

# Law School Strategies for Amelioration and Protest: What Law Schools Can Do

James G. Leipold

## Introduction

What can law schools do to advance their strategies for amelioration and protest? In addressing the possibilities, I describe what law schools have done to compensate their gay and lesbian students who face the discrimination of military recruiters, and also what has not been happening on campuses. The last topic leads me to suggest some of the things that law schools can do in the future.

For more than ten years, the administrative burden of the Solomon Amendment has fallen disproportionately on career services professionals. Under all of the various incarnations of this pernicious legislation, military recruiters have been entitled to a substantial amount of resources and assistance from law schools and their career services offices even though the military's discriminatory policy against gay, lesbian, and bisexual lawyers is contrary to the values to which many individual schools are committed. The military has sought and obtained what no other employer gets: assistance without compliance with a school's requirement of adherence to its nondiscrimination policy.

Law school career services professionals have often been the ones on campus who have had to manage and mitigate the actual presence of the military on campus, accommodating the recruiters and the students who wish to meet with them, and dealing with the emotions and activities of students opposed to the military's presence on campus. As a practical matter, the burden of putting into operation a school's ameliorative actions, whatever they might be, has also often fallen on the career services staff.

In testing the limits of the Solomon legislation, much of the risk-taking and many of the most creative ideas about pushing back have also come from career services professionals. The National Association for Law Placement

**James G. Leipold** is the Executive Director of NALP. This paper was presented at the Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Section's panel entitled "Accepting the Court's Invitation" at the Association of American Law School's Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., January 3, 2007.

James Leipold may be reached at [JLeipold@NALP.org](mailto:JLeipold@NALP.org).

(NALP), for its part, has long been committed to supporting its member law schools in enforcing their own nondiscrimination policies, and has provided educational programming and tools to help law school career services offices navigate the Solomon waters on their own campuses. While the law school career services community had great hopes that the Supreme Court's consideration of a First Amendment challenge to this legislation in *Rumsfeld v. FAIR* might lead to at least a ratcheting down of the financial stakes for non-compliance with Solomon, none of us was really surprised by the outcome of this litigation. It seemed that all was not lost, however. While the Court deferred to Congress on this matter, the silver lining in this decision seemed to be the language that has framed this workshop: "Law schools remain free under the statute to express whatever views they may have on the military's congressionally mandated employment policy, all the while retaining eligibility for federal funds."<sup>1</sup> In addition, the Court noted that "students and faculty are free to associate to voice their disapproval of the military's message."<sup>2</sup>

In the years and months leading up to *FAIR*, as the military continued to increase its demands that its recruiters be given equal access to campus, many law school administrators were intimidated by the possibility that small acts of protest or resistance could lead to the loss of federal funds for the entire university. In my mind, the Court's clear language once and for all freed up students, faculty, and administrators to protest without fear of reprisal. With the Court imprimatur now in place, the question within NALP's GLBT section soon became whether law schools were in fact doing anything differently since the *FAIR* decision.

### The NALP Survey

To investigate this question, NALP surveyed its U.S. member law schools between November 15 and December 15, 2006, to determine what steps they were taking to respond to the on-campus presence of military recruiters, and to collect information about new ameliorative initiatives since the *FAIR* decision was released. While there have been several efforts over the long years of Solomon to collect and document law school amelioration practices, none seemed particularly current, and there seemed to be nothing in place to look at school practices following the *FAIR* decision.

As we began to design the survey, it became clear that law school responses to on-campus military recruitment are complex and difficult to quantify. In trying to set down questions that would capture campus behaviors, it became clear that there were both individual and collective acts that we would have to try to document—acts of individual faculty, students, or staff and also acts that represented the collective will of some portion of the law school community. It also became clear that it was not always possible to disentangle acts of protest from acts of amelioration. While a student picket line outside of an interview

1. *Rumsfeld v. FAIR*, 547 U.S. 47, 60 (2006).

