



**Teresa Kennedy  
 President's Message**

**ACC Georgia  
 Walks the  
 Road to  
 Effective  
 Leadership**

Beginning October 23, over 50 members of the Georgia Chapter joined ACC members from 47 states and 57 countries in San Diego for ACC's 2006 Annual Meeting. "The Road to Effective Leadership" included outstanding educational tracks, including return to fundamentals programs, essential skills for the new-to-in-house lawyer, leadership and management skills training, and international business and legal issues.

Our chapter's high level of leadership and engagement were evident throughout the conference. ACC Georgia members taught lively, complex panels on issues ranging from hedge funds to marketing law, and from board insurance to privacy. Others led national committee meetings focused on intellectual property, litigation, and insurance.

ACC's national board met with chapter leaders, sharing strategic goals and offering support in achieving chapter objectives. Georgia Chapter leaders (including George Sewell, nominee for

2007 president, and Lori Shapiro, nominee for 2007 president-elect) participated in ACC's Leadership Development Institute. This interactive program encouraged volunteer leaders from ACC chapters nationwide to share best practices around programs, membership, and community outreach.

Long-time ACC Georgia sponsor Kilpatrick Stockton treated chapter members to cocktails and music under the stars in Balboa Park's scenic Japanese Gardens. The group enjoyed live music, a fresh sushi bar, and an invaluable opportunity to explore common issues and further strengthen our partnership. Many thanks to Kilpatrick Stockton for your gracious hospitality and generous support of ACC Georgia!

Counsel on Call, another longtime friend of ACC Georgia, treated chapter members to a festive dinner at San Diego's trendy Chive restaurant. The evening of fun and fellowship was capped off by a surprise appearance by Food Network's Emeril, who graciously posed with chapter members for photos. Our sincere thanks to Counsel on Call for an unforgettable evening!

The Association of Corporate Counsel capped off the 2006 Annual Meeting

by celebrating a major milestone: our 20,000th member, Rashelle Perry, GC of Utah-based Merit Medical Systems, joined us in August. ACC's membership now includes all Fortune 100 companies and more than 8,500 member companies in total. As one of the nation's largest chapters, we here at ACC Georgia clearly know a good thing when we see it! Mark your calendars for the 2007 Annual Meeting, October 29-31 in Chicago.

**Pragmatic Practices in Privilege Protection . . . . .2**

**National Day of Service Report . . . . .4**

**The Young Lawyers Committee . . . . .4**

**Avoiding Unconscious Bias Keeps Us Riveted; Arbitration v. Litigation Sparks Spirited Debate; and the Networking was Fun too! . . . . .5**

**ACC Georgia Chapter 2007 Proposed Officers & Directors Slate . . . . .5**

**Arbitrate or Litigate:  
 The Great Debate . . . . .6**

**ACC News Briefs . . . . .7**

# Pragmatic Practices in Privilege Protection

Susan Hackett  
Senior Vice President and General Counsel  
Association of Corporate Counsel  
hackett@acc.com

The continued vitality of the attorney-client privilege<sup>1</sup> is threatened by a number of governmental policies—foremost among them those of the U.S. Department of Justice. Because of these policies, companies that have been accused of wrongdoing or that are engaged in voluntary self-evaluation or self-reporting are often forced to waive their attorney-client privileges in order to be judged as “cooperating” with prosecutors or enforcement officials. Erosion of the attorney-client privilege has a negative and concrete impact: executives and directors who would like to consult with corporate counsel about the most sensitive issues are confused about whether the corporate attorney-client privilege will apply to their conversations with counsel and thus their communications with lawyers are “chilled”; lawyers investigating allegations of wrongdoing are worried about how their honest attempts to unearth and correct serious problems may be used against the company’s interests in the future; and line employees who lack the sophistication or means to protect themselves can be deprived of their Constitutional rights and left without the protections we would guarantee to any other person whose actions are under scrutiny as a result of a government investigation.

Much of the public discourse on this issue to date has focused primarily on documenting the existence of privilege erosion and arguing the merits or privilege protections in the modern corporate context (and demanding reform of abusive policies that undercut privilege): while ACC’s work in this area is creating substantial advances,<sup>2</sup> very few people offer practical applications that corporate counsel and clients should consider adopting to protect themselves before or during a privilege attack. So here it is! ACC conducted research (through extensive confidential interviews) with in-house counsel to identify the key issues ACC members face and to catalogue the various approaches employed to address those issues.

