Ohio Women’s Bar Foundation Leadership Institute

By Denise Platfoot Lacey

The New Year always brings to me a refreshed spirit after spending time with family and friends at the holidays. It also brings a renewed purpose in my work, and resolve to re-prioritize and implement aspirations in my professional and personal life. As the 2013-14 Chair of the Ohio Women’s Bar Foundation’s Leadership Institute, the New Year also reignites my eagerness for this year’s class to embark on the second half of its Leadership Institute journey, as well as my unfettered excitement that they are halfway to their graduation!

The 2013-14 Leadership Institute class has completed three of its six day-long training sessions, with topics including the nuts and bolts of business development, developing a personal brand, 360° assessments that profile individual leadership habits, ways to “lean in” to leadership, and principles for successful public speaking in rehearsed and impromptu settings. The class members have fully invested themselves in these training sessions. I have been awed by the commitment they have shown by the quality and depth of the discussions they have had, the thoughtful introspection and self-analysis they have exhibited, and the dedication to improving their skills that they have demonstrated through the practice exercises.

Our prestigious faculty has undoubtedly played an enormous role in making the Leadership Institute sessions high quality and incredibly engaging. The faculty members have delivered valuable information through interactive sessions that have allowed the class members to participate in meaningful discussions and engage in practical exercises where they have received quality feedback. To date, our faculty has included:

- Melissa Centers, State Auto Insurance (Columbus); Roxanne Kaufman Elliott, ProLaureate Leadership Development (Avon Lake); Anne Owings Ford, McDonald Hopkins LLC (Cleveland); OWBA President-Elect Claudia Herrington, Sarnova (Dublin); John J. Kuntz, CBIG (Cincinnati); Barbara Morgenstern, Miami University (Oxford); Kim Proxmire, Greenfield Belser (Columbus); Susan Rector, Ice Miller (Columbus); OWBA Vice President, Laura Sanom, Faruki Ireland & Cox PLL (Dayton); Mary Jane Trapp, Thrasher, Dinsmore & Dolan (Cleveland); and Leadership Institute Advisory Committee Members: Valoria Hoover, Kohrman Jackson & Krantz (Dublin); Maria Kortan-Sampson, Goodrich Corporation (Twinsburg, retired); Justice Judith Ann Lanzinger, The Supreme Court of Ohio (Columbus); Mary Sullivan, Peck Shaffer & Williams LLP (Cincinnati); Maxine Thomas, Charles F. Kettering Foundation (Dayton).

The next half of the year brings training on topics that include negotiating, communication styles, effective communication techniques, effective uses for social media, the ethical issues surrounding social media, and effective leadership habits. Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor of The Ohio Supreme Court, a Leadership Institute Advisory Committee member, will be giving lunch-time remarks at the January session.

The pinnacle of the year will be the graduation ceremony where we will celebrate the class members’ successes, welcome the incoming Leadership Institute class, and honor an outstanding women lawyer who has demonstrated exemplary leadership in the legal profession. The Ohio Women’s Bar Foundation Leadership Luncheon will be held on May 22, 2014. More details about the Leadership Luncheon and the 2014-15 Leadership Institute applications will be made available on the Ohio Women’s Bar Foundation website at www.owba.org/foundation.

Denise Platfoot Lacey is Lecturer of Law & Externship Faculty at the University of Dayton School of Law.
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An Evening at Saks

On November 21, 2013 a fabulous event at Saks Fifth Avenue at Polaris Mall in Columbus brought together the women of the OWBA In-House Counsel Subcommittee and WELD for an exclusive preview of the latest fashion and beauty trends featuring MaxMara consultant, Keedan Trotman.

An Evening at Saks was chaired by Claudia Herrington and sponsored by PorterWright. Quite a few of the PorterWright attorneys attended alongside those that had registered from the OWBA and WELD. Other sponsors included Brio and Saks Fifth Avenue. The fashion show was enjoyed by all as well as the excellent choice of appetizers by Brio Tuscan Grille.

The models displayed outfits of their latest fashion and beauty trends that were modeled in bright blues, navy and black dresses, pants and skirts with jackets to match, some of those colorful.

For those who attended, a free bag filled with samples of Saks’ quality perfumes was placed on each of the guest chairs to take home with them.

The fashion show started at 6:00 pm. Co-workers and friends began networking around 7:15 pm and then everyone was off to shop for their favorite in-store Saks outfits and perfumes.

President’s Message

As I write this message (on December 22, 2013), you would not know that it is the holiday season by stepping outside. It is 60 degrees and sunny in Cincinnati. Despite the unseasonably warm weather that will surely be gone tomorrow, the holiday spirit is alive and well in the legal community. I am continually amazed at the generosity of those in this profession. Whether it’s the simple gift of a financial donation, buying a present for a child in need, volunteering at a shelter or helping the other worthwhile causes, I always find myself in the company of other lawyers who are doing the same thing – giving back. By nature, we as a profession are helpers. We want to help people and give back - qualities that I cherish in those around me. On November 7th, the Ohio Women’s Bar Association and the Ohio Women’s Bar Foundation hosted a state-wide “Giving Back” CLE. The CLE offered 3.5 hours of free legal education and was developed as a way for our organizations to give back to those lawyers who so unselfishly give so much to the public sector each and every day. Over 268 people attended the CLE across the state. It was a great success and could not have been accomplished without the dedication of the committee members who organized it. A very special thank you to Laurie Avery, Cindy Bischof, Whitney Cole, Marilena DiSilvio, Amanda Gatti, Mimi Geswein, Stephanie Hanna, Erin Hess, Lisa Kathumbi, Nicole Koppitch, Carrie Starts and Sara Sudkamp for all your hard work. Each of you went above and beyond to ensure that the Giving Back CLE was a success. You did a tremendous job!

As we take time to reflect on our blessings and give to those less fortunate, know that the OWBA appreciates its members and strives each year to provide better opportunities for you to be involved and give back. If you would like to be more involved in the OWBA or if you have an idea for an event, please reach out to us at admin@owba.org. May you each have a happy New Year and a wonderful 2014.

Stephanie K. Bowman is a United States Magistrate Judge
This Giving Back event was successfully held on November 7, 2013. The events were approved for a total of 3.50 CLE hours with 2.00 CLE hours of professionalism, 1.00 CLE hour of Ethics and 0.5 CLE hours for substance abuse. A vast majority of the attendees were not OWBA members, so we were able to provide CLE credit to a lot of public/private sector attorneys that may not have been able to get their credits elsewhere at a convenient time and location.

Over 81 percent of attendees were specifically there to obtain CLE credit, and 40 percent attended for networking purposes. Almost everyone showed interest in attending a similar event in the future.

Magistrate Judge Stephanie Bowman guided the Giving Back Statewide Event for all locations, and was the Chair for Cincinnati’s event held at Frost Brown Todd. Amanda Gatti of Reminger chaired Cleveland’s event at the Carl B. Stokes U.S. Federal Courthouse; Mimi Geswein of IceMiller, LLP chaired the Columbus event held at IceMiller; and Laurie Avery chaired the Toledo event at Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick, LLP. Our reception sponsors included The Kroger Company, Carl B. Stokes U.S. Federal Courthouse, Reminger, IceMiller, and Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick.

Many public sector and private sector attorneys attended the free CLE event held at the 7th Floor Auditorium of the Carl B. Stokes U.S. Federal District Courthouse. The room was full, with 90 attendees, of which included Judge Fitzsimmons of Rocky River Municipal Court and Armond Budish of the 8th District of the Ohio House of Representatives.