2. *Id.* at 69-70.

room might clearly be classified as an act of protest against a discriminatory military hiring practice, and law school funding for several GLBT students to attend the job fair at the Lavender Law conference might clearly be classified as an ameliorative act meant to compensate a law school's GLBT students for job opportunities they are not able to pursue, other acts are much harder to classify as simply one thing or another. Finally, there are activities that, at some schools, are simply baseline best practices for creating an inclusive campus environment that is welcoming to GLBT students, while at other campuses, these same activities are actually deliberate acts of amelioration.

A copy of the survey instrument we ultimately adopted, including summary responses, appears at Appendix A. The survey made two basic inquiries of each school, asking them to document faculty and staff-led responses related to Solomon and then, separately, student-led responses and activities. The survey also asked respondents to distinguish between activities initiated on campus prior to the *FAIR* decision and those initiated after the *FAIR* decision. The survey was put together by a group of volunteers serving on NALP's Solomon Amelioration Workgroup, headed by Angela Dalfen at Golden Gate University School of Law, and its findings were used as the basis for an *Amelioration Best Practices Guide* published in August 2007. Before looking at some of the findings, it is important to note that the survey was not designed as a piece of social science research. Rather, it was meant to be an informal survey to gauge current amelioration practices at American law schools and to try to determine whether those practices have changed since the *FAIR* decision. By designing a survey instrument that listed possible activities and actions, we also hoped to suggest to our member law schools a range of additional strategies they might consider.

### Survey Responses and Results

The response rate for the survey was very good, at 58 percent, with 112 out of 192 U.S. law schools providing a completed survey. The responses were distributed remarkably evenly across NALP's five geographic regions and also across law schools based on size, urban, suburban, and rural location, and public/private status.<sup>3</sup> The response rate and the distribution of responses across law schools suggest that the results do provide a representative window into law school practices across the country. The survey was sent to the chief career services officer at each law school, who was encouraged to share copies of the survey with GLBT student organizations and interested faculty and staff members before finalizing their responses. To be sure, there are certainly things related to Solomon and military recruiting that are going on at the law schools that were not captured by this survey. Nevertheless, on balance and in the aggregate, the results provide a decently accurate snapshot of current law school practices.

One of the surprising findings of the survey is that in the nine months that followed the Supreme Court's decision, only a small number of law schools have undertaken any new initiatives to protest or ameliorate the discrimination

3. See App. A, at 3 (summary demographic breakdown of the response pool).

inherent in the Solomon Amendment. Appendix A shows that the number of schools initiating any specific new practice since the *FAIR* decision is small indeed. Some of the narrative responses suggest that rather than freeing up or energizing people to vigorously challenge the validity of the military's hiring practices, at some schools the Court's decision seems to have produced a sense of resignation that has actually served to diminish the commitment to acts of protest and amelioration.

Turning then to the survey results themselves, as a threshold matter, 98 percent of the responding schools reported that members of the U.S. military JAG Corps had visited their school to recruit since the *FAIR* decision. Schools responded to three other baseline questions: 88 percent of the schools reported that they have an officially recognized GLBT student organization, 63 percent reported that there is a member of the law school faculty or staff who is designated to coordinate matters relating to the Solomon Amendment, and 44 percent reported that a member of the career services office meets regularly with the GLBT students to discuss the military's presence on campus.<sup>4</sup>

The rest of the survey asked schools to document their responses to the military presence on campus, noting whether each act or action was a practice prior to the *FAIR* decision, was initiated after the *FAIR* decision, or is not a practice at that school. Responses to the military on campuses across the country vary tremendously, although a clear majority of schools engage in multiple activities to provide information about their own nondiscrimination policies, to provide additional resources and support to their GLBT students to ameliorate the military's discrimination against them, and to protest the policies of Congress and the military. According to the survey respondents, students too are engaged, though perhaps less than we might imagine and hope.