We interviewed a significant number of CLOs (as well as in-house compliance, litigation and governance counsel), at corporations of various sizes in a wide range of industries (including consumer goods, retail, manufacturing, high tech, financial services, insurance, pharmaceuticals, and telecommunications). We also interviewed a number of outside counsel to these corporations, as well as current and former government officials responsible for investigating and prosecuting allegations of corporate wrongdoing, in order

to garner any additional thoughts they could share.

The resulting research shows that privilege erosion problems generally fall into one (or more) of the following categories: audit process, internal investigations, individual rights of employees, document retention policies, limited waiver issues, and prosecution agreements and corporate monitorships.

The full resource documenting all of these practices is now available online at <http://www.acca.com/Surveys/attyclient2.pdf>. For more information generally on ACC’s efforts to change privilege practices in the prosecutorial and regulatory community, or for additional research material on this topic, go to ACC’s privilege homepages at [www.acca.com/php/cms/index.php?id=84](http://www.acca.com/php/cms/index.php?id=84).

To whet your appetite, I’ve outlined below the top ten practices at work in departments that are at the cutting edge of privilege protection. As always, if you have comments or suggestions on this article or our privilege work generally, please feel free to contact me at 202.293.4103, ext. 318 or [hackett@acc.com](mailto:hackett@acc.com). And stay tuned for more info and updates about the legislation we helped to draft that will be coming to the floor of Congress during the lame duck session, and perhaps to vote in the early part of next year.

## ACC’s Top Ten Privilege Protection Practices for In-house Counsel

### Document Control Practices

1. Don’t become your client’s worst enemy on privilege protection by over-asserting privilege ... don’t place the “attorney-client privileged” imprimatur on every e-mail, fax cover sheet, letter and document just because you authored it. Over-asserting privilege actually weakens your ability to argue for the protection of truly privileged documents because it will appear that you don’t know how to use the legend judiciously.

2. When writing, memorialize that the client requested the legal advice by writing words such as: “In response to your request for legal counsel on this issue.” Also, ensure the distribution of the privileged work is limited solely to those parties intended to receive it in the client group. This suggests careful dissemination tactics, such as avoiding email attachments which are easily copied and forwarded to others, and adding a header to each page of your documents that states something like: “Do not distribute this document to anyone other than those listed as recipients without permission of the legal department.” Finally, it is prudent to think before writing at all. While we don’t suggest that you never write anything down, remember that what is not memorialized cannot be produced (unless the

attorney is called as a witness, which is less likely to be allowed. Sometimes a walk down the hall to conduct a conversation in person is more effective and is certainly more easily protected than a lengthy and detailed email that will generate all kinds of interest in its production.

### In the Internal Investigation Context

3. Segregate the “facts” (e.g., the factual “results” of your internal investigation) from documents that contain attorney work product (e.g., an outline of legal strategies, legal inferences or conclusions), so as to make a “produce-able” internal investigation report that does not contain privileged material. The attorney-client privilege doesn’t protect facts from being produced and most lawyers and their clients want to cooperate with auditors or investigators by producing what it is that the investigator needs to conduct his work and the defense counsel for any errant employees may need to develop their defense. Since only lawyer-client communications or lawyer impressions and work product in anticipation of litigation are protected, segregate these in a separate place that allows you to produce factual reports without waiving privileged material.

4. Consider the best involvement of non-lawyer or lawyer (not-practicing law) employees who work in company compliance, internal audit, risk management, and reporting functions. Non-lawyers who are asked to assist in-house counsel can be seen as agents of lawyers for purposes of protecting privilege, but they can also perform tasks that are undertaken without agency: namely, those tasks consistent with their corporate offices and that corporate counsel, and which could become public should their work be requested in the future. If they are not working under your agency, you may be able to produce their findings without waiving privilege and satisfy your opponent’s request for facts; if they are working under your agency, it may be possible to claim privilege to insulate their work from discovery.

5. Avoid executing affidavits that contradict accusations against the company; otherwise, corporate counsel may become a fact witness and any hope of asserting privilege may disappear. Counsel may also find that such actions as signing the company’s Sarbox 404 reports can be seen as a verification of company assertions, and can lead to a finding of waiver.

