspension from practicing law.

Opponents of the amendment argue that it could foster unfair punishments. Dozens of lawyers who filed a brief in opposition cited the cases of two Indiana lawyers who were disciplined under that state’s professional conduct rules, one for asking, without an ostensible reason, whether someone was gay, and another for describing himself with a racially derogatory term during a private telephone conversation with another lawyer’s secretary.

Like the Indiana bar association, those in 22 other states and the District of Columbia already have protections against harassment and discrimination by lawyers in the conduct of their profession.

The A.B.A.’s model rules, adopted in 1983 and meant for state bar associations to follow, contain guidance for enforcement. A number of women and minorities, however, say they are inadequate to combat bias, prejudice, harassment and discrimination.

Two years ago, the A.B.A. began looking into adding a stronger prohibition to eliminate incidents like Ms. Rifkin’s.

Rather than sweeping the episode under the rug, Ms. Rifkin, 37, decided to underscore what she saw as hostile treatment by asking Judge Grewal for sanctions to punish the opposing counsel, Peter Bertling, a lawyer in Santa Barbara, Calif.

In his order, Judge Grewal noted that Mr. Bertling’s comment served to “reflect and reinforce the male-dominated attitude of our profession.” The judge pointed to a recent A.B.A.-sponsored study, “First Chairs at Trial: More Women Need Seats at the Table,” which concludes that stereotypical sexist remarks to female lawyers are “among the more overt signifiers of the discrimination, both stated and implicit, that contributes to their underrepresentation in the legal field.”

Only 18 percent of partners at top law firms are women, and women are underrepresented among trial lawyers in most types of cases, the report said.

In civil cases, “men are three times more likely than women to appear as lead counsel and to appear as trial attorneys,” the report said. In criminal law, “men are nearly four times more likely than women to appear as trial attorneys,” it found. Women were dominant — 66 percent — only as trial lawyers for government entities.

During her time in the courtroom, Ms. Rifkin has become “well accustomed” to inappropriate remarks, she said.

“People make comments every day on everything, from what women lawyers are wearing or whether they are smiling or can take a joke,” she said.

The fine of $250, which was donated to a group that promotes full participation by women in the legal system, “may not fully compensate” Ms. Rifkin for Mr. Bertling’s conduct, Judge Grewal said, but it “might deter it in the future.”

Mr. Bertling, 56, said in an interview that he had not heard what he considered sexist remarks in his decades of practice. But after the fine, he asked a lawyer in his office if she had. She showed him inappropriate comments in deposition transcripts, but said she did not seek penalties for them because, like many female lawyers, she thought doing so was futile.

“I went and reread the rules of professional responsibility,” Mr. Bertling said. “It’s helped me to stay focused and be conscious not to make that kind of comment.”

A version of this article appears in print on August 5, 2016, on page B1 of the New York edition with the headline: On the Docket: Curbing Harassment in Court.