President’s Message

Being still awash in the emotions engendered by the Academy’s 2009 Educational Outreach Program in Kazakhstan, I am going to indulge myself by recounting some of that stupendous adventure. Nancy Jackson was our organizer, facilitator, herder, and solver of all problems. Entirely apart from that, she was treasured for the joyous drive she brought to the Academy’s traversal of the steppes, mountains, forensic laboratories, and dance floors of Kazakhstan. Many thanks to Kay Pitluck, one of our fellow travelers, for providing the photographs of Central Asia found throughout this issue.

My wife, Rhonda Berg, and I, the nominal leaders of the undertaking, were mostly swept along by the plans made by the local organizers in Kazakhstan. The Academy participants, though fewer than in some previous outreach programs, comprised a uniformly strong group that took an active role in all the forensic programs convened during our ten-day stay. In particular, all addressed the Academy’s 2009 Educational Outreach Program in the Republic of Kazakhstan, and my daughter, Cecilia Bohan, New York Times photo editor, who addressed image fakery and its detection at the Times and her practice for choosing photographs to illustrate news articles. Rounding out the group, and we were very glad to have them, were Rhonda Berg, Kay Pitluck, and Natasha Torpolova. Natasha was an excellent travel companion and interpreter extraordinaire from Ukraine who had attended the Denver meeting.

By late on the night of May 14, we all had gathered at the Hotel Grand Park Esil in Astana, Kazakhstan’s booming new capital city. Because Director Amankulov insisted on our “relaxing” for two days following our trips across anywhere from ten to thirteen time zones, we headed north the following morning for the mountains and lakes of Kokchetav, our destination a lodge in Burabay National Park, 265 km north of the capital, at 53N just south of the Siberian border. There, we hiked, swam, danced, ate, ate, and drank kumiss. Well, some of us drank kumiss, that ancient fermented-mare’s-milk drink consumed throughout Central Asia for at least 2,500 years. The taste,
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Legislative Corner

Congress has been holding hearings about forensic science as a result of the National Academy of Science’s report released in February.

On March 18, 2009, the House Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security held a hearing on the report. Subcommittee Chairman Bobby Scott (VA-D) emphasized the critical role that forensic science plays throughout the country in both convicting perpetrators while keeping the innocent free.

The NAS report called into question the reliability of the non-DNA disciplines. Ranking Committee Member Louie Gohmert (TX-R) noted a recent article in The National Law Journal, entitled “Defense Counsel View Report as New Weapon.” This is a concern for those of us involved in forensic disciplines relating to pattern evidence. Congressman Gohmert stated his belief that more research in forensic science concerning common language and methodology is needed. We will wait to see how Congress and the Administration react to the NAS study.

In May, members of the Consortium of Forensic Science Organizations (CFSO) met with a representative of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. The OSTP has held meetings with Federal forensic science laboratory directors and representatives of the Innocence Project to hear the many issues concerning the various groups.

In addition, Senator Leahy, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, suggested that the CFSO host a “round table” consisting of any interested stakeholders to discuss the recommendations made in the NAS report with a goal of developing consensus among the stakeholders. During the two meetings held in Washington, DC, considerable progress was made with general agreement in some areas as well as areas where only limited agreement was reached.

While Congress and the Administration consider their responses to the NAS report, forensic scientists may be confronted with fresh attacks by the defense bar on the reliability of pattern evidence: fingerprint identification, firearms and tool mark evidence, handwriting, footwear and tire impression evidence, etc. Challenges on the question of adequate research to support statements of single source uniqueness can most certainly be anticipated. While a considerable amount of research has already been done by the forensic science community, more will finally put the reliability question to rest. One possibility of this research may be a change in the way expert opinions are expressed. It may be that absolute statements of uniqueness are not possible to support statistically. None-the-less, strong statements can still be made to convey to juries the idea that there is a close association between the known sample and the questioned sample. Expressing that kind of opinion will be a challenge to articulate.
President’s Message cont.

Nancy, Rhonda, and I decided, was like the odor of a wetted-down campfire. This characterization comport well with later information that the Kazakh process for producing the drink, is to ferment it in a wooden cask charred on its inner surfaces. The first meal with kumiss was also the first of three occasions that a boiled sheep’s head was placed in front of the oldest person present, me. Its bestowal was characterized as a sign of respect. With it came the privilege and obligation of slicing off the ears and choosing who to convey them to. I gave one to Director Amankulov’s 9-year-old daughter sitting to my right and the other to my own daughter, once I caught her. Both daughters consumed their gifts with, if not gusto, then with the respect that was due. It must be said that the most difficult thing for American guests in Kazakhstan to accomplish is to consume a respectable fraction of the food put before them at every meal and coffee break, and thereby to reciprocate the respect that the offering is meant to show. This was a particular problem with all the meat platters proffered and when this was pointed out to one of our new Kazakh friends, he told us that Kazakhs are the second greatest consumers of meat in the world. The first? Wolves.

Monday morning, following our drive back across 200 kilometers of steppe to Astana, we toured the national forensic laboratories, housed in a dedicated multi-story building completed four months earlier. We discussed with many of the lab operators their work and workload. Most of the equipment that we saw was of the latest technology and recently purchased. At the end of the tour, we assembled in a conference room along with three Kazakh parliamentarians. We all—including the parliamentarians—addressed the laboratory staff making up the audience, and fielded their questions.