### In the Audit Context

6. Several themes emerged as leading practices employed by clients when auditors demanded the production of source materials (including privileged documents) as the only acceptable means of to establish the com-

pany's actions and financial fitness. Several members focused significant attention on negotiating the terms of info production in advance establish clear "rules of the road" regarding the need to produce privileged documents. These efforts were designed to work with auditors to identify in advance what they really need / try to find a way to get them the facts without sacrificing privilege. Some suggested that when these negotiations with the more junior auditors assigned to your campus failed or floundered, that they were nonetheless successful in the end if they went over the junior auditors' head and pushed back against waiver demands with the company's relationship partner in the audit firm (or when they contacted the audit firm's mother ship offices). Others reported success when they requested MFN clauses (most favored nation) that bootstrap the client's treatment to the best treatment offered by the auditor to any client or to any entity related to the client (since some companies have the same auditor working for 200 subs, many of which are located in jurisdictions that have a continuing tradition of more respect for privilege claims asserted by clients.

#### **Client Education and Employee Rights**

**7.** Take a hands-on, proactive approach to client education about the privilege, what it protects, and how it is likely to be used, waived or lost within today's investigation, prosecutorial, or audit context. Be upfront in the cool light of day about the extent to which an attorney can (or can't) offset employee concerns that sensitive conversations with counsel will end up being used against them personally in the future. This hands-on approach will often help bolster the confidence of employees about what they can do to preserve privilege themselves, as well as what they should expect privilege to protect (or not), so that when the pressure is on, your job won't be to begin educating clients who are already nervous (at best) and very likely, hostile and confused about how their actions or statements will be viewed or used.

**8.** Learn how to give the so-called "Corporate *Miranda*" (aka *Upjohn* warnings) and talk with executive management in advance of troubles about how they plan to treat employees who are accused or suspected of wrongdoing. Such conversations should include discussion of reimbursement/ advancement of fees under corporate indemnification policies, joint defense agreements and their possible terms and applicability, whether employees who are accused will be provided with counsel retained by the company, and so on.

Corporate counsel is not the lawyer for any individual employee interviewed about a company failure or problem, but the employee is owed that reminder, and perhaps

more: if their actions were not inappropriate or a determination of wrongdoing has not been made, the employee remains a part of the client group you represent. Even if you are obligated to remind non-cooperative employees that their uncooperative behavior in an investigation could lead to discipline or termination (and some companies consider it a best practice to include such a policy in their employee handbooks), employees have rights that you must respect and will scrutinize any discrepancies between corporate policies and practices and the treatment afforded them — you don't want to be seen as "writing" or re-writing your policy in response to a red-hot controversy.

#### **Privilege and the Board**

**9.** One of the surprise findings of this project was the number of in-house counsel who expressed concerns about privilege problems in the relationship with board members. These members were focusing on ensuring that any directors' engagement letters with their own lawyers made clear that such a representation is limited to the individual's conduct in their capacity as a board member so as to avoid problems of board members telling their own lawyers about privileged issues in a fashion that could lead to waiver of a corporate privilege (since the personally-retained outside counsel might share privilege with the board member, but not the company.) Others were working to ensure that any agreement between the entity and board members contains a claw-back provision for privilege protection. Still others were focusing on developing policies that would help determine how and under what circumstances the board will make waiver decisions when a privilege waiver demand is presented (the worry being that individual managers might not be properly authorized to make a privilege waiver decision on behalf of the entity, but that the board might be too likely to succumb to waiver demands without full consideration of the potential perils (such as future third party litigation demands) that may ensue. Finally, several of those interviewed were carefully considering how to handle any future claim by board members that they were acting on the advice of company lawyers if targeted in an investigation — almost surely leading to a waiver in order for the board member to prove his defense.

#### **Limited Waivers**

**10.** When faced with a demand for privileged material, try to negotiate some kind of protection from future third party discovery; also try to limit waiver to certain categories of information to avoid entire subject matter waivers. The jurisdictions are split on whether to recognize so-called limited waiver agreements (the majority have held that such agreements are not enforceable). These efforts may not succeed, but it is the only chance of insurance against future third party claims that counsel may have if forced to

waive to the government. No one likes the idea of limited waiver, but in today's environment, if your back is up against the wall, it may be the best you can do.