A number of interesting things emerge when the responses are arrayed in rank order by frequency.<sup>5</sup> The most common practice, not unexpectedly, is posting the law school's nondiscrimination policy when the military recruiters come calling. Surprisingly, however, a small number of schools report that this is not a practice at their law school even now, and one school went so far as to note that: "Career Services was advised post-*FAIR* that we must treat the military equally as any other employer. Therefore we discontinued the practice of posting [our nondiscrimination] notices on the doors of the interviewing recruiters...there has been no guidance from the ABA, the AALS, or from NALP post-*FAIR*."

As I scan the faculty- and staff-led activities list from top to bottom, one of the things that strikes me is that few of the actions or activities near the top

4. See App. A.

5. See App. B (lists with faculty- and staff-initiated actions listed first, followed by student-led initiatives.) The response listed as a percent is the combined total of schools that reported that the practice happens on their campuses whether the practice was initiated prior to *FAIR* or after the Court's decision. The base is the number of respondents for each question, which in most cases is 112. And, although they are included in the total for calculating the percent, the lists also show the actual number of schools where the practice was reported as a new one following *FAIR*.

of the list can truly be classified as acts of protest or amelioration. With a few exceptions, these are law school activities that should and would happen in most law schools whether or not the military had a discriminatory hiring practice, simply as a matter of creating a welcoming and supportive environment for GLBT students. As the frequency of practice or occurrence diminishes, you begin to see more actions and activities that can more easily be characterized as acts of protest or amelioration. So, for instance, 81 percent of the responding schools reported that faculty or staff is involved in hosting or co-sponsoring an event organized by the GLBT student organization, and 70 percent of the respondents reported that the school promotes outreach to GLBT students, but only 34 percent of the schools have established a Solomon Amendment Task Force, and only 8 percent of the responding schools report that faculty or staff have been involved in lobbying or otherwise contacting Congress about the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy.

I am most struck by the fact that only three of the thirteen activities suggested by the survey are reported to occur on more than half of our law school campuses. It is perhaps this lack of engagement on the part of students that is most surprising. Note, for instance, that students reportedly staffed informational tables on military hiring and the Solomon Amendment at only 38 percent of the responding law schools, distributed pins or stickers or other items to protest the military presence on campus at only 37 percent of the responding law schools, staged actual protests or picket lines at only 33 percent of the responding law schools, and lobbied or otherwise contacted members of Congress about the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy at only 20 percent of the responding law schools. Most telling, perhaps, are the following narrative responses:

“The students seem more interested in issues relating to gay marriage and the intersection of race and sexual orientation than in the military”;

“While our GLBT students were disappointed by the Court’s decision in *FAIR*, they did not feel a response to the decision itself would be productive”;  
and

“The Court’s decision did not change much on our campus.”

The good news is that there were schools where the outcome in *FAIR* did seem to be a call to action for students. In particular, the number of campuses where student protests and student-staffed informational tables took place increased by nearly 10 percent. One school wrote that “The Supreme Court decision energized our [GLBT student organization]—prompting them to begin outreach to the law school community toward increasing awareness of Solomon Amendment and ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ issues.”

In addition to providing a list of possible actions, the survey also gave respondents a chance to document other practices. Overall, there were few

additional or innovative activities written in. Several schools used the space to note the leadership role that a dean or particular faculty member had taken on this issue. Others documented positioning their nondiscrimination policy or a statement about military recruiting in various strategic places, including as a footer on all outgoing Career Services Office (CSO) e-mails and on poster-size blowups in hallways and on bulletin boards throughout the law school. Other schools documented using their on-campus interviewing orientation programs and materials to highlight the discriminatory nature of the military's hiring policies. One school sponsors a GLBT career fair on campus to which it invites students from neighboring law schools, and another uses their CSO office to coordinate community service activities in the local GLBT community. On the student side, the most common practice that the survey did not ask about seemed to be the sale of t-shirts, generally olive drab or military fatigue in color and often with a slogan emblazoned on them, such as "Go Gay!" Many schools noted that their ameliorative efforts were not exclusively focused on military recruiting, but were more broadly aimed at providing a welcoming and safe educational environment.