After lunch, we attended and were a major component of the formal opening of the international round table. In addition to ourselves, the attendees included forensic laboratory directors and national forensic directors from: Azerbaijan, Belarus, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Ukraine. Also present were officers from the US embassies in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan. The latter included Anthony Beaver, who has, through his position with the US State Department, provided a great deal of financial and other support to the developing Kazakh forensic program. All were called on to make comments, a stage that led to some interesting disagreements reflective of different national approaches to government forensic work, in particular with respect to the police involvement in that work—echoing one of the more controversial recommendations of the recent National Academy of Sciences Report, “Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward.”

On Tuesday morning, May 19, our group was allocated among five sections: transportation forensics (accident reconstruction), molecular-genetic examination, computer technology, narcotics, and environmental forensics. Thus distributed, we and the other non-Kazakh participants met with our Kazak counterparts to exchange information regarding the latest techniques and results in our respective fields. In the afternoon, we reconvened as a single group in the Ministry of Justice auditorium for the Plenary Session talks presented by Director Amankulov, Haskell Pitluck, Cecilia Bohan, Bob Barsley, and Larry Depew. Closing ceremonies and retrospective discussions of the program took place in the evening, culminating in a final dinner at which we were joined by the Vice Minister of Justice. All of the foreign participants received elaborate Kazakh robes and matching headgear. I also received a dombra, that two-stringed traditional Kazakh musical instrument that we were fortunate to hear many times during our stay in the country. Not a balalaika, but still mighty fine. Also, lest I fail to mention it, there was a bouquet presented to each woman in our group upon our arrival at each new place—chrysanthemums, tulips, and roses—with the expected effect.

On the 20th, we flew Air Astana east for two hours to Ust-Kamenogorsk. We had set as a goal that everyone be able to pronounce the city’s name by the time we left it. Our arrival was greeted by a contingent from the regional forensic center, and we were brought directly to their laboratories. After a tour, we gathered in a conference room and pretty much repeated the events at the Astana labs. Although the physical surroundings of the Ust-Kamenogorsk forensic center appeared ancient and were pretty decrepit (Director Amankulov said that they were to be replaced in the near future), the work done within that laboratory, which included a newly equipped forensic DNA facility, appeared to be of high quality and its practitioners enthusiastic.

From Ust-Kamenogorsk, we traveled 160 km east-northeast by coach, until we were high in the Altai mountain range, which Kazakhstan shares with China, Russia, and Mongolia. In fact, at 50N and 83E we were quite close to where all four countries converge. Our destination was Klimovka, a cluster of wooden cabins, mostly new, that in content and surroundings resembled the logging camp in the movie McCabe and Mrs. Miller. Again,
flowers for the ladies, kumiss for all, and a sheep’s head for me. But also saunas, swimming, water massages, and rainy horseback riding up a stream-fording mountain trail. In addition to the rain, we also had sunny weather, windy weather, and a thunderstorm during our two days at Klimovka, leading to the comment that we would be complete if we also saw snow. The first half of our four-hour bus trip back to Ust-Kamenogorsk passed through a gentle but steady snowfall. Once in the city, we went directly to the airport, where we were met by lab personnel bearing gifts, including copies of a regional map that two of us had expressed an interest in after seeing it posted at the lab.

From the far east, we flew to the far south to Almaty, the Kazakh capital until 1997. The city, the largest and most sophisticated in Central Asia, though essentially planar, lies just ten kilometers north of the abrupt rise of the Tien Shan Mountains. It was there, based at the Ambassador Hotel, that we spent our remaining time in Kazakhstan. Historically, the national forensic laboratories have been located in Almaty, and the local facilities remain substantial and staffed by experienced forensic practitioners, with whom we repeated our interactions in Astana and Ust-Kamenogorsk. Again, we were impressed by the level of interest displayed and questions asked by our local hosts.

Following the completion of our final forensic exchanges, we traveled with many of the local forensic people east from Almaty about 50 km to the Issyk region, site of the recovery of Kazakh’s now-iconic Gold Man dating from 400 B.C. In the foothills of Issyk, we settled in for a picnic at a family day camp centered on a fish farm. In an experience and with technique not to be revealed, we landed more than enough trout for a satisfying fish fry for the forty of us. After the fish fry, we traveled further into the mountains, to another resort, where some of us were supplied with horses that lacked the spirit of ones at Klimovka. Although our ride was primarily on the asphalt road dodging cars and trucks, we did have the opportunity to go partway up one of the mountains, which permitted those who had ridden in both places to claim, with photo documentation, that they had ridden Kazakh horses in both the Altai and Tien Shan ranges.

In sum, the 2009 Educational Outreach Program was very successful. As with some of the earlier such ventures, it is likely that it will lead to a continuing relationship with the forensic program of the host country. We were told by Director Amankulov that he hopes to invite a number of Academy members over the next few years to visit Kazakhstan in order to present short courses to his scientists. I believe that every one of us in the group just returned from that country can recommend that one so invited should accept with alacrity.
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Investigation and Resolution of Case #195 Before the AAFS Ethics Committee

The following account of the investigation leading up to the expulsion of an Academy member from the Questioned Documents section reflects the Academy’s new policy of providing detailed reports of all completed ethics investigations resulting in sanctions. The intent of the policy is to convey to the Academy membership in an effective manner some of the ethics pitfalls forensic practitioners can fall prey to. Presenting actual cases of this nature has long been the practice in the legal profession, with boards of overseers in many of the states using such cases as object lessons to the attorneys under their supervision, and subject to their discipline.