In conclusion, do think pro-actively about how to protect your client's rights to confidential counsel, and do not simply acquiesce when your client's privilege rights are contested or waiver of material is demanded. Given recent progress in making our case before courts, Congress and the public on this issue, it is no longer considered suicidal for a company to protest a waiver demands; it is increasingly acceptable to push back and very unlikely that you will be retaliated against in a fashion that worried many corporate counsel only a few months back. Prosecutors and enforcement officials are increasingly on guard against the appearance that they are making unfounded privilege wavier demands outside of the courtroom context.

1. Although the "attorney-client privilege" (maintaining the confidentiality of communications between an attorney and client) is distinct from the "work product doctrine" (precluding adversaries from discovering the work product of attorneys developed in anticipation of litigation), these protections are closely related. Except where specifically noted, for ease of exposition in this document the terms "attorney-client privilege" and "privilege" are used to refer collectively to both protections.

2. ACC and its partners in the Coalition to Protect the Attorney-Client Privilege (including the US Chamber, the NAM, the Business Roundtable, the American Chemistry Counsel, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, the ACLU, and others, including the ABA which cooperates with our efforts have made substantial progress in demanding and securing privilege reforms: in March of 2006, the US Sentencing Commission announced that it would amend offensive privilege waiver language inserted at the request of the Justice Department in the Corporate Sentencing Guidelines; we've hosted hearings in the US House and Senate that have solidified bipartisan support for censoring prosecutorial and enforcement practices that undermine the privilege (and that have now led to the introduction of legislation to essentially repeal the Thompson Memo's provisions that inappropriately define cooperation as requiring companies to surrender their privilege and other rights, and we're making progress convincing courts, the media, and others that our privilege concerns are not only justified, but vital to the health and assurance of corporate compliance efforts. For more information, see ACC's privilege homepages at at <http://www.acca.com/php/cms/index.php?id=84>.

# National Day of Service Report

On Saturday, September 30, 2006, the ACC Georgia Chapter participated in ACC's National Community Service Day by volunteering at the Foster Care Support Foundation ("Foundation"). Twenty-eight ACC Georgia members and their families participated in the work day.

The Foundation is an all volunteer unpaid community resource that assists Georgia's foster children in providing clothing, toys, and infant equipment to basic foster care families and foster children to supplement the small daily amount received by the foster parent. The Foundation advised that basic foster care families and children receive amounts that range from \$13.68 to \$17.75 per day to provide for foster children in their care. This amount must cover food and clothing, diapers, infant equipment, and basic school supplies for a child. In 2005, the Foundation provided for approximately 5,000 foster children in the State of Georgia. Foster care families are able to visit the Foundation and receive a limited number of clothing items and basic equipment at no charge to the foster family. ACC Georgia Chapter members assisted the Foundation by sorting clothing, cleaning and repairing cribs, strollers, and other infant equipment, filling orders for foster children residing outside of the metro Atlanta area (who were unable to shop at the Foundation's Center), and packaging the orders for shipping. At the conclusion of the day, each member agreed it was a very worthwhile and rewarding day. We look forward to your participation at next year's event.

If you are interested in learning more about the Foster Care Support Foundation, please visit [www.fostercare.org](http://www.fostercare.org).



*Twenty-eight ACC Georgia members and their families participated in ACC's National Community Service Day by volunteering at the Foster Care Support Foundation.*



## The Young Lawyers Committee

The Young Lawyers Committee is finishing up a tremendously successful year, and wishes to thank its members and all participants in its events. Our September event covered financial planning, wealth management, wills, estates, and trusts. ACC members of all types came out to hear advice on this "cross-age" important topic. We look forward to

presenting non-practice specific presentations each year for all ACC members.

Next month, YLC will be having a social event/holiday party and all ACC members are invited. Details coming soon via email

# Avoiding Unconscious Bias Keeps Us Riveted; Arbitration v. Litigation Sparks Spirited Debate; and the Networking was Fun too!

Our labor and employment CLE program on September 12, 2006 gave us the opportunity to learn about an explosive new theory that is gaining ground in the employment arena. The theory of “unconscious bias” has been presented by social scientists as a justification for a strict liability standard in employment cases. The theory holds that white male executives are inherently biased in making employment decisions.

In our September program, attorneys from Ford & Harrison, LLP, our generous sponsor, provided us with tips and strategies to structure corporate decision-making in ways that minimize the risk of unconscious bias.

We also learned about other recent developments in employment law, including trends related to jury waivers and class action waivers, the recent Supreme Court case adopting an expansive interpretation of Title VII retaliation, blogging guidelines and policies, recent EEOC developments, and pre-employment medical testing.