The Cleveland event began with a panel discussion on topics based upon Sheryl Sandberg’s book, Lean In. Panelists included Judge Janet Burnside, Valoria Hoover, Darnella Robertson, Anna Faraglia, and moderator Jessie Hill. Judge Benita Pearson and Magistrate Jennifer Alexander presented on issues regarding the use of technology and how it can assist your practice, as well as how technology has benefited the Court’s efficiency. After a short break, Peggy Foley Jones led an interactive discussion on the use of social media and how it affects professional practice. The day ended with a humorous take on a somber topic as Arthur Kaufman of Hahn Loeser spoke briefly on issues of substance abuse.

Toledo’s panelists for the Lean In discussion included Kyle Cubbon, Catherine Garcia-Feeman, Ava R. Dustin, John Mackay, the Honorable Stacy L. Cook and Moderator Mary Ellen Pisanelli. Marshall Bennett, Jr.’s presentation was on Time Management Skills. Margaret Lockhart was our Ethics speaker who spoke on Social Media. Marsha Drees, Director of Harbor Symmetry Wellness spoke on Substance Abuse.

Cincinnati’s panelists for the Lean In topics included Paula Boggs Muething, Mary Sullivan, Mina Jones Jefferson, Judge Sylvia Hendon, Kathleen Brinkman and Moderator Martha Cutofft Sarra. April Besl spoke on Time Management Skills. Jill Meyer and Julie Byrne were Cincinnati’s speakers for Social Media and Ethical Concerns. Scott R. Mote and Cecily Ferris were our speakers on Substance Abuse.

Columbus panelists for the Lean In topics were Judge Colleen O’Donnell, Barb Pfeiffer, Marchelle Moore, and Moderator Mimi Geswein. Jessica Hamlin’s addressed Time Management; Heather Coglianese spoke on Ethical Concerns, and Jenny Arrigo was our speaker regarding Substance Abuse.
Empowering Each Other in 2014: Let’s Roar!

By Sherri Dahl, Esq.

What if every negative or hurtful word we utter acts like a boomerang that goes out into the universe, then turns around and hits us like a negative energy bullet? If this is the case, then a lot of folks criticizing Sheryl Sandberg might want to take cover. Regardless of what you think of the book “Lean In”, in 2013, its author, Sheryl Sandberg, got people talking about women’s status in the workplace at levels not experienced since the 1970s. After hearing some women attack Sandberg on television, I read the book to determine what all of the fuss was about. I still do not understand what in the book triggered the negative remarks. Clearly this was a book written by a woman trying to help other women. So, why were some women attacking Sandberg?

Maybe, just maybe, some of us are resistant to anyone suggesting that we should act differently. We are so used to being independent and strong, that we do not react well when help is offered. “Lean In” offers help to women who are unaware of certain techniques or philosophies. Nonetheless, I can hear some women reacting to the points offered in “Lean In”: “I don’t want to lean in” . . . “I already lean in” . . . “why is she telling me I have to lean in?”

Sadly, the harshest critics of women are other women. We begin by judging the outside of other women – “her hair is inappropriately long for her age” . . . “that color does not look good on her” . . . “why is she showing so much cleavage” . . . “she is not put together” . . . “she is trying to be too perfect.” We also judge and condemn the way other women act – “she is too cold” . . . “she is overly friendly” . . . “she is a know it all” . . . “she thinks she is too good for us.” Sound familiar?

Is there a scientific reason for our hostility toward other women? In her article, “Why are women so critical of each other?,” psychotherapist Rosjke Hasseldine writes that competition and jealousy among women are natural reactions when women are set up to survive in a culture where they are not equal to men.¹ She says that women survive on a starvation diet of invisibility and silence and are in danger of acting like crabs in a bucket – as soon as one tries to escape and manages to get to the top of the bucket, the others pull the escapee back down because of fear of not being liked and fear of being alone. Dr. Seth Meyers says that in his practice, he sees female clients being critical of other women in areas where the criticizing woman appears to feel inadequate.² Dr. Sylvia Gearing says that women are naturally competitive, and will stab each other in the back routinely just to “stay even.”³ Wow! – that all sounds pretty nasty, doesn’t it?

Is there any way to put a positive spin on our behavior? I prefer to believe that women are complex creatures with such active, brilliant, creative minds that we are constantly searching for subjects to analyze. Like scientists and engineers, we consider everything around us, deconstructing the current status of a person or situation and comparing them to the way they could be if improvements were made. The definition of analyze is: to examine methodically and in detail the constitution or structure of something, typically for purposes of explanation and interpretation.⁴ That is exactly what we do, right? Looking through this lens, women are not stabbing each other in the back, we are merely analyzing to facilitate improvement . . . sure we are.

We feel extremely comfortable analyzing others, but apparently, do not welcome analysis from others. Sandberg learned that if you want to ensure a swift hail storm of criticism, give advice to women about the workplace. Why does this topic cause so much dissension? Perhaps it is because we resist being categorized simply by gender. Maybe if “Lean In” had been marketed as a guide for men and women on how to get ahead in a professional setting, critics would have been more kind. It is also possible that some women perceive the “Lean In” book as pressuring them to do something they do not want to do, or something they are not comfortable doing. To those women I say – don’t lean in, then. Lean back, if that works better for you.

Each individual woman is unique in her priorities, opinions and goals.

(continued on next page)

4. The definition of analyze is available at https://www.google.com/search?q=synonym+for+analyzing&sourceid=ie7&rls=com.microsoft:en-us:IE-SearchBox&ie=&oe=
(continued from previous page)

Often, all women are lumped together and discussed as a gender, as if we are all the same. It is a mistake to assume that all women are the same and care about the same issues. For example, many believe that the number one priority for women in the workplace is the balance between working and spending time with children at home. Tell a woman without children or a woman with grown children that this is the highest priority for women and you may see her teeth grinding. The simple fact is that for some women issues related to children are important and for others they are not important at all.

I think Sandberg was trying to speak to a group of women whom I have also met. There are some women who want to achieve success in the workplace but wait for that success to be given to them, rather than taking active steps to obtain it. Lawyer women who want to achieve success must be comfortable strategizing for it and asking for it. Of course, there are exceptions – sometimes lawyer women are probably promoted easily without specific planning, strategy and political wrangling – but this has not been my experience, nor has it happened to any of the women I know. We are in a difficult profession; generally, things do not come easily. Most of the women I know first tried to “do good work” and accomplish the goals that they thought were necessary for promotion (i.e., achieving billable hour requirements and pleasing others). But sometimes the expected result does not come, leaving us feeling rejected. Marc Chernoff suggests using rejection as motivation for change.5 Chernoff says that “[r]ejection doesn’t mean you aren’t good enough; it means the other person failed to notice what you have to offer,” and recommends using rejection as motivation. So, if you are not achieving the success you want at work, why not consider change? Switch jobs. Start your own firm or business. Or, change your behavior within your current work environment. There are no simple answers, but it is easier to control your behavior than to cause others to change their actions.

Do you ever feel like you are walking a tightrope while trying to juggle? The complexities of the workplace are obvious; less obvious are the spider web of difficult matters we manage outside of work. Some have spouses, parents or siblings with mental illness or dementia. For the women who have children in their lives, there are biological children, adopted children, and step children. In their spare time, some women are dealing with physically handicapped children, children with learning disabilities, or children who are gifted, but dyslexic. Again, all women are unique in how they handle and think about problem-solving.