There is one other narrative response that came directly from a GLBT student organization that is worth noting:

"It would be nice to have more faculty support. We didn't see anyone but [a career services staff member] at the protests or wearing buttons. Lots of faculty signed [an] anti-Solomon letter, but we don't see much more support than that. Among the most shameful times in our nation's history are those where discrimination against minority groups is condoned or ignored. This is one of those times and we should be ashamed...."

In summary then, there seem to be many common strategies in place designed to both create a welcoming environment for GLBT students on our law school campuses and also to ameliorate the presence of military recruiters on campus. Most of those strategies do not seem to be particularly rigorous, however, and most law school practices have not changed since the *FAIR* decision. While a number of schools reported some heightened awareness of the issue on campus and some heightened activity in response to the presence of the military on campus, many more schools reported that things remain status quo, or worse, that there is a sense of resignation and complacency about military recruiting on campus. It seems that schools have not, in general, embraced the Court's invitation to exercise their First Amendment rights to challenge the military's discriminatory hiring practices, and more importantly, to challenge the Congressional policies that keep those practices in place.

### **Three Suggestions for What Law Schools Can and Should Do**

While there is no easy or obvious list of best practices to emerge from this survey, I feel confident making three suggestions about what law schools can and should do going forward.

**First**, acts of protest and amelioration are locked in time and exist in the context of the historical moment. Strategies that seemed relevant or effective five years ago need to be reconsidered now that the Supreme Court has upheld Congress's coercive use of its spending power to support the discriminatory hiring policy of the military. Therefore law schools should, on an annual basis, convene a group of faculty, staff, and students to evaluate the current relevance and value of the school's ameliorative and protest practices, and actively evaluate whether new, different, or additional strategies might be appropriate. Responsibility for this annual evaluation will best be met if law schools either designate a single person on campus to facilitate and coordinate Solomon amelioration, or staff a Solomon Amendment Task Force to address the presence of discriminatory military recruiting on campus.

**Second**, it is virtually certain that new legislation to repeal this discriminatory law will be reintroduced and will face vastly improved odds for passage. Law schools should actively engage students, faculty, and staff to devise strategies for individually and collectively working with members of Congress to repeal the military's ban on lesbian, gay, and bisexual military personnel. The NALP survey makes it clear that very few law schools have been actively engaged on Capitol Hill in advocating for legislative change. If the new Congress does not hear from us on this issue, we will have abdicated a historic responsibility. As an educational tool, this provides an ideal moment for engaging students in the process of tackling legislative change.

Our law school-based efforts to repeal the underlying military policy should also include directly engaging the military, where support for "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" has sharply diminished. On this topic I commend to you the work of Diane Mazur, and in particular her article "A Blueprint for Law School Engagement with the Military."<sup>6</sup> The need to eliminate all barriers to military recruitment to meet the troop build-up contemplated by the current administration may, ironically enough, provide the impetus for an emerging consensus within the military itself that this policy should be retired.<sup>7</sup>

**Third**, and finally, law schools across the country continue to recruit and accept tuition from students who, simply because of their sexual orientation, are not eligible to compete for jobs that recruiters come to campus to fill. Therefore, at least once a year law school faculty and staff should ask their GLBT students what sort of support they would like in the face of this discrimination. Looking backwards from some point in the future when this policy has finally been undone, to have done anything less will seem shameful indeed.

6. Diane H. Mazur, *A Blueprint for Law School Engagement with the Military*, 1 *J. Nat'l Sec. L. & Pol'y* 473 (2005).

7. General Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1993 until 1997, all but made this point in his op-ed to the *New York Times*. See John M. Shalikashvili, *Second Thoughts on Gays in the Military*, *N.Y. Times*, January 2, 2007, at A17.