In October, in a program generously sponsored by Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP, we were privileged to have a distinguished panel of experts share their insights about the relative benefits and detriments of arbitration and litigation. The program was moderated by Jessica Pardi,

Esq. and the distinguished panelists were:

- The Honorable Phillip Etheridge, senior judge, Superior Courts of Georgia
- Phillip Armstrong, Esq., senior counsel, ADR and litigation, Georgia-Pacific Corporation
- Andy Weissert, Esq., senior vice president and general counsel, AXIS U.S. Insurance

We look forward to the following programs for the rest of 2006:

**Nov. 14, 2006:** Legal Strategies to Deal with an Aging Workforce  
Lunch Program Sponsored by Elarbee, Thompson, Sapp & Wilson

**Dec. 12, 2006:** Third Party Criminal Acts and Liability  
Lunch Program Sponsored by Gorby, Reeves & Peters, P.C. and Lockton Companies

Please contact Lori Shapiro at 770.437.2458 or [lshapiro@eliinc.com](mailto:lshapiro@eliinc.com), or George Sewell at 770.437.2736 or [gese@facilitygroup.com](mailto:gese@facilitygroup.com), if you are interested in participating in or sponsoring a future program.

## ACC Georgia Chapter 2007 Proposed Officers & Directors Slate

The 2006 ACC Georgia Chapter board of Directors recommends the following slate of chapter officers and directors for 2007. The chapter membership will vote on the proposed slate at the upcoming Annual Meeting on Tuesday, November 14, at Maggiano's in Buckhead.

### Officers

President: . . . . . George Sewell  
 President Elect: . . . . . Lori Shapiro  
 Vice president (Sponsorships and Programs) . . . . . John Tanner  
 Vice president (Outreach Initiatives) . . . . . Virginia Wadsworth  
 Vice president (Membership) . . . . . Steven Kaplan

Vice president (Special Programs) . . . . . Betsy Griswold  
 Treasurer . . . . . Henry Abelman  
 Secretary . . . . . Sally Austin

### At-Large Directors:

Teresa Kennedy, Immediate Past President . . Term Expires 2007  
 Caroline Pearlstein . . . . . Term Expires 2007  
 Stacy Geer . . . . . Term Expires 2008  
 Tom Schroeder . . . . . Term Expires 2008  
 Myra Coleman Bierria . . . . . Term Expires 2009  
 Michael E. Ruberti . . . . . Term Expires 2009

# Arbitrate or Litigate: The Great Debate

Jessica F. Pardi

Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP

Often, parties are faced with the dilemma of how to resolve a dispute. If given the option, should they litigate or arbitrate? This question may arise prior to an actual dispute, when the parties are deciding whether to incorporate an arbitration clause into a written agreement governing their relationship, or it may arise in the face of an actual dispute if there is either no governing arbitration clause or the scope of the arbitration clause is unclear.

When making this decision, relevant factors include the following:

1. Desired Speed of Resolution;
2. Possibility of a Successful Dispositive Motion;
3. Scope of Discovery;
4. Confidentiality;
5. A Jury Determination;
6. Complexity or Industry-Specific Nature of the Dispute; and
7. Expense.

Each of these seven factors will vary in importance depending on the circumstances of the dispute.

## 1. Desired Speed of Resolution

The common perception is that arbitration results in a final award faster than litigation, and that an arbitration award is almost impossible to appeal. This likely is true with a few exceptions. First, the most experienced arbitrators often are in high demand and have limited availability during the year following selection of the arbitrator or arbitration panel. Lack of arbitrator availability can delay the process and ultimate resolution.

Second, many courts have a mandatory mediation program that can affect a speedy resolution with less expense than litigation or arbitration. Additionally, because the mediation is mandatory, neither side appears weak for participating. Finally, as arbitration becomes increasingly common, so do appeals of arbitral awards. While still not nearly as frequent as an appeal of a court ruling, appeals from arbitration awards are more common than they once were.

## 2. Possibility of a Successful Dispositive Motion

If you believe that you likely would win your dispute with a dispositive motion, such as a motion to dismiss or a motion for summary judgment, then you may prefer to litigate. Dispositive motions rarely are entertained or ruled upon by arbitrators. Conversely, a motion to dismiss may be filed immediately after service of a complaint, and discovery may be stayed until the court rules on the motion. Motions for summary judgment are not filed as early as motions to dismiss, but if successful, they obviate the need for a trial.