But, one thing we have in common is that we can be really hard on ourselves. We think we should perform certain duties (like baking cupcakes for the party even if it means staying up all night to do it). We might think that we should be a particular weight (even if it means only sleeping three hours a night so that we can work out between 4 and 5 a.m.). Maybe we think that we are not successful if we have not been married nor had children by a particular age (who says we all have to marry or have children?). Perhaps we wear pointy-toed shoes even though they hurt our feet and we hate them (if you like the shoes, you should wear them). Guilt, fear, pain, shame, anxiety, exhaustion . . . we should not feel these every day. If you have little voices in your head that suggest that you are not good enough, tell them to be quiet.

We all face a multitude of complex matters in our work and personal lives. In 2014, let’s take care of ourselves so that we are prepared to be positive and mighty. Whether you choose to lean in or lean back, formulate your thoughts toward others and plan to achieve your personal goals from a place of positive strength. And never forget to reach a hand out so that you can help someone else. As you trudge through the next 365 days, remember some Katy Perry wisdom: 6

Now I’m floating like a butterfly Stinging like a bee I earned my stripes I went from zero, to my own hero

You held me down, but I got up Already brushing off the dust You hear my voice, you hear that sound Like thunder gonna shake the ground You held me down, but I got up Get ready ’cause I’ve had enough I see it all, I see it now

I got the eye of the tiger, a fighter, dancing through the fire ‘Cause I am a champion and you’re gonna hear me roar

Rather than allowing ourselves to tear other women down, let’s focus on empowering each other. Let’s focus on our commonality and helping each other achieve goals that we never even imagined were possible. Let’s roar! ■

Sherri Dahl, Esq., is Principal at Squire Sanders (US) LLP, in Cleveland. She can be reached at sherri.dahl@squiresanders.com.


Understanding Gender Differences for More Effective Networking

By Ann Zallocco

We have long known that men and women, generally, have different skill sets in business. So it’s natural that women would also network and build new business differently than men.

Ivan Misner, Ph. D., Hazel Walker and Frank De Raffele, authors of Business Networking and Sex, concluded, after conducting 12,000 surveys and months of research, that men and women may not be so different in their drive for success; however, the process, mindset and way of creating results are very different.

“We have different ways of viewing the world. Some of this comes from nature, some from nurture. What it means is that if we want to be effective, we must learn how to respect, appreciate and embrace one another’s differences,” Dr. Misner said.

While this research may not be surprising, it is an important reminder that lawyers should give thought to these differing approaches and tailor their networking efforts accordingly.

Understand the Relationship
According to the authors of Business Networking and Sex, men approach networking in a more transactional manner, and are more likely to focus on business first, whereas women’s approach is more relational, with a tendency to focus on building the relationship first – then conducting business.

Helen Fisher, Ph.D., biological anthropologist at Rutgers University and author of “Why Him, Why Her”, finds that different networking approaches are at least partly due to differences in the brains of men and women: “The male brain is more compartmentalized; they get straight to the point, they know the goal. They tend to decide right away, with little to no small-talk, whether they will work with you or not.”

Knowing the priority of the person with whom you are networking can provide a more direct route to success. With women, they work to develop a personal relationship first. With men, you may be more effective through a direct approach – if you know what you want, ask for it. Of course, these are general guidelines and not all men or women share these networking characteristics.

Find the (Right) Time
The authors and researchers of “Business Networking and Sex” found that, although women feel that networking plays a slightly larger role in their success than men, and that they receive a higher percentage of their business from networking than men, their male counterparts spend more time networking than women in business. Additionally, according to the same researchers, women are more likely to feel that family obligations are an obstacle to networking and also feel less comfortable attending evening events. With this research in mind, scheduling your networking events to be held during the lunch hour or late-afternoon may increase your chances of connecting with more women.

Build an All-Women Network
There’s no shortage in this world of “old boys’ clubs,” but, in the past decade or so, there’s been an increase in women’s groups that mirror the growth in the number of woman-owned businesses, according to the Center for Women’s Business Research.

According to a February 10, 2010, article published by Entrepreneur, Women’s Only Networking Grows, many women business owners say they prefer to stick to women-only groups, finding that they relate better to the compassionate, helpful approach to networking often shared by other women. Thus, by becoming active in an all-women network, you may find access to professionals you otherwise wouldn’t have encountered by attending only mixed-gender events.

Opportunities for women-only networking abound, including through the National Association of Women Business Owners, the Central Ohio Women’s Business Center, Dames Bond, and a variety of industry-specific groups, like the Ohio Women’s Bar Association.

In addition, many businesses and law firms have developed women’s initiatives to foster a supportive atmosphere for women both within the company and the outside business community. If your firm or company doesn’t have a women’s initiative, consider starting one. If you have a women’s initiative in place, make sure you are using it to actively promote your women and expand their networks. One way to leverage your efforts is by collaborating with other women groups. Thompson Hine’s Spotlight on Women group did this recently by launching the Professional Women’s Networking Group (PWNG) with women’s initiatives from accounting firm KPMG LLP, Citi Fund Services, Ohio, Inc. and Diamond Hill Investment Group. PWNG holds events quarterly for its four members, each with an educational, networking and philanthropic component.

Just as we do in our personal lives, we can get the most out of our business relationships when we have a mutual understanding of how each person functions. Being mindful of such differing approaches when developing networking strategies can lead to new relationships and opportunities.

Ann Zallocco is an associate in the Corporate Transactions & Securities practice group of Thompson Hine LLP. She focuses her practice on the representation of companies in corporate and transactional matters, with a particular focus on energy matters.
Negotiations: The Advantage of Being a Woman…
And the Mistakes She Makes
By Karen Hough, Founder and CEO of ImprovEdge

There’s a common misconception that the best negotiators are unyielding tough nuts who yell and pound their fists. However, those who engage in a collaborative process with a win-win outcome are the most successful. For over 12 years, I’ve been working with professional negotiators in Fortune 500 companies. I’ve seen impressive skills in both men and women, but there are some gender-specific trends I’ve noticed. If we as women can focus more on our strengths, we can become exponentially better negotiators. Whether you are negotiating a million-dollar contract or bedtime for a 4-year-old, women have collaborative advantages in negotiation.

But, where do we fall down?

Mistake #1: We don’t negotiate. I call this “price-tag syndrome.” We believe that the price we see is non-negotiable. Believe it or not, you can negotiate anywhere. Ask the grocer to give you tomorrow’s sale since you are shopping today. And when gathering competitive estimates, ALWAYS ask, “What can you do for me on this number?”

Mistake #2: We negotiate against ourselves. Sorry friends, but women are the WORST at this! We walk in with 10% already knocked off the price of our proposals before the client even asks. If they are silent, we fill the gap with promises to shave the number, or we give up extra services. Know your value – know your price – and present it confidently.

Mistake #3: We undervalue ourselves. This mistake is common amongst female entrepreneurs setting prices and female executives wanting a raise. Get some competitive analysis! Find out what the market is paying for services or jobs just like yours. Then make sure your prices reflect the market plus any special skills you bring to the table. Ask for more - you’re worth it.

Now, let’s concentrate on our strengths:

Advantage #1: We ask questions. In negotiation, the person asking questions and listening is the one with the power, not the one talking all the time. It is especially important to hone your skill in asking open-ended questions; the type that requires a narrative answer. “Tell me more about your work in pharmaceuticals.” Questions also allow us to catch our breath or clarify an important point. If you feel stumped, a good open-ended question can buy time and enlighten us.

Advantage #2: We prefer agreement over conflict. When we are able to keep ourselves and those in the room calm, agreeable and talking, everything in negotiation goes better. Understand that when emotions show up, it’s time to take a break. Get out of the room or call back. If you are feeling confrontational, emotions might lead your decisions.