Introduction
The member was not sanctioned for expressing expert opinions differing from the majority view or from anyone else’s view. He was sanctioned for delivering into the judicial stream a report that misrepresented the work on which he said he based his conclusion regarding the key issue in the associated legal dispute.

Context
The member, a questioned documents specialist with decades of experience, was hired to determine which of two overlapping writings had been made first, a determination referred to as “sequencing.” One of the writings was done in black ink with a pen and the other with blue ink from a mechanical device. This is a difficult, though not always impossible, undertaking. There are a number of techniques brought to bear—usually in combination—in attempts to determine sequencing, though often no amount of effort is successful. On June 23, 2005, the document on which the tests were to be made was brought to the member’s office. According to the member, the attorneys who brought him the specimen remained present during his examinations and were pressuring him to complete his work. He reported studying the specimen with eight different optical techniques, all the while being interrupted by the attorneys’ questions. The attorneys then left, taking the specimen with them. On November 5, 2005, he was contacted by the attorney who had hired him, and asked to prepare a written report of his findings. He had not had the opportunity to again examine the specimen since the rushed work of June 23, and did not have the specimen before him again. In response to the request, he prepared a three-page report dated November 11, 2005, labeled “Preliminary Forensic Document Report.” Although the letter of November 11 states that the specimen was returned “herewith,” member said that he had not actually had them in his possession since the June 23 visit and that the statement regarding the return of documents was standard boilerplate inserted into his reports. In the November 11 Report, he referenced only two of the eight types of examination he said that he had carried out on June 23: infrared luminescence spectroscopy and observation of light transmitted through the paper bearing the writings of interest. He agreed during the investigation that a recipient of the Report could reasonably conclude that his conclusions were based only on the two techniques listed. His conclusion was that the handwritten signature was first and the blue ink was subsequently printed over that signature, that is, was second in time.

Basis of Sanction
The member stated during the investigation that his conclusion regarding sequences was not based on the two methods he described in his November 11. He said that, because he had not been able to create photographic documentation of one of the measurements he did base his conclusion on, he had used the photographs from another measurement to illustrate his Report, that is one of the measurements identified in the November 11 Report.

In the course of the investigation, the member asserted that, although he had not based his sequencing conclusion on the two techniques he set out in his November 11 Report, one could have used those techniques by themselves to determine the sequencing. As a consequence, there was a considerable amount of back and forth directed at that issue. It may be this that misled some Academy members into believing that the whole dispute was founded on a technical disagreement among experts regarding techniques that could be used for sequencing. The important thing is that at no point in the investigation did the member claim that his conclusion had been based on the two techniques detailed in his November 11 Report. The conclusion was therefore compelled that he had misrepresented his work in a formal report he expected to play a key role in a dispute before the court. It was this misrepresentation for which he was expelled from the Academy. His labeling his November 11th Report “Preliminary” does not provide him with a defense, given that the Report contained no qualifications or conditions for his stated conclusion. Similarly, his having been rushed in his examination of the specimen four months before writing the report is irrelevant. The final point against him was that, as the legal process continued, he never corrected or amplified what he had placed in the Report that misrepresented his work.

Lessons
That one must not misrepresent one’s work or data is too obvious a lesson to bear stating. However, there are a couple of underlying lessons. One is that the forensic practitioner is a professional scientist and that as such must not permit himself or herself to be rushed by anyone in carrying out tests needed to reach a forensic conclusion. Allowing this interference by persons who neither understand nor appreciate the professional work being carried out seems a particularly grievous failing. The forensic professional must take charge in the forensic arena. A second lesson is that if, for any reason, the necessary time and care could not be devoted to a study, the forensic practitioner must not state a conclusion, let alone a conclusion in a formal report, based on the study. Finally, though many of us find ourselves in the position of writing a report before all of the information about a case is available to us, it is essential that we think about what we mean when we say that a report is “preliminary.”
A Word From Your 2010 Program Chair

(1) Message to Section Program Chairs:
Don’t wait for papers to arrive. Make it happen. Here’s how.
Start by figuring out what are the important areas and topics that your section must cover. One important, suggested topic for a full track: What does the NAS report imply for our section?

In Engineering Sciences, it’s areas like Vehicular Accident Reconstruction, Environmental Pollution, and Structural Failures — you get the idea. For each of these areas, get someone eminent in the area who is familiar with ongoing research and/or issues to serve as track chair. Have each track chair define what is important in the track, who are the best authors to present on those topics, and have the track chair call those authors to solicit submissions. When the submissions come in, have the track chairs (and you) conduct a peer review. If there is disagreement, send it to a third respected actor in the field, or send it to me. Finally, the track chair should serve as both the moderator and as a rater for the papers in the track, with the ratings sent on to the next Section Program Chair.

The point of all of this is to raise the quality of the presentations. Practitioners and scholars often have to travel thousands of miles and spend hundreds of dollars (and more) to attend the session. Give them their money’s and their time’s worth. It’s up to you! Finally, if you think you would be a great track chair, call you section program chair NOW.

(2) Many of you will positively hate this idea:
If we were to move from a paper proceedings to a CD-ROM-based proceedings, (a) we could possibly save money, and (b) and more importantly, we could allow longer papers (even much longer papers), color, live links, and so forth. And, long term, it would save a lot of shelf space in your den. Think about it, and let me know what you think. (But think about it first.)