## 3. Scope of Discovery

Typically, the scope of discovery in litigation is broader than that agreed upon by parties to an arbitration or allowed by arbitrators. In litigation, requests that are reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence are generally permitted. This is a fairly generous scope of discovery, and much information may be collected in litigation through interrogatories, requests for documents and depositions.

Conversely, the parties to an arbitration typically do not serve written interrogatories, and often the number of depositions is limited. Additionally, unlike judges, arbitrators typically do not allow broad document requests encompassing programs, deals or transactions other than the one(s) in dispute. Further, while the law varies by jurisdiction, arbitrators typically do not have the subpoena powers granted to a court. This may make it difficult to obtain the testimony of key witnesses.

## 4. Confidentiality

A confidentiality agreement is almost a foregone conclusion in arbitration. Indeed, protecting information from the public record, i.e. a court, is often a leading factor in the decision to include a mandatory arbitration provision in a contract. While confidentiality agreements or protective orders may be obtained in litigation, they are far less common and may be difficult to obtain if opposed by one or more parties.

If confidentiality is important, you may want to include an arbitration clause in your contracts. The clause could expressly require that any arbitration be governed by a confidentiality agreement. Keep in mind, however, that there may

**continued on page 7**

## continued from page 6

be times when you want to use the leverage of bad press against your adversary. In these instances, you may want to either litigate or object to any proposed confidentiality agreement in an arbitration.

### 5. A Jury Determination

Most companies are loathe to put their fate in the hands of a jury of “their peers.” While jurors typically are well-intentioned citizens, it is unlikely they will have knowledge of your particular business or industry.

There are, however, occasions when you may prefer to be before a jury rather than one or more arbitrators. For example, if your company is the “David” in a “David v. Goliath” dispute, you may want to present your side of the story to a jury. Arbitrators may intentionally ignore emotional or sympathetic arguments so as to appear logical and reasonable, whereas juries may be more easily swayed by sympathetic stories and parties. Additionally, juries may be more easily impressed by expert testimony than are arbitrators who often consider themselves to be experts.

### 6. Complexity or Industry-Specific Nature of the Dispute

Just as there are times when a jury may be the preferred decision maker, there are also disputes that are not appropriate for a jury. These include highly technical and industry-specific disputes wherein anyone outside of the particular field is unlikely to understand the concepts and customs necessary to justly and efficiently adjudicate the dispute.

In anticipation of these types of disputes, some industries, such as the reinsurance industry, routinely include arbitra-

tion clauses in their contracts. Many such arbitration clauses also mandate that the arbitrator(s) be current or former officers or directors within the industry. These safeguards are designed to promote efficient and rational resolutions to technical disputes.

### 7. Expense

The common perception is that arbitration results in a final determination in less time than litigation and is, therefore, less expensive. This may be accurate if you have the following: (a) a single arbitrator rather than a panel of arbitrators; (b) a short time between the arbitration demand and the date of the hearing (remember this may be affected by the availability of the arbitrator); and (c) narrow scopes for discovery and expert testimony. In the absence of any of these three factors, arbitration may be as expensive, or indeed more expensive, than litigation.

While every dispute presents unique circumstances, these seven factors will guide you through the initial analysis of whether to arbitrate or litigate.

Jessica F. Pardi, Esq.

Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP

1600 Atlanta Financial Center

3343 Peachtree Rd., NE

Atlanta, GA 30326-1044

Direct Dial: 404.504.7662

Facsimile: 404.365.9532

Email: [jfp@mmmlaw.com](mailto:jfp@mmmlaw.com)

*Ms. Pardi is a partner in the litigation and insurance dispute resolution groups.*

## ACC News Briefs

### Looking for a Job in Your State? Look No Further Than Your Chapter Webpage!

Upgrades to ACC's In-house Jobline have allowed us to bring dynamic job postings directly to your chapter webpage. Just select “job listings” from your page and get the latest in-house counsel announcements in your state or country. Listings are updated daily and can even be sent directly to your personal RSS feeds. Check it out now by selecting your chapter from the pull-down listing at [www.acca.com/chapters/](http://www.acca.com/chapters/). To learn

more about setting up an RSS feed, go to [www.acca.com/rss/faq.php](http://www.acca.com/rss/faq.php).