Advantage #3: We can read body language. Women often admit that they had a “gut feeling” about someone or something. When you ignore your instinctual response to a negotiation situation, you are endangering your success. If the other person seems uncomfortable, confused or anxious, note it. It may explain some of their demands or behavior. Also, watch your own body language and be sure that it is in alignment with your goals. If you want the conversation to be collaborative, keep your arms uncrossed and lean forward. Look for the collaborative win/win in any negotiation. If one party wins it all, and the other party loses it all, the deal will probably fall through. When all parties walk away from a negotiation with something they wanted, everyone considers it a win. Those deals usually stay in place, and the parties can return to negotiate again, agreeably, on the next deal.

Karen Hough is the Founder and CEO of ImprovEdge and the Author of “Be the Best Bad Presenter Ever: Break the Rules, Make Mistakes and Win Them Over,” to be released in May 2014 and published by Berrett-Koehler. She speaks internationally and writes on negotiation, leadership, sales, and presenting with impact, and is the recipient of the 2012 Silver Stevie Award for Women in Business for Most Innovative Company.
Strategic Communication for Confident Results

By Merri Bame

This may not be your firm’s time for planning (nor your own, for that matter), yet as you move further into 2014 it can be a strategic time for you to both plan and practice how to communicate throughout the year – regarding your relationship building, your marketing, your self-management and follow-through.

Plan how to communicate? Yes. When we enter any experience with a plan, including how to communicate, we experience a higher probability of confidence with ourselves AND those we are with. My presentation coaching clients feel incredible about their presentation experiences when they plan their focus in advance, prepare themselves mentally and practice their plan “on their feet.” Like most practical experiences, the ones we have walked through in advance- which create both an emotional and physical memory – give us recall. Presenters with recall have confidence.

Consider this, for example. Have you ever given a talk more than once? Then you know what I mean. Not all the variables of your message or audience or time allotment are the same when you give a talk more than once, but at least with your recall of the content flow, going into that next experience you have familiarity and confidence about what to do. Simply because you have practiced.

So let’s consider what our days would be like if we planned the following types of communication in advance:

• how we manage our employees
• how we communicate with our clients
• how we respond to our practice group team members
• how we present at a hearing, oral argument, presentation or training
• how we address the rest of the world

Planning our communication in advance – just like planning for the year’s financial, recreational, philanthropic and professional goals – gives us a chance to reflect on, decide on and focus on something HUGELY important to you and your career.

Your communication style – how you blend being slow or quick to respond; task-or people-focused–is the single most important indicator of success for your career’s journey. You naturally respond one particular way when comfortable with people or circumstances. And when you encounter circumstances or people who test your comfort, you may revert to a different, perhaps unpracticed style that is part of your recall. Why? Because you didn’t have a plan for anything different. But your communication style, that single most important trait that leads to trust and influence, is something to feel good about, especially when you give time to think about your impact.

What impact do you wish to make? Nelson Mandela taught us instead of fighting our oppressors, reconcile. Bella Mansfield, the nation’s first woman to earn a law degree, taught us to challenge expectations. Each of these individuals displayed their authentic self, stood up, spoke up and learned when to be silent and sit down. They focused at times on people, other times on task.

How did they accomplish the impact they wished to make? They knew enough about their communication style strengths to rely on them not when they were comfortable, but when they were outside their comfort zone. They paid attention to the communication style of their challengers so when they needed to influence them, they tweaked their own style to create the impact they needed. Each time they met up with opposition, they adjusted their communication style to the needs of those they were with.

Now let’s turn back to you. What impact do you wish to make?

Think. Decide. Practice. So get started with pen and paper. Think about your own communication. What assets are built into your repertoire? When you are with co-workers, clients, opposing council, etc., how do you wish to come across? Write all this out so you see what you’re good at and can make decisions accordingly. Make these decisions today. Tomorrow’s challenges will force you into default mode if you don’t make these decisions now. If your default mode gives you the impact you want – you’re good. But if it doesn’t, you can use some planning time for a new recall.

Get thinking, then decide how you wish to come across when the times come for each of the above bulleted circumstances. Today your planning may have to do with a client, tomorrow a boss. Who knows what the next day, moment or hour may bring. Taking 20 minutes to reflect on options gives you the chance to take a confident, next step.

Practice what you have decided. For instance, say aloud to whom you are with, “I want to come across as______.” If it’s easier for you, make a statement of comparison. “I don’t want to come across as________ but as __________.” Saying aloud your decision gives you opportunity to live up to your words. This practice, one conversation at a time, gives us recall.

Remembering how we used strategy to plan, decide and practice our communication we launch into next circumstances with confidence. We have a plan, and whether we are taken by surprise or whether we have the chance to plan out what to say and how to operate, we trust our next steps. Plan your communication for 2014 and you will see a difference in your professional results.
A work-related injury in the state of Ohio is one that is sustained in the course of and arising out of the injured worker’s employment (ORC § 4123.01(C)). A psychiatric condition is compensable provided it arose “from an injury or occupational disease sustained by that claimant or where the claimant’s psychiatric conditions have arisen from sexual conduct in which the claimant was forced by threat of physical harm to engage or participate” (ORC § 4123.01(C)(1)).

Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is a psychiatric medical condition that is frequently sought to be additionally allowed in a compensable workers’ compensation claim. One such claim was recently decided by the Ohio Supreme Court in Armstrong v. John R. Jurgensen Co., 136 Ohio St.3d 58 (2013), decided June 4, 2013.

The injured worker, Shaun Armstrong, was involved in a horrific motor vehicle accident while operating a one-ton dump truck in the course of his employment with John R. Jurgensen Co. Armstrong was driving the dump truck and had to stop at a yield sign while on an access ramp to a freeway. While at a complete stop, Armstrong noticed a vehicle approaching from behind at a high rate of speed. Armstrong braced for impact. The approaching vehicle struck the dump truck behind with such force that the vehicle came to rest “basically underneath” the dump truck. Armstrong was in shock as he exited his truck. He noticed that the driver of the other vehicle had his head down and was motionless with blood coming from his nose. Armstrong was transported to an emergency room for treatment when he learned the other driver had died.

Armstrong’s workers’ compensation claim was uncontested and was allowed for cervical strain, thoracic strain and lumbar strain, presumably the diagnoses from the emergency room physician on the date of injury. Armstrong subsequently requested the additional condition of PTSD in his workers’ compensation claim. A staff hearing officer heard Armstrong’s motion for additional condition and granted PTSD, finding a sufficient causal relationship between PTSD and his industrial injury. On appeal, the Industrial Commission of Ohio affirmed the additional condition of PTSD.

Armstrong’s employer, John R. Jurgensen Co., appealed the Industrial Commission’s decision to the Clark County Common Pleas Court. The trial court reversed the Industrial Commission’s decision, holding that PTSD was not compensable because it did not arise from Armstrong’s physical injuries that had been allowed in his workers’ compensation claim. The Second District Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court’s decision and Armstrong appealed this decision to the Ohio Supreme Court.

The issues before the Supreme Court were twofold. First, the Court had to discern legislative intent to the statute at issue (ORC § 4123.01(C)(1)), i.e., work-related injuries include psychiatric conditions “where the claimant’s psychiatric conditions have arisen from an injury or occupational disease sustained by that claimant. . . “Secondly, the Court had to determine whether the facts in Armstrong’s claim provided the required causal relationship between PTSD and the worker’s compensation claim as defined in the statute.