## Amelioration Best Practices Survey

### With Summary Results

The purpose of this survey is to find out what steps U.S. law schools have taken to respond to the on-campus presence of military recruiters, and to collect information about nonameliorative initiatives since *FAIR v. Rumsfeld* was decided in March 2008. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Your responses will be kept confidential and used only in group summaries. Your school will not be identified by name or any other distinguishing feature in any report of the findings of this survey. **RESPONSES ARE DUE BY DECEMBER 15, 2008.**

We are grateful for your help. If you have questions about the survey please contact James Leopold at the NALP office at 202-635-1001 or [jleopold@nalp.org](mailto:jleopold@nalp.org).

1. Have members of the US military JAG Corps visited your school to recruit since the *FAIR v. Rumsfeld* case was decided by the Supreme Court in March 2008?

Yes 58% No 2%

2. Is there a member of your school's faculty and/or staff who is designated to coordinate matters relating to the Solomon Amendment?

Yes 63% No 37%

3. Does your law school have an officially recognized GLBT (Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender) student organization?

Yes 88% No 12%

4. Does a member of the career services office meet regularly with your GLBT students to discuss the military's presence at your school?

Yes 44% No 56%

Listed below are a variety of actions and activities (not limited to those coordinated by the career services office), that some law schools have instituted in response to the Solomon Amendment or to support their GLBT students in general. For each of the practices listed below, please indicate whether the practice began before the *FAIR v. Rumsfeld* decision, happened for the first time since the decision, or is not a practice on your campus.

**Staff and faculty led responses and activities.** (Use checkmarks to indicate the appropriate response for each item.)

	instituted prior to <i>FAIR v. Rumsfeld</i> decision	instituted after <i>FAIR v. Rumsfeld</i> decision	Not a practice on our campus
5. Circulating or posting law school's nondiscrimination policy	56%	1%	3%
6. Circulating or posting a statement specifically addressing military recruiting on campus	82%	4%	14%
7. Circulating or posting a letter from the dean stating the law school's position on military hiring policies	48%	2%	50%
8. Organizing a panel discussion or other event with GLBT attorneys discussing their careers	58%	8%	16%
9. Funding GLBT students to attend off-campus events or programming (e.g., Lavender Law)	53%	5%	40%
10. Facilitating a GLBT attorney-student mentoring program	15%	6%	79%
11. Establishing a Solomon Amendment task force (or similar group focused on ameliorative efforts)	13%	1%	86%
12. Sponsoring events with local GLBT advocacy organizations	43%	5%	52%
13. Displaying rainbow flags, "Safe Zone" signs, or other expressions of solidarity with GLBT students	50%	2%	48%
14. Submitting letters, editorials, or articles to local or national media outlets about the Solomon Amendment and military recruiting	28%	3%	77%
15. Funding one or more fellowships for summer or post-graduate work on GLBT issues	15%	3%	82%

continued



	Initiated prior to FAIR v. Rumsfeld decision	Initiated after FAIR v. Rumsfeld decision	Not a practice on our campus
16. Amending law school's nondiscrimination policy to specifically address military recruiting	50%	4%	44%
17. Lobbying or otherwise contacting members of Congress about the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy	5%	2%	92%
18. Offering a class or seminar on "Sexual Orientation and the Law"	50%	4%	44%
19. Hosting, co-sponsoring, moderating, and/or participating in an event organized by the GLBT student organization	77%	4%	19%
20. Speaking at an academic or professional conference about military recruiting or the Solomon Amendment	19%	2%	79%
21. Serving as the faculty or staff advisor to the GLBT student organization	67%	2%	31%
22. Conducting a teach-in, debate, or panel discussion on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell"	43%	5%	50%
23. Circulating a petition or similar document expressing opposition to the Solomon Amendment	18%	2%	79%
24. Promoting faculty and staff outreach to GLBT students	68%	2%	29%
25. Including discussion or examination of Solomon Amendment or "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy in courses	27%	2%	67%

26. Other faculty or staff initiated actions or activities not referenced above (please describe):

Listed below are a variety of actions and activities some law students have instituted in response to the Solomon Amendment. For each of the practices listed below, please indicate whether the practice began before the FAIR v. Rumsfeld decision, happened for the first time since the decision, or is not a practice on your campus.