(3) Get to work! August 1st is coming up at warp speed.

A Night on the Town at the Seattle Opera

Enjoy a night on the town with your peers during the 2010 Annual Scientific Meeting in Seattle. Stephen Billick (Psychiatry & Behavioral Science) has made arrangements with the Seattle Opera to hold a limited number of tickets for the Verdi opera, Falstaff.

In Falstaff, the merry wives of Windsor unite in mischief-making when an ignoble nobleman plots to plunder their savings in this inventive creation capping Verdi’s career. A true ensemble tour-de-force, Falstaff improves upon the original Merry Wives script, keeping the sweet young lovers subplot and adding the knight’s most pithy observations from Henry IV for good measure. Equal parts orchestral virtuosity and riotously paced comedy, the opera is a perfect fusion of renaissance realism and light-hearted fantasy.

Tickets will be sold at cost, around $100 per ticket. Interested persons should contact Anne Warren at awarren@aaf.org.
A Note From Our Workshop Chairs

The August 1 deadline for submitting workshop proposals is rapidly approaching. Individuals and section officers are encouraged to submit proposals on relevant and timely issues. Workshops may address a topic of importance to an individual section or may be interdisciplinary. Workshops should be interesting, informative and (where possible) fun!

Workshop proposals will be reviewed and ranked by the sections and evaluated by the workshop committee. Each section is encouraged to form a subcommittee to perform this task. Selections will be made to ensure that the best program possible is offered. Please note that workshop space is limited and it is unlikely that all proposals submitted will be included in the program. However, proposals are appreciated since they contribute to the quality of the overall program. Those individuals who did not have an opportunity to present their workshops at the 2009 meeting are encouraged to resubmit their proposals for the 2010 meeting. Please submit your proposals online using the AAFS website (www.aafs.org).

The August 1, 2009, submission deadline is firm and will be here before you know it. Work on your proposals now! Please remember, to be considered, you must submit all required workshop proposal materials by the deadline.

2010 Poster Sessions

Do you want to get the word out about your research, but are not quite sure you want to present a paper at the 2010 Annual Scientific Meeting in Seattle, WA? Consider presenting a poster during the Poster Sessions!!! For more information contact Sondra Doolittle at the Academy office or Poster Sessions Chair, Scott Batterman (scott@battermanengineering.com).

AAFS Topics of Interest and Continuing Education Needs Identified

The following is a comprehensive list of recommended abstract topics based on the continuing education needs of the 2009 Annual Scientific Meeting attendees:

- Domestic Violence
- Geriatric Topics & Elder Abuse
- HIV/AIDS & Domestic Violence
- Computer Program Training
- Forensic Pathology New Research
- Psychiatry, Treatment & Treatment Efficacy
- Injury Biomechanics & Pathology Correl
- ISO 17025 Accreditation
- Mass Spectometry Interpretation Course
- Forensic Nursing & Victimology
- Toxicology Workshops
- Natural Disease Presenting in Forensic Cases
- Extended Ethics Scientific Session
- Physical Anthropology
- Vulnerable Populations of Abuse/Neglect
- HIV & Infectious Diseases

FSF Needs Your Help With the 2010 $ilent Auction!

With your help, the Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) Annual Silent Auction can exceed expectations during the 2010 meeting in Seattle, WA. Does your agency or department have "logo" gear such as hats, patches, pins, coffee mugs, T-shirts, denim shirts, polos, etc., that you would be willing to donate to the auction? Many of us are collectors of such items for display at work or at home.

Through extensive research, the FSF will obtain a number of fun items, but YOUR donation will make a huge difference. Please forward items to Kimberly Wrasse at the Academy office no later than December 31, 2009. You and your agency will be recognized for your donation. Thank you in advance.

Suggested Ideas:  .  .  .  .  .  .  .
2010 Volunteer Form
Interested in Hosting a Forensic Science Educational Conference at Your University?

In December 2000, the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) was released comparing U.S. students with those of 41 other nations. At the end of 12th grade, our students ranked among the very lowest in math and science of the 42 countries. Keenly aware of the deficiencies, middle- and high school science teachers are seeking appropriate methods to improve science competence in students.

With today’s explosion of television programs and media coverage of the latest advancements in the forensic sciences, students have become fascinated with anything relating to the work of the forensic scientist. Wishing to foster a stronger interest in science learning among our nation’s young people, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences now co-sponsors Forensic Science Educational Conferences (FSEC). The goal of the Conferences is to increase science teachers’ knowledge of the forensic sciences and to assist them as they enrich and/or develop challenging, innovative curricula.

To date, 17 conferences have been conducted with one more planned for 2009. AAFS is asking that you consider hosting a Forensic Science Educational Conference at your university during 2010. The conferences are usually held during the spring and summer months with as many as 75 + middle- and high school science teachers attending.

AAFS staff will be happy to assist you in organizing an FSEC. If interested, please contact either Kimberly Wrasse (kwrasse@aafs.org) or Nancy Jackson (njackson@aafs.org) for details.

FSF Student Travel Grants Available

The Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) is pleased to offer three (3) Travel Grants this year for students to assist with travel expenses in attending the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) Annual Meeting in Seattle. A complimentary 2010 meeting registration is also included with this award. This is a wonderful opportunity, and members are encouraged to promote it.