With regard to the first issue, the Court held that the statute at issue is unambiguous and under such circumstances, the Court must apply the statute as written. Here, the statute states that the psychiatric condition must have “arisen from an injury. . . “ As Justice French found at page 62, this phrase ‘contemplates a causal connection between the mental condition and the claimant’s compensable physical injury.”

Armstrong argued that the statute should be interpreted to include not only the physical injuries sustained by the injured worker, but also the mechanism of injury itself, i.e., the entire episode that gave rise to the injured worker’s physical injuries. Citing several Ohio Supreme Court decisions, the Court rejected this argument, again holding that the ORC § 4123.01(C)(1) is unambiguous and, therefore, must be applied as written. The Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the Second District Court of Appeals. The Court held that Armstrong undiscputedly sustained compensable physical injuries as a result of his industrial accident, which included cervical strain, thoracic strain and lumbar strain. It was also not disputed that Armstrong suffered from PTSD as a result of the tragic motor vehicle accident. Pursuant to the psychiatric condition statute, it is required that Armstrong establish that PTSD is causally related to his physical injuries (cervical strain, thoracic strain and lumbar strain) and not simply to his involvement in the motor vehicle accident itself.

It should also be noted that the Court considered expert medical testimony from the injured worker’s psychologist, Jennifer Stoechel, Ph.D., and the employer’s psychologist, William L. Howard, Ph.D. Dr. Howard opined that Armstrong’s PTSD resulted from the accident but not the physical injuries of cervical strain, thoracic strain or lumbar strain. Dr. Howard further stated
News

(continued from previous page)

that Armstrong would have developed PTSD even without his physical injuries. In this regard, Dr. Howard testified that Armstrong’s PTSD was caused by his witnessing the accident and “the mental observation of the severity of the injury, the fatality, (and) the fact that it could have been life-threatening to him at some point.” The Court held that Armstrong’s physical injuries did not cause his PTSD and, therefore, his psychiatric condition was not compensable under ORC § 4123.01(C)(1).

In conclusion, for a work-related psychiatric condition to be compensable, there must exist a nexus between the psychiatric condition and the injured worker’s physical injuries or occupational disease. The statutory analysis requires a causal connection to the physical injuries regardless of whether the accident was a simple lifting injury at work or a tragic motor vehicle accident.

For more information about PTSD as a workers’ compensation claim, contact Phil.Cochran@ThompsonHine.com.

Phil Cochran is counsel in Thompson Hine’s Labor & Employment practice group in Columbus, Ohio, and can be reached at Phil.Cochran@ThompsonHine.com. This article was originally published in Thompson Hine Law@Work, Fall 2013.

eDiscovery 101

The OWBA brought back Peter Pepiton and Rachael Rodman of Dinsmore & Shohl for an event on Thursday, November 21, 2013. Peter is the eDiscovery Director at Dinsmore & Shohl in Cincinnati. He manages the litigation support department and oversees the firm’s eDiscovery initiatives. He is also an internal consultant for collection and culling methodologies and designing review protocols. Rachael is a partner in Dinsmore’s intellectual property group, representing clients in intellectual property and trade secret disputes. Rachael is also active in the firm’s eDiscovery group. Their newest panelist is Sara Sudkamp, a Corporate Attorney with The Kroger Co., based in Cincinnati, Ohio. Sara is responsible for litigation holds and for conducting and advising on all stages of discovery including preservation, collection, and production of large volumes of eDiscovery.

Topics of the presentation included Who put the “e” in eDiscovery; Preservation/Collection, and Culling and Review of ESI Production Issues.

This event was chaired by Magistrate Judge Stephanie Bowman of the U.S. District Court, Southern District of Ohio. Those that attended eDiscovery received 2.00 hours of General CLE credit.

Dayton’s Newest Women Attorneys Reception

Dayton’s Newest Women Attorneys Reception was held on the evening of December 11, 2013, at Coco’s Bistro, 250 Warren Street, Dayton, Ohio. Coco’s has moved from their former location, and the new restaurant extends a feeling of warmth and ambience in the evening hours.

Sponsors, Faruki Ireland & Cox, PLL, Salix, WilmerHale and Mike Mobley Reporting supported the OWBA’s Mission in promoting the leadership, advancement and interests of women attorneys.

Because of their sponsorship, the event was a success and it offered a memorable experience for these new women attorneys. Congratulations to Elyse Akhbari, Melissa Koppenhoefer, Amy Mocko Johnson, Marlene Kindel, Ana Perez and all other newly admitted attorneys that joined us that evening.

The reception was co-chaired by Erin Rhinehart and Jade Smarda of Faruki Ireland and Cox.

Several judges came out to offer their wealth of knowledge and expertise to these new women attorneys. Judge Mary Donovan of the Second District Court of Appeals, Judge Frances E. McGee from the Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas, Magistrate Judge Michael Newman and Magistrate Judge Sharon Ovington all came out to welcome and congratulate these new women attorneys.

Judge Frances McGee – Spoke in support of the New Women Attorneys and won the OWBA Membership through June 1, 2014 in a raffle drawing

Jade Smarda and Erin Rhinehart, Co-Chairs of the event

Judge Michael Newman – Spoke in support of the New Women Attorneys
Women in History

January 5, 1925 – Nellie Tayloe Ross is inaugurated as the first woman Governor in U.S. history – as Governor of Wyoming.

January 11, 1935 – Amelia Earhart makes the solo flight from Hawaii to North America.

January 13, 1850 – Charlotte Ray is born. She was the first female African-American lawyer and first woman admitted to the bar in Washington, D.C. She died in 1911.

January 29, 1926 – Violette Neatly Anderson is the first African-American woman to practice law before the U.S. Supreme Court.

February 3, 1821 – Elizabeth Blackwell is born. She is the first full accredited female doctor in the U.S. (in 1849), and along with her sister Emily, founded the first medical school for women.

February 3, 1874 – Poet, author and art critic Gertrude Stein is born. She died in 1946.

February 7, 1867 – Laura Ingalls Wilder is born. The author of the beloved Little House books died in 1957.

February 17, 1870 – Esther Hobart Morris in Wyoming became the first American woman Justice of the Peace.

February 27, 1922 – U.S. Supreme Court upholds the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees women the right to vote.

March 4, 1917 – Jeannette Rankin (R-MT) took her seat as the first female member of Congress.

March 8 – International Women’s Day, whose origins trace back to protests in the U.S. and Europe to honor and fight for the political rights of working women.

March 11, 1993 – Janet Reno is confirmed as the first woman U.S. Attorney General.

March 15, 1933 – Ruth Bader Ginsburg is born. She was second female U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

March 26, 1930 – Sandra Day O’Connor, first woman U.S. Supreme Court Justice is born.

Follow us on Social Media

The Ohio Women’s Bar Association can be found on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn. Join our groups, like us and connect to us to share information and connect with women attorneys across Ohio.

http://www.facebook.com/OhioWomensBarAssociation

http://www.twitter.com/OWBA

http://www.linkedin.com/Group/OhioWomen’sBarAssociation
**Celebration of Excellent Women**

On Thursday, December 12th Squire Sanders and the Ohio Women’s Bar Association (OWBA) co-hosted a unique networking session and panel discussion at the Hilton Easton with some of Central Ohio’s most dynamic women. These professionals shared their knowledge, skills and experiences they’ve gained through their diverse and rewarding career paths.