Student led responses and activities: (Use checkmarks to indicate the appropriate response for each item.)

	Initiated prior to FAIR v. Rumsfeld decision	Initiated after FAIR v. Rumsfeld decision	Not a practice on our campus
27. Promoting attendance at off-campus GLBT networking events or programming (e.g., Lavender Law)	81%	1%	16%
28. Organizing or sponsoring a panel discussion, teach-in, debate or other event on the Solomon Amendment and the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy	53%	2%	44%
29. Staffing informational tables on military hiring and the Solomon Amendment	20%	8%	62%
30. Serving on a Solomon Amendment task force (or a similar group focused on ameliorative efforts)	27%	4%	69%
31. Drafting or circulating a petition or similar document expressing opposition to the Solomon Amendment	28%	4%	70%

continued

	Initiated prior to FAR v. Abate/Robt decision	Initiated after FAR v. Abate/Robt decision	Not a practice on our campus
32. Promoting widespread awareness of the Solomon Amendment among other students by:			
a. Making announcements in class	17%	3%	80%
b. Posting flyers around campus	43%	4%	48%
c. Distributing pins or stickers	22%	6%	68%
d. Using website, email, or other electronic communication	29%	6%	58%
e. Other: _____			
33. Protesting or picketing military recruiters on campus	25%	8%	67%
34. Attending or organizing an off-campus protest	15%	6%	69%
35. Disseminating information about recent surveillance of GLBT student groups by the Pentagon	9%	7%	68%
36. Lobbying or otherwise contacting members of Congress about the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy	14%	6%	68%

37. Other student initiated actions or activities not referenced above (please describe):

38. Please use this space to tell us anything else that you feel is important or noteworthy about the response to the Solomon Amendment at your law school. It would be helpful if you would describe any additional ameliorative steps that your school has taken that are not captured above. Finally, if there was something new or different about the campus response this year in the wake of the Court's decision in FAR that has not been captured in the questions above, please use this space to highlight that for us.

**Demographic Information:** To assist in grouping schools for analysis, please answer the following questions. Your school will not be identified by name or by any other distinguishing feature in any report of the findings of this survey.

39. In which NALP region is your school located?

Northeast 18%    Mid-Atlantic 14%    Southeast 25%    Midwest 23%    West/Rocky Mountain 22%

40. How would you characterize your school's location?

Urban 63%    Suburban 22%    Rural 13%

41. What is the size of your JD population?

0-500 23%    501-1000 54%    1001 or larger 23%

42. Law school is:

Public/state-supported 36%    Private 64%

43. Name of your law school (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Note: If you supply your school's name, it will be used only to contact you if there are questions about your survey response. Your school will not be identified by name or any other distinguishing feature in any report of the survey findings.

Please fax your completed survey to 202-835-1112 or mail it to: NALP, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 1110, Washington, DC 20036-5413.