Travel Grant Guidelines:

- The applicant must be a fourth year undergraduate or a graduate student at an accredited four-year college, university, or professional school whose accreditation is acceptable to the FSF Board of Trustees.
- The applicant must have a letter of recommendation from his/her advisor or professor.
- The applicant must submit a 400-600 word essay explaining how attendance at an AAFS meeting will impact his/her career decision.
- The applicant must submit a curriculum vitae including information such as forensic science areas of academic study and practice, academic record, forensic science activities, membership and participation in professional organizations (such as the AAFS), presentations at professional and academic meetings, as well as any publications and other pertinent data related to his/her forensic background.

The deadline for submission of the completed applications is October 15. Please forward a cover letter containing detailed contact information, your letter of recommendation, your essay, and your curriculum vitae electronically to Kimberly Wrasse at kwrasse@aafs.org or by mail to: Kimberly Wrasse, FSF, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904.

Applications are judged by the FSF Student Travel Grant Subcommittee. Selection of Grant recipients is based solely on the information provided in submitted documents.

The FSF Board of Trustees is able to approve the expenses, not to exceed $800 per student, for up to three (3) students this year. A complimentary 2010 meeting registration is also awarded to the grant winners. Good luck!
FSF Student Affiliate Scholarships

Beginning in 2010, the Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) will fund a limited number of AAFS Student Affiliate registrations for the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) Annual Meeting through a “Scholarship Program.” At the present time fifteen (15) scholarships will be available.

The winning abstracts will be selected by the committee. The scholarship abstracts need not be selected for presentation at the meeting, though this could be deemed advantageous by the selection committee. The scholarships will be awarded through the committee’s evaluation of the quality and relevance of the abstracts to the advancement of forensic science by AAFS Student Affiliates. Please check the FSF website in the next few months for additional information on submitting abstract for consideration by the FSF Student Affiliate Scholarship Committee. The deadline for submission is **August 1st**.

To qualify for the scholarship, AAFS Student Affiliates must submit the abstract for the AAFS 2010 program through the online submission system or Call For Paper form. In the awards section, check the box indicating that “the paper should be considered for the FSF Student Affiliate Scholarship.” Once requested, the abstract will be reviewed by the FSF Student Affiliate Scholarship Committee.

---

FSF Jan S. Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Assistance

**Grant Available**

**Purpose:** The purpose of the Jan Grant Fund is to provide Graduate Students with financial assistance to complete their thesis or independent research project as required for a graduate degree in Criminalistics/Forensic Sciences. *The thesis or research project must be in the field of Criminalistics/Forensic Sciences.*

**Eligibility:** The applicant must be a full or part time student completing his or her graduate degree requirements by conducting a research project at an educational institution accredited in the U.S. by a recognized academic body. This project must, in the opinion of the FSF Awards Committee, make a significant scientific contribution to the field of Criminalistics/Forensic Sciences.

**Grant Amount:** The Jan Grant Award amount for this year will be $500. The funding must be used to complete the research project. The recipient must identify in the published abstract and in the presentation the fact that the research was supported by a grant from Jan’s Forensic Science Fund - Grant.

**Application:** Please complete the application (on reverse side) and submit with the required attachments outlined in Part II on the application form.

**Submission Deadline:** July 31, 2009.

Please forward your application (found on page 9) and required supporting documentation electronically to Kimberly Wrasse at kwrasse@aafs.org, or by mail to: Kimberly Wrasse, FSF, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904. Please submit no later than the submission deadline.
Jan Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Grant Application

Please print legibly or type all information. Add additional sheets as necessary.

**PART I - Background Information**

Last Name_____________________________  First Name_________________________  M.I._____   Social Security No.____________________

Mailing Address_______________________________  City___________________  State_______ Zip__________  Country___________________

Home Phone___________________  Daytime Phone___________________  Cell Phone___________________  Email______________________

Marital Status (optional)___________   # of Dependents (optional)_______    Date of Birth___________________   Citizen of _________________

Employment - May include permanent or part-time employment, internships, military experience, or volunteer work.

Current (or last) Employer ________________________________________________  Position Held_____________________________________

Employer's Address ___________________________   City___________________  State_______ Zip__________  Country___________________

Supervisor's Name_____________________________   Work Phone___________________________  Email______________________________

Education - List your education accurately and completely.

Name of Undergraduate School ___________________________________  Full/Part Time _______  Hours Earned Sem ________  Qtr ________

Major ____________________________________  Dates Attended From (mo/yr) _____________________  To (mo/yr) ____________________

Level of Degree Earned_______________________   Graduation Date (mo/yr) _______________________

Name of Graduate School ________________________________________  Full/Part Time _______ Hours Earned Sem ________  Qtr ________

Major ____________________________________  Dates Attended From (mo/yr) _____________________   To (mo/yr) ____________________

Level of Degree Earned_______________________   Graduation Date (mo/yr) _______________________

Name of Graduate Advisor ________________________________   Address ______________________________________________________

Advisor’s Phone _____________________________________    Advisor’s Email _____________________________________________________

*The applicant must be a full or part-time student completing his/her graduate degree by conducting a research project at an educational institution accredited in the USA by a recognized academic body.