Co-chaired by OWBA President, Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman, United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio, and Tara A. Aschenbrand, Senior Associate, Squire Sanders, the event featured a keynote by Chief Justice Maureen O’Connor, The Supreme Court of Ohio, and a panel of excellent women leaders including Marilyn McClure Demers, Associate Vice President and Associate General Counsel of corporate and intellectual property litigation, Nationwide; Kelley Griesmer, Chief Operating Officer, PELOTONIA; Jennifer M. Griffith, Regional President, Commerce National Bank; Julie Presas, Assistant General Counsel, OCLC; and Sonya Trent, Founder of Exquisite Wines.

Susan DiMickele, Partner, Squire Sanders moderated the panel discussion where participants shared experiences ranging from their first “big break” to issues of leadership, women leaders, professionalism and equality. Also discussed were contemporary workplace issues highlighted by leaders such as Melissa Mayer, CEO of Yahoo, and Sheryl Sandberg, COO of Facebook, as well as the distinctions between mentoring and sponsorship and the importance of both when advancing in the workplace.

Acknowledging the wide range of challenges faced by women and their families, donations were accepted for Amethyst, Incorporated a Central Ohio leader in treatment for homeless women and their families.

We have received tremendous positive feedback from participants who appreciated the insights and candor of the panelists. Their passion and enthusiasm in support of women in their journey for continued success in their careers can perhaps be best summed up by the following participant comment: “Very good panel – joyful and informative.” Attendees left feeling positive about their ability to reach their goals and to advance the contributions women make in the workplace every day.

---

**Members in the News**

**Stephanie R. Hanna** has joined Carlile Patchen & Murphy as an associate attorney. She will concentrate her practice on commercial litigation, business conflict mediation, and administrative proceedings. Stephanie received her Juris Doctor from the University of Toledo College of Law in 2008, and her Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration from Michigan State University in 2005. She serves on the Columbus Bar Association Board of Governors, the Ohio State Bar Association’s Litigation Section Council, and the Board of Trustees of the YWCA Columbus. She chairs the Bylaws Committee of the Women Lawyers of Franklin County, is a member of the John Mercer Langston Bar Association, and is a member of the 2013 Ohio Women’s Bar Foundation Leadership Institute. She can be reached at (614) 628-0810 or shanna@cpmlaw.com.

For over 40 years, Carlile Patchen & Murphy LLP has focused on responsively serving the legal and business needs of mid-sized Central Ohio businesses and their owners and executives. Beyond the traditional advice on choice of entity and structure of ownership interests, the firm has extensive experience in counseling clients on financing, tax planning, mergers and acquisitions, succession planning, real estate, employment matters, litigation, and securities matters. For more information, please visit www.cpmlaw.com.

**Adrienne Pietropaolo** is a member of the current Leadership Institute class and staff attorney at Barnes & Thornburg LLP in Columbus. Adrienne recently welcomed her third son, Marco Alberto Pietropaolo to the world on December 18, 2013. He was 7lbs. 9 oz. and 19 ½ inches long. Congratulations to Adrienne, her husband and Marco’s big brothers!
Southwest Ohio’s Newest Women Attorneys Reception

The OWBA’s annual Reception Honoring Southwest Ohio’s Newest Women Attorneys took place on Wednesday, December 4, 2013 at Obscura, 645 Walnut Street in Cincinnati, Ohio from 5:00 pm until 7:00 pm.

Our sponsors, Thompson Hine, Reminger and Statman/Harris/Eyrich supported the OWBA’s Mission in promoting the leadership, advancement and interests of women attorneys. Because of their sponsorship, the event was a success and it offered a memorable experience for these new attorneys. Congratulations to new attorneys Patricia Bruns, Kenya Faulkner, Michelle E. James, Victoria Lowry, Rachel Lyons, Ellen Melville and Heather Woodridge!

The event was led by Kristyn J. Huening of FirstGroup America, Inc. Magistrate Judge Stephanie Bowman, Chief Judge Diott, Judge Barrett, and Magistrate Judge Litkovitz were kind enough to attend and offer her wealth of knowledge, insight, and expertise in congratulating these newest women attorneys.

Northeast Ohio’s Newest Women Attorneys Reception

The Northeast Ohio’s Newest Women Attorneys Reception was held on the evening of January 23, 2014 at Hyde Park 123 W. Prospect Avenue in downtown Cleveland, Ohio. Zukerman Daiker & Lear Co., LPA; Ulmer & Berne, LLP and JANIK, L.L.P. sponsored the OWBA’s Mission in promoting the leadership, advancement and interests of women attorneys.

Marilena DiSilvio and her assistant, Riannon Ziegler, both from Reminger, are the chairs for this reception.

Invitations were mailed to all new women attorneys that graduated in May and November of 2013 as identified by The Supreme Court of Ohio, along with invitations to the local judges in the Northeast Ohio area. The reception was designed to congratulate and welcome these new women attorneys.

**Coming Attractions**

**Lean In Discussion Group**
Thursday, March 27, 2013 | 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.
Lockkeepers, 8001 Rockside Road, Valley View, Ohio 44125

*It’s here! Another discussion on Sheryl Sandberg’s “Lean In” taken after the first Northeast Ohio’s Summer Book Discussion that was held at Lockkeepers in July 2013. Many of you who attended the event in July were really interested in going forward with other “Lean In” Circle Groups. Stay tuned for details.*

**Leading with Style (Columbus)**
Wednesday, April 2, 2014
Columbus, Ohio
Hollywood Casino

**Annual Meeting**
May 8, 2014
The Sheraton, Columbus, Ohio
*The 2014 OWBA Annual Meeting will be held on May 8, 2014, at the Sheraton Columbus Hotel at Capitol Square,*

75 East State Street, Columbus, Ohio. This year’s event will be held in the Congressional Ballroom. More information to follow.

**Leading with Style (Cincinnati)**
June 2014
Cincinnati, Ohio
Location TBD
Watch for more information on this event, to be held in June 2014.

**2014 Golf Classic Outing**
StoneWater Golf Club
Monday, July 21, 2014
*The Golf Classic Outing was moved to July 21, 2014, at the StoneWater Golf Club, 1 Club Drive, Highland Heights, Ohio. StoneWater Golf Club is situated on 180 acres of lush landscape and abundant wildlife. The StoneWater Golf course features stunning sandstone quarried from the property and meandering water in the form of wetlands, lakes, streams and running waterfalls.*
I’ll start this article with full disclosure. In the past year, I have attended two panel discussions centered on Sheryl Sandberg’s book “Lean In”. I was also on the OWBA Committee which put together the new mentorship program for the OWBA which is based loosely on Sandberg’s “Lean In” Circles. However, I had not read a single page of the book myself. The very little I knew about the book was what I had heard from news stories. I imagine there are others out there like me who have not found the time to read the book (three kids and a full-time job anyone?). Of course, ironically, I had to ask for an extension on this article. Consider what follows as a sort of “Cliff Notes” for Sandberg’s “Lean In”. It is meant to generate discussion and perhaps inspire you to also read the book for yourself.

Introduction: Internalizing the Revolution

To continue with my full disclosure, before I read the introduction to “Lean In”, I did not think I liked Sandberg and her whole idea of “leaning in.” However, in the first few pages I found her to be completely disarming. Sandberg tells a story about being pregnant and working at Google. Sandberg explains that during her pregnancy she was slowed down by morning sickness and her enlarged size. One morning she was late for an important meeting, but the lack of parking at Google meant she had to park far away. After that experience, she “waddled” (her words) into the office of Google founders Larry Page and Sergey Brin and announced that they needed pregnancy parking. Brin agreed immediately and explained that he had never thought about it before. Sandberg then explains:

To this day, I’m embarrassed that I didn’t realize that pregnant women needed reserved parking until I experienced my own aching feet. As one of Google’s most senior women, didn’t I have a special responsibility to think of this? But like Sergey, it had never occurred to me. The other pregnant women must have suffered in silence, not wanting to ask for special treatment. Or maybe they lacked the confidence or seniority to demand that the problem be fixed. Having one pregnant woman at the top – even one who looked like a whale – made the difference.