### Attend ACC's Corporate Counsel University in St. Louis, April 29–May 1

Are you new to in-house practice or you have just taken on new management responsibilities? If you want to help your company succeed and if you want to move up the ladder, you

**continued on page 8**

# Board of Directors

## President

**Teresa T. Kennedy**  
Cox Communications, Inc.  
404.843.7681  
teresa.kennedy@cox.com

## Vice President and President Elect (Sponsorship/Programs)

**George Q. Sewell**  
The Facility Group, Inc.  
770.437.2736  
gese@facilitygroup.com

## Vice President (Advocacy)

**Caroline K. Pearlstein**  
The Coca-Cola Company  
404.676.5315  
cpearlstein@na.ko.com

## Vice President (Public Relations)

**Betsy Griswold**  
UPS Capital Corporation  
404.828.7004  
betsygriswold@ups.com

## Vice President (Membership/YLD)

**Sally Austin**  
Children's Healthcare of Atlanta  
404.785.7521  
sally.austin@choa.com

## Secretary

**Steven Rubin**  
Rollins, Inc.  
404.877.4125  
srubin1@rollinscorp.com

## Treasurer

**Lael Bellamy**  
The Home Depot  
770.384.2221  
lael.bellamy@homedepot.com

## Immediate Past President

**Theodore Kingsley**  
BellSouth Telecommunications  
404.335.0720  
theodore.kingsley@bellsouth.com

## Board of Directors & VP of Programs

**Lori Shapiro**

## Board of Directors

**Henry Abelman**  
**Stacey Geer**  
**Stephen Kaplan**  
**Tom Schroeder**  
**John Tanner**  
**Virginia Wadsworth**

## Chapter Administrator

**Lisa K. Smith**  
770.562.5371  
lisasmith@csosolutions.net

## continued from page 7

need to learn how to perfect your game. Now in its 5th year, ACC's Corporate Counsel University has become the gold standard for best practices for attorneys who are new to in-house, or who would like to sharpen their management and in-house practice skills. Open only to in-house counsel, Corporate Counsel University will provide you with proven skills to make you a more effective lawyer. Like all ACC programs, Corporate Counsel University will emphasize practical tips and hands-on advice, with plenty of opportunities to interact with faculty and other attendees.

And new for 2007, we have expanded to offer programming for in-house paralegals! Some restrictions apply. Join us in St. Louis April 29–May 1, 2007 for ACC's 5th Annual Corporate Counsel University. For more details and to register, visit [acc.com/ccu/07](http://acc.com/ccu/07).

## Access the Improved Membership Directory on ACC Online

Have you ever wondered if other ACC members in your state attended your law school? Or work in similar industries? Wonder no more! The ACC membership directory allows you to search for fellow members by last name, company name, chapter, committee, law school, and now you can even determine if a member has signed up for ACC's MemberToMember<sup>SM</sup> service! It's a great resource for following up with members that you've met at chapter and ACC meetings, and can help you build a network of members that practice in your specialty. To access the directory, visit the ACC homepage at [www.acca.com](http://www.acca.com). Enter your membership user name/id (available on your membership card or ACC Docket label) and your password, which is the first eight letters of your last name, to access this information. Forget your Id? Contact ACC's membership department at 202.293.4103, ext. 360 or [membership@acca.com](mailto:membership@acca.com).

## Renew Your Membership Today!

You recently received your invoice for 2007 dues. Have you renewed yet? Renew your membership to avoid interruption of member benefits including the following:

ACC Docket, your best source for cutting edge practice information. The ACC Docket covers issues that are important to you today, no matter the size of your legal department ([www.acca.com/p-docket.php](http://www.acca.com/p-docket.php)).

Virtual Library<sup>SM</sup>, our database of articles and sample forms, policies, and checklists on best practices in managing your department, working with outside counsel, records retention, billing, an hundreds of other topics specific to in-house practice. ([www.acca.com/vl/php](http://www.acca.com/vl/php))

Networking through chapter and committee peer networks. Both of these networks offer valuable resources from in-house counsel in your geographic area or practice specialty ([www.acca.com/networks/index.php](http://www.acca.com/networks/index.php)).

You can renew online at [www.acca.com/membership/become.php](http://www.acca.com/membership/become.php), or you can fax your invoice with credit card payment to 202.293.4701. To request an additional invoice or to check the status of your membership, please contact the membership department at [membership@acca.com](mailto:membership@acca.com) or at 202.293.4103, ext. 360.