**PART II - Thesis/Research Information**

(Attachment I)  Provide a concise three (3) to six (6) page double-spaced thesis/research proposal which addresses the following:

*Title
*Introduction, background, and significance of the proposed research
*Experimental procedure
*Expected results and contributions to the criminalistics (forensic science) knowledge base
*Budget for the total project
*Description of how support from the grant would contribute to the completion of the project

(Attachment II)  Provide a concise one (1) to two (2) page double-spaced statement of qualifications explaining why you believe you will be successful in completing your research. Include reasons why you require financial assistance to complete your research.

(Attachment III)  Curriculum Vitae.  Provide your curriculum vitae of no more than three (3) pages.

(Attachment IV)  Letter of Recommendation.  Provide a letter of recommendation from your research advisor.

(Attachment V)  Most recent cumulative college/university transcripts for your undergraduate and graduate degree(s).

**PART III - Certification/Acknowledgement**

Statement of Applicant

I, the undersigned, certify that all information provided by me in this application is true and factual.  I further agree that should I receive a “Jan S. Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Grant”, I shall acknowledge the grant in any publication resulting from the research supported by the grant.

Signature of Applicant ___________________________________________________                            Date ______________________________
11th Annual FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award Offered

PURPOSE: To nurture a productive dialogue between emerging judicial and forensic standards of reliability and validity, the Forensic Sciences Foundation is pleased to offer the 11th Annual Emerging Forensic Scientist Award. The award will be presented to the author of the best paper on any topic focusing on the reliability and validity of techniques, processes, or methods in a forensic area of the author’s choice.

HOW TO ENTER: Entrants should submit an abstract of the proposed paper to the AAFS Program Committee by August 1, 2009, in compliance with AAFS abstract criteria, and indicate that the abstract is submitted for the Emerging Forensic Scientist Award. Initial review and acceptance/rejection of the abstract will be done by the AAFS Program Committee which will focus specifically on the abstract’s treatment of reliability and validity issues. Multiple abstracts may be submitted for the Program Committee’s review; however, once the Program Committee approves abstracts for presentation, only one may be designated by the presenter as an EFSA entry.

SELECTION PROCESS: Abstracts accepted by the AAFS Program Committee and the EFSA Program Committee will be scheduled for presentation during the scientific session of the section which accepted the abstract, and evaluated by representatives of the Multidisciplinary Awards Committee appointed by the Forensic Sciences Foundation Board of Trustees. Announcement of the winning entry will be made in the Academy News following determination of the winner by the Awards Committee. The Award will be presented during the 2011 AAFS Annual Business Meeting in Chicago, IL.

CRITERIA TO ENTER: An eligible entrant need not be an AAFS member. However, entrants who are AAFS members must be a Student Affiliate or Trainee Affiliate. All entrants must be within three years of completion of formal training (must submit proof from laboratory director or university professor) at the time the paper is presented in 2010. Only the presenter is eligible for the award; no substitutions will be accepted after the application is submitted. The decision of the Awards Committee is final and the amount of the award is firm. The form below must be completed and sent with the abstract submission to the AAFS office by August 1, 2009.

THE AWARD: The award will cover the expense of the recipient’s attendance at the 2011 meeting, including registration, airfare, five nights lodging, and $75/day per diem. A commemorative plaque will also be presented to the award winner at the 2011 AAFS Annual Business Meeting in Chicago, IL.

FSF EMERGING FORENSIC SCIENTIST AWARD ENTRY FORM

I am submitting an abstract to the FSF Review Panel to be considered for the Emerging Forensic Scientist Paper Award. The AAFS Section in which I wish to present is: ______________________________.

I entered the field of forensic science in _______.

Name _________________________________

Employer _________________________________

Street Address _________________________________

City/State/Province _________________________________

Postal/Zip Code _________________________________ Country _________________________________

Telephone _________________________________ Fax _________________________________

Email _________________________________

Send this form by August 1, 2009, to: AAFS 2010 Program Committee 410 N. 21st Street Colorado Springs, CO 80904

I hereby acknowledge that I have read and comply with the requirements noted above and that the information provided is true and correct. Attached is a letter from my affiliated laboratory/university. My resume and completed “Call For Papers” form also are attached.

__________________________________________ _________________________________

Signature Date

The Program Committee solicits the submission of abstracts on topics of interest to the forensic science community. August 1, 2009, is the deadline for the submission of abstracts.

Scientific papers selected for presentation will be divided into two groups:

• Platform Presentation (standard scientific session)
• Poster Session

The Program Committee will select appropriate abstracts from those submitted by the August 1, 2009, deadline. Abstracts of papers must be submitted on the official abstract form which accompanies this announcement. Specific format and content requirements for the abstracts are noted on the form. A current copy of the presenting author’s curriculum vitae must be attached to the original abstract form.

If you wish to submit your abstract on-line, go to the AAFS website at: www.aafs.org.

Notification of Acceptance

Notification of Acceptance will be mailed to all presenting authors by November 15, 2009. Meeting registration materials will be sent to presenting authors.

Oral Presentations

Content

1. The presentation must cover the material reported in the abstract.
2. The opening statement of the presentation should acquaint the audience with the nature and purpose of the paper.
3. Sufficient time should be allocated to the results of the study, and should be stated simply and clearly so that the significant facts can be readily identified.
4. The presentation should be concluded with a concise summary of the essential findings or results.