This is Sandberg’s central theme: that we need more women in power. However, Sandberg explains that the statistics show that even though the percentage of women who earn college degrees has increased since the early 1980’s, the percentage of women at the top of corporate America has not changed. Sandberg explains that only twenty-one of the Fortune 500 CEOs are women. She also quotes investor Warren Buffett as stating generously that one pregnant woman at the top – even the one who looked like a whale – made the difference.

Sandberg’s central theme: that we need more women in power. However, Sandberg explains that the statistics show that even though the percentage of women who earn college degrees has increased since the early 1980’s, the percentage of women at the top of corporate America has not changed. Sandberg explains that only twenty-one of the Fortune 500 CEOs are women. She also quotes investor Warren Buffett as stating generously that one pregnant woman at the top – even the one who looked like a whale – made the difference.

Sandberg also addresses some of the criticism I have heard of her book. She acknowledges that there is more than one definition of success or happiness, and that not all women want a career, or children, or both. She also acknowledges that the vast majority of women are struggling to make ends meet and take care of their families, and explains that parts of the book will be “most relevant to women fortunate enough to have choices about how much and when and where to work.” However, Sandberg believes that “[i]f we can succeed in adding more female voices at the highest levels, we will expand opportunities and extend fairer treatment to all.” Sandberg acknowledges that her own financial situation makes it easier for her to “lean in” but explains: “My intention is to offer advice that would have been useful to me long before I had heard of Google or Facebook and that will resonate with women in a broad range of circumstances.”

The Leadership Ambition Gap: What Would You Do If You Weren’t Afraid?

In this Chapter, Sandberg looks for an explanation for the lack of females in leadership roles. She explains that it is not due to a lack of skills, and cites statistics that girls are increasingly outperforming boys in the classroom and earning a majority of the higher education degrees. However, as Sandberg explains: “while compliant, raise-your-hand-and-speak-when-called-on behaviors might be rewarded in school, they are less valued in the workplace.” Sandberg also cites statistics that support the notion that professional ambition is expected by men, but can be seen as a negative for women. Sandberg notes that “she is very ambitious” is not considered a compliment in our culture. Sandberg herself admits that while she laughs at the stories her family tells of her bossiness when she was a young girl, there is still a part of her that cringes.

Sandberg also discusses the harm caused by gender stereotypes and a social-psychological phenomenon called “stereotype threat.” Sandberg explains that when members of a group are made aware of a negative stereotype, they are more likely to perform according to that stereotype. Sandberg cites a study which showed that when girls are reminded of their gender before a math or science test (e.g., checking off an M or F box at the top of the test), they perform worse. Sandberg also cites several examples of popular culture portraying working women as “harried and guilt ridden.” Sandberg summarizes the effect of these stereotypes:

For many men, the fundamental assumption is that they can have both a successful professional life and a fulfilling personal life. For many women, the assumption is that trying to do both is difficult at best and impossible at worst. Women are surrounded by headlines and stories warning them that they cannot be committed to both their families and their careers. They are told over and over again that they have to choose, because if they try to do too much, they’ll be “harried and unhappy. Framing the issue as “work-life balance” – as if the two were diametrically opposed—practically ensures work will lose out. Who would ever choose work over life?

(continued on next page)
Sandberg concludes:

**Fear is at the root of so many of the barriers that women face.** Fear of not being liked. Fear of making the wrong choice. Fear of drawing negative attention. Fear of overreaching. Fear of being judged. Fear of failure. And the holy trinity of fear: the fear of being a bad mother/wife/daughter.

**Sit at the Table**

Sandberg begins this Chapter with a story of a meeting she hosted at Facebook for Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner and fifteen Silicon Valley executives. Geithner had brought four of his members of staff with him, all who were women. The women declined to sit at the large conference table, even after Sandberg motioned for them to sit with the invited guests, who were mostly men. Sandberg talked to the women after the meeting and told them they should have joined them at the table. The women were surprised at first, but then agreed. Sandberg says this was a watershed moment for her. She realized that “in addition to facing institutional obstacles, women face a battle from within.”

Sandberg explains there is a phenomenon called “the imposter syndrome” where capable people are plagued by self-doubt. Sandberg describes the syndrome:

> . . . many people, but especially women, feel fraudulent when they are praised for their accomplishments. Instead of feeling worthy of recognition, the feel undeserving and guilty, as if a mistake has been made. Despite being high achievers, even experts in their fields, women can’t seem to shake the sense that it is only a matter of time until they are found out for who they really are—imposters with limited skills or abilities.

Sandberg says that feeling like a fraud is a symptom of a greater problem for women: we consistently underestimate ourselves. Sandberg cites several studies which show that women judge their own performance worse than it actually is, while men judge their own performance as better than it actually is. Sandberg shares that when she doesn’t feel confident, she’s learned that it sometimes helps to fake it. She explains:

> I discovered this when I was an aerobics instructor in the 1980s (which meant a silver leotard, leg warmers, and a shiny headband, all of which went perfectly with my big hair). Influenced by the gospel of Jane Fonda, aerobics also meant smiling for a full hour. Some days, the smile came naturally. Other days, I was in a lousy mood and had to fake it. Yet after an hour of forced smiling, I often felt cheerful.

Sandberg says that feeling confident—or pretending that you feel confident—is necessary to reach for opportunities.

**Success and Likeability**

In this Chapter, Sandberg addresses a cultural bias which she believes is at the very core of why women are held back and hold themselves back: success and likeability are positively correlated for men and negatively correlated for women. Sandberg explains that women sense this punishment for success, and she re-counts several times in her life where she has muted her own achievements. Sandberg describes the predicament this creates:

> If a woman is competent, she does not seem nice enough. If a woman seems really nice, she is considered more nice than competent. Since people want to hire and promote those who are both competent and nice, this creates a huge stumbling block for women. Acting in a stereotypically feminine ways makes it difficult to succeed for the same opportunities as men, but defying expectations and reaching for those opportunities lead to being judged as undeserving and selfish. Nothing has changed since high school; intelligence and success are not clear paths to popularity at any age. This complicates everything, because at the same time that women need to sit at the table and own their success, doing so causes them to be liked less.

To deal with this dilemma, Sandberg repeats the advice given by Hannah Riley Bowles, a professor at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government. Bowles recommends that women come across as being nice, concerned about others, and “appropriately” female. Sandberg summarizes this concept in the phrase “Think personally, act communally.” This means women should position themselves as connected to a group and not just out for themselves. Sandberg also recommends substituting “we” for “I” (e.g., “we had a great year” versus “I had a great year”).

Bowles also recommends that women provide a legitimate explanation for the negotiation. Sandberg offers this advice: “One way of doing this is to suggest that someone more senior encouraged the negotiation (“My manager suggested I talk with you about my compensation”) or cite to industry standards (“My understanding is that jobs that involve this level of responsibility are compensated in this range”).”

Sandberg also advises using a method called “relentlessly pleasant” by Mary Sue Coleman, the president of the University of Michigan. “This method requires smiling frequently, expressing appreciation and concern, invoking common interests, emphasizing larger goals, and approaching the negotiation as solving a problem as opposed to taking a critical stance.”