**APPENDIX B****Most Frequently Reported Faculty and Staff Led Practices**

*In rank order from most frequent to least frequent, law schools reported the following actions and activities taken by faculty and/or staff in response to having the military on campus. (The figures below represent the percentage of schools reporting the practice, whether the practice was started before or after the FAIR decision, followed by the number of schools reporting that the practice was commenced after the Court's decision in FAIR.)*

**97%** of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members circulate or post their law school's nondiscrimination policy;

**1** school reported that it initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

**86%** of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members circulate or post a statement specifically addressing military recruiting on campus;

**4** schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

**81%** of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members host, co-sponsor, moderate, and/or participate in an event organized by the GLBT student organization;

**5** schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

**70%** of the law schools reported that the school promotes faculty and staff outreach to GLBT students;

**2** schools report that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

**69%** of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members serves as the advisor to the GLBT student organization;

**2** schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

**65%** of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members organize a panel discussion or other event with GLBT attorneys discussing their careers;

**9** schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

**60%** of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members offer a class or seminar on sexual orientation and the law;

**4** law schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

60% of the law schools reported that the school funds GLBT students to attend off-campus events or programming such as the annual Lavender Law Conference and Job Fair;

5 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

54% of the law schools reported that they have amended their law school's non-discrimination policy to specifically address military recruiting;

5 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

52% of the law schools reported that faculty and/or staff members display rainbow flags, safe zone signs, or other expressions of solidarity with GLBT students;

2 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

50% of the law schools reported that the school circulated or posted a letter from the dean stating the law school's position on military hiring;

2 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

50% of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members conducted a teach-in, debate, or panel discussion on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell";

5 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

48% of the law schools reported that the school sponsors events with local GLBT advocacy organizations;

6 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

39% of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members include discussion or examination of the Solomon Amendment or the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy in law school courses;

2 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

34% of the law schools reported that the school has established a Solomon Amendment task force or a similar group focused on ameliorative efforts;

1 school reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

23% of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members submitted letters, editorials, or articles to local or national media outlets about the Solomon Amendment and military recruiting;

3 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

22% of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members circulated a petition or similar document expressing opposition to the Solomon Amendment;

3 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

21% of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members spoke at academic or professional conferences about military recruiting or the Solomon Amendment;

2 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

21% of the law schools reported that the school facilitates a GLBT attorney-student mentoring program;

7 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

18% of the law schools reported that the school funded one or more fellowships for summer or post-graduate work on GLBT issues;

3 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

8% of the law schools reported that one or more faculty and/or staff members lobbied or otherwise contacted members of Congress about the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy ;

3 schools reported that they initiated this practice after the *FAIR* decision.

### Most Frequently Reported Student Led Practices

In rank order from most frequent to least frequent, law schools also reported the following actions and activities taken by students in response to having the military on campus:

**84%** of the law schools reported that their students promoted attendance at off-campus GLBT networking events or programming, such as the annual Lavender Law Conference;

**3** schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

**55%** of the law schools reported that their students organized or sponsored a panel discussion, teach-in, debate or other event on the Solomon Amendment and the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy;

**3** schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

**51%** of the law schools reported that their students promoted widespread awareness of the Solomon Amendment among other students by posting flyers around campus;

**4** schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

**45%** of the law schools reported that their students promoted widespread awareness of the Solomon Amendment among other students by using a website, email, or other electronic communication;

**6** schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

**38%** of the law schools reported that their students staffed informational tables on military hiring and the Solomon Amendment;

**9** schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

**37%** of the law schools reported that their students promoted widespread awareness of the Solomon Amendment among other students by distributing pins or stickers;

**6** schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

33% of the law schools reported that their students protested or picketed military recruiters on campus;

8 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

31% of the law schools reported that a student representative serves on a Solomon Amendment task force or a similar group focused on ameliorative efforts;

4 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

30% of the law schools reported that their students drafted or circulated a petition or similar document expressing opposition to the Solomon Amendment;

4 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

20% of the law schools reported that their students promoted widespread awareness of the Solomon Amendment among other students by making announcements in class;

3 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

20% of the law schools reported that their students lobbied or otherwise contacted members of Congress about the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy;

6 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

15% of the law schools reported that their students attended or organized an off-campus protest;

0 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.

12% of the law schools reported that their students disseminated information about recent surveillance of GLBT student groups by the Pentagon;

7 schools reported that their students did this for the first time after the *FAIR* decision.