Time

The final determination as to the length of time that will be allocated to a specific paper rests with the Section Program Chair. However, 15 minute presentations are standard.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ABSTRACT, 35MM SLIDES, & LCD PROJECTION

General Instructions

Content of Abstract
Your abstract should be informative, containing:
1. A short specific title.
2. The Learning Objectives.
3. A sentence statement of the paper’s hypothesis or proposition.
4. A brief synopsis of the content, or statement of the methods, whichever is pertinent.
5. A summary of the results obtained, if pertinent.
6. A general statement of conclusion, if possible.
7. A minimum of one-half page single spaced (approximately 500 words) to a maximum of one full page (approximately 700 words) in length. Abstracts which do not meet the one-half page minimum will not be printed in the AAFS Proceedings.
8. Three key terms.
9. A brief statement of what impact the presentation or research findings will have on the forensic sciences and/or humanity.

Abstracts should NOT be written in the first person.

Format of Abstract
Your abstract must be typed and submitted in a legible format following the instructions provided below:
1. The title, names of authors with respective degree(s), and addresses must be stated exactly as you wish them to appear in the program. Indicate with an asterisk (*) who will be presenting.
2. Type abstract single spaced, 10 point type size, and return it along with a copy on disk.
3. Type all copy, including title, in upper and lower case; capitalize and punctuate exactly as you wish the abstract to appear.
4. Exercise care in preparing the abstract. If unsuitable for publication as received, the abstract will be returned to the author for correction, revision, or completion.

35mm Slides
35mm slide projectors are not part of the standard AV package and must be reserved. Please indicate your request for a slide projector by checking “other” and stating so on item #8 Audio/Visual Requirements on the next page. Noted below are the official guidelines in preparing 35mm slides for presentation at the 2010 AAFS Annual Meeting:
- Limit the information on each slide to a single point or idea.
- Keep slides simple with plenty of open space between lines.
- Limit messages to seven lines or less. Do not use more than seven words per line.
- Do not crowd the slide. Two or more simple slides are better than one that is complex and crowded.
- Use simple graphs and illustrations with a minimum of captions. Avoid using thin lines, dots, dashes, or other specialty lines unless they are very bold and black.
- Avoid backing up the projector. If you need a frame twice, make a duplicate frame.

Word Processor Preparation
An electronic copy of your abstract submission is required. Please follow the format guidelines provided below:
1. Software: Microsoft® Word for Windows is preferred.
2. Type size: 10 pt (10 characters per inch).
4. Margins: top: 1”, left side: 1”, right side: 1”.
5. References/Footnotes: do not put in the header or footer of the document.
6. Do not embed objects, pictures, tables, or charts within document.
7. No boxes, frames, or lines.
8. Remove editing comments, notes, etc., and accept tracked changes in the document prior to saving and submitting.

Specific Instructions
1. Complete attached form.
2. Follow instructions provided in typing abstract.
3. Proofread all information provided.
4. Attach one current copy of presenting author’s curriculum vitae to original abstract form. Return the original abstract, with attached c.v., and a copy on disk, by August 1, 2009, to:

Mailing Address: AAFS
410 North 21st Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Sample Abstract
Injury Pattern Analysis in Fatal Traffic Crash Investigation
Michael D. Freeman, PhD, DC, MPH, Oregon Health and Science University School of Medicine, 3071 Dogwood Drive South, Salem, OR 97302; and Clifford Nelson, MD, Medical Examiner Division, Oregon State Police, 301 Northeast Knott Street, Portland, OR 97212-3092

After attending this presentation, attendees will understand some principles of crash investigation, the necessary elements for the application of Injury Pattern Analysis, characteristic injury patterns of certain types of crashes, and an example of a practical application of Injury Pattern Analysis.

This presentation will impact the forensic community and/or humanity by serving as a key aspect of fatal crash investigation as it can augment traditional means of investigation in a systematized format via interdisciplinary communication and collaboration.

Reconstruction of a fatal crash can be augmented, in certain circumstances, by information gleaned from the postmortem evaluation. Further improvement of the scope and accuracy of an investigation can result from evaluation of the injuries of crash survivors, taking into account the conformity of individual vehicle interiors as well as the movement of the occupants during the crash.

The term “Injury Pattern Analysis (IPA)” is proposed as a description of a fatal crash investigation technique that utilizes accident investigation, and reconstruction techniques, occupant kinematics, postmortem records, hospital and healthcare provider acute injury records, and other evidence as an adjunct to the investigation of homicides resulting from fatal crashes.

The authors will present a case study in IPA as an example of the practical application of the technique. It is recommended that medicolegal death investigators become familiar with the principles of IPA.

Crash, Fatal, Investigation
Complete all of the Following Information

NOTE: In order for your paper to be considered for presentation you are required to complete ALL areas of this form. Incomplete information will be returned to the author for completion. Those who wish to submit their abstract online, go to the AAFS website at: www.aafs.org.

1. Presentation Choice:  □ Oral  □ Poster  □ Breakfast Seminar  □ Luncheon  □ Workshop

2. Section Selection: Please circle the section in which you desire to present a paper: Criminalistics, Digital & Multimedia Sciences, Engineering Sciences, General, Jurisprudence, Odontology, Pathology/Biology, Physical Anthropology, Psychiatry & Behavioral Science, Questioned Documents, Toxicology, Last Word Society

3. Amount of Time Required:

4. Presenting Author, Name & Mailing Address:

5. Is the presenting author an AAFS member/affiliate or applicant?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, AAFS ID #

   a. If AAFS member/affiliate/applicant, please list section affiliation:

   b. Is abstract a candidate for: Pathology/Biology Best Resident Paper?  □ Yes  □ No  (publication ready manuscript required)

   General Section Achievement Award?  □ Yes  □ No

   Physical Anthropology Ellis R. Kerley Award?  □ Yes  □ No

   Physical Anthropology J.L. Angel Student Award?  □ Yes  □ No

   FSF Student Affiliate Scholarship?  □ Yes  □ No

6. Co-Author(s) Name(s), Address(es) and Business Affiliation (attach additional sheet if required):

7. Has this paper been presented or published before?  □ Yes  □ No

   If yes, where and when?