Sandberg acknowledges the paradox of advising women to want to change the world by adhering to biased rules and expectations. However, Sandberg points out that there are benefits to the communal (continued on next page)
You just get on.” I made up my mind that instant. Google was tiny and disorganized, but it was a rocket ship. And even more important to me, it was a rocket ship with a mission I believed in deeply.

Sandberg also discusses her concept of an 18-month plan (which does not necessarily need to be 18 months). She explains that she typically sets two types of goals: (1) targets for what her team can accomplish; and (2) personal goals for learning new skills.

Sandberg ends the Chapter by advocating that women become less risk adverse. Sandberg cites an internal study from Hewlett-Packard which showed that women only apply for open jobs if they think they meet 100 percent of the criteria listed, but men apply if they think they meet 60 percent of the criteria. Sandberg explains:

Women are also more reluctant to apply for promotions even when deserved, often believing that good job performance will naturally lead to rewards. Carol Frohlinger and Deborah Kolb, founders of Negotiating Women, Inc., describe this as the “Tiara Syndrome,” where women “expect that if they keep doing their job well someone will notice them and place a tiara on their head.”

Sandberg then summarizes:
Taking risks, choosing growth, challenging ourselves, and asking for promotions (with smiles on our faces, of course) are all important elements of managing a career. One of my favorite quotes comes from author Alice Walker, who observed, “The most common way people give up their power is by thinking they don’t have any.”

Do not wait for power to be offered. Like that tiara, it might never materialize. And anyway, who wears a tiara on a jungle gym?

Are You My Mentor?
Sandberg takes the title of this Chapter from the children’s book Are You My Mother? In the book, a baby bird searches for its missing mother by asking different animals, a car, boat, plane and a steam shovel: Are you my mother? Sandberg believes if you have to ask the professional equivalent of the question—Are you my mentor?—then the answer is probably no. Instead, Sandberg explains that just as when the bird found his mother, when someone finds the right mentor, it is obvious. Sandberg believes the strongest relationships develop out of a “real and often earned connection felt by both sides.” Throughout the Chapter Sandberg cites examples of relationships she has had in her own career as both a mentor and a mentee to support this belief. One of these examples is Sandberg’s relationship with Clara Shih:

I met Clara about five years ago at a conference and was immediately impressed by her ideas about social media. She went on to write a thoughtful book on the subject and founded Hearsay Social, a software company that helps businesses manage their social media presence. Every so often, Clara would contact me, always with an interesting point or thoughtful question. She never asked a question that she could have found the answer to on her own. When I was leaving the Starbucks board of directors in 2012, I gave them a few names of social media experts who might join in my place and included Clara. She was only 29 years old at the time, but she was invited to join the board.

Sandberg addresses various aspects of the mentoring relationship, including the reciprocal nature of the relationship, the tricky issue of the perceived sexual context of a male-female relationship and the benefits of having peers as your mentors. Sandberg’s discussion illustrates that the relationship is more important than the label. Sandberg closes the Chapter with a touching story from when she worked at McKinsey & Company, a management consulting firm and finally found her “mother.” (You’ll have to read the book for this one because I don’t think I can do it justice without repeating the entire story).

To Be Continued - Part 2 of this summary will appear in the Spring issue of the Ohio Women’s Bar Association Network Newsletter.
Sustaining Members (as of October 31)

- Deborah Akers-Parry
  Wolf and Akers LPA
- Randal Sue Bloch
  Wagner & Bloch
- Magistrate Judge Stephanie Bowman
  U. S. District Court
  Southern District of Ohio
- Judge Janet Burnside
  Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court
- Angela Courtwright
  Ice Miller LLP
- Sherri Dahl
  Squire Sanders LLP
- Judge Mary DeGenaro
  7th District Court of Appeals
- Judge Patricia Delaney
  5th District Court of Appeals
- Jennifer Elleman
  Lexis Nexis
- Amanda Gatti
  Reminger Co., LPA
- Melissa Graham-Hurd
  Melissa A. Graham-Hurd, Atty. at Law
- Nita Hanson
  Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
- Laura Hauser
  Technical Consumer Products, Inc.
- Kathleen Havener
  The Havener Law Firm LLC
- Claudia Herrington
  Sarnova
- Valoria Hoover
  Kohrman Jackson & Krantz PLL
- Jennifer J. Jacquemain
  Oldham Company, LLC
- Lisa Kathumbi
  Littler Mendelson
- Maria Kortan-Sampson
  Retired
- Helen MacMurray
  Mac Murray Petersen & Shuster
- Catherine Martineau
  MacMillan Sobanski & Todd, LLC
- Amanda Martinsek
  Thacker Martinsek LPA
- Jean McQuillan
  Case Western Reserve University School of Law
- Susannah Muskovitz
  Muskovitz & Lemmerbrock, LLC
- Suzanne Nigro
  Suzanne M. Nigro, Atty. at Law
- Denise Platfoot Lacey
  University of Dayton School of Law
- Michelle Proia Roe
  Mettler – Toledo, LLC
- Julie Rabin
  Rabin & Rabin Co LPA
- Alice Rickel
  Alice Rickel & Assoc
- Grace Royalty
  U. S. District Court, Southern District of Ohio
- Laura Sanom
  Faruki Ireland & Cox P.L.L.
- Christine Santoni
  Reminger Co., LPA
- Michele Shuster
  Mac Murray Petersen & Shuster
- Carrie Starts
  Reminger Co., LPA
- Patricia Walker
  Walker & Jocke
- Linde Webb
  Lydy & Moan, LTD
- Amelia Workman Farago
  Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
- Ann Zalloco
  Thompson Hine LLP

New Members (November 1 to December 31, 2013)

- Linda Applebaum
  City of Cleveland
- Rebecca Black
  The Law Office of Rebecca M. Black, LLC
- Alyssa Breymann
  University of Toledo
- Sarah Buckley
  The Scotts Company LLC
- Lauren Carpenter
  University of Toledo
- Sam Daunhauer
  University of Toledo
- Lisa Davis
  University of Toledo
- Lia Evans
  The University of Akron School of Law
- Kenya Faulkner
  University of Cincinnati
- Dorci Gass-Lower
  Supreme Court of Ohio
- Stephanie Green
  University of Toledo College of Law
- Alea Grimes
  University of Toledo
- Christine Hammond
  University of Cincinnati College of Law
- John Hardison II
  University of Toledo
- Alicia Harris
  University of Toledo
- Kayla Henderson
  University of Toledo
- Jenna Lyn Hohan
  University of Toledo
- Michelle Kempe
  University of Toledo College of Law
- Justine Konicki
  Kohrman Jackson & Krantz PLL
- Michael Laurie
  University of Toledo
- Jessica Marco Richards
  Marco and Marco
- Stephanie Martinez
  University of Toledo
- Kara Maruszak
  University of Toledo
- Judge Frances McGee
  Montgomery County Common Pleas Court
- Jennifer Meyer
  City of Cleveland Law Department
- Sarah Miller
  Porter Wright Morris & Arthur
- Angela Moore
  University of Toledo
- Lindsay D. Navarre
  Lucas County Prosecutor’s Office
- Elizabeth Otis
  University of Dayton School of Law
- Jake Rachman
  University of Toledo College of Law
- Nancy Scarecella
  Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court
- Jamie Stanley
  University of Toledo
- Margie Stoner
  University of Toledo
- Selena Strickling
  University of Toledo
- Elaine Wilson-Reddy
  University of Dayton, School of Law
- Andrea Young
  Patricia A. Kavacs