8. Audio/Visual Requirements: Each room will be equipped with a screen, electronic pointer, lectern microphone, and an LCD projector. All additional equipment must be requested and is subject to approval by the Section Chair.

   □ Other Equipment Requested: __________________________________________

9. AAFS Policy on Full Disclosure of Faculty Financial Interests or Relationships

   It is the policy of the Continuing Education Program of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences to ensure balance, independence, objectivity, and scientific rigor in all its educational activities. All faculty participating in these programs are expected to disclose to the program audiences: (1) any real or apparent conflict(s) of interest related to the content of their presentations, (2) discussion of unapproved (unlabeled) uses of pharmaceuticals/medical devices, and (3) ongoing research (preliminary) data. The intent of this disclosure is not to prevent a speaker with a financial or other relationship from making a presentation, but rather to provide listeners with information on which they can make their own judgments about the presentation. It is also the policy of the AAFS that all speakers must disclose whether non-FDA approved uses of pharmaceutical products or medical devices are included in the presentation. In keeping with this procedure, the faculty or presenter is required to complete and sign the following disclosure statements:

   a. Will your presentation include any discussion of commercial products or services?  □ Yes  □ No

      If yes, please list all manufacturer(s) or provider(s) and describe the nature of the relationship(s) (attach additional pages as needed):

   b. Is this activity/presentation financially supported?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, by whom? __________________________________________ and in what form?  □ Grant Support  □ Paid Consultant  □ Employee  □ Shareholder  □ Speakers Bureau

   c. Does this presentation include the discussion or use of unapproved (unlabeled) pharmaceuticals/medical devices and/or ongoing research?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, please describe (attach additional pages as needed):

   Disclosed information will be made available to participants in the Final Program provided to all registrants.

10. Complete the following:

   a. I hereby acknowledge that my abstract will be published in the AAFS Proceedings if accepted for presentation.  □ Yes  □ No

   b. I hereby acknowledge by submission of this form that the Journal of Forensic Sciences reserves the right of first publication of this paper if it is accepted for presentation at the AAFS Annual Meeting.  □ Yes  □ No

      The Journal of Forensic Sciences’ right of this publication is limited to six months from the date of presentation.

   c. I hereby acknowledge permission to tape my presentation at the AAFS Annual Meeting.  □ Yes  □ No

   d. I will comply with the AAFS guidelines for legible 35mm slides, LCD projection, and that structured abstracts are required.  □ Yes  □ No

   I hereby acknowledge that I have read and comply with the requirements noted herein and that the information provided is true and correct.

   Signature  ____________________________  Date  ____________________________

   (Abstract Form on Reverse Side)
Please state what the attendee can expect to learn, retain, or implement into his or her practice.

Please state how your presentation will impact the attendees in terms of: knowledge, competence, and/or performance.
The 17th FSEC was held June 8-10, 2009, at CU-Boulder. Seventy-seven enthusiastic middle- and high school teachers from across the country participated in the wide array of forensic topic lectures and hands-on workshops. The conference was hosted by David Norris (General) with the assistance of steering committee members Jane Bock (General), Biological Sciences Initiative representative Tammy Maldonado, and CU Anatomy/Forensic Biology Senior Instructor Ruth Heisler. In addition, the conference was aided extensively by Julie Graf, Director of the Biological Sciences Initiative, and her very capable staff.

The lecture presenters were all professionals involved with forensic work and/or forensic education. They included DNA and mitochondrial DNA forensics expert Phillip Danielson, Boulder County Coroner Tom Faure (General); Brenda Harris of the Broomfield Crime Lab; Kim Nichols and CU Instructor Ruth Heisler; retired Judge and former AAFS president Haskell Pitluck (Jurisprudence); Jim Reed from NecroSearch International; City of Boulder Detective Tom Trujillo; Sherlock Hounds (drug sniffing dogs) and handlers Beth Kelly and Nita Bitner; and Jane Bock and David Norris.

In addition to lectures, the participants engaged in hands-on exercises in laboratory-based forensic science, including Fingerprint Analysis, Forensic DNA, Forensic Botany, Forensic Entomology, and Forensic Anthropology. Credit for assistance in developing the laboratories and demonstrating the activities goes to Kim Nichols, Jesse Robertson, Katrina Eike, Ruth Heisler, Jane Bock, David Norris and three versatile students, Janessa Jacobs, Lindsey Schroeder and Amrita Chager. And last, but not least, a big thank you to Kay Pitluck, volunteer-extraordinaire and photographer.
Participants of the Boulder FSEC enjoy the lecture portion of the day.

Insect species are examined in the entomology laboratory.

In the DNA laboratory, participants drop everything to get down to serious business.

Bones are measured in the forensic anthropology laboratory.

Participants of the Boulder FSEC enjoy the lecture portion of the day.

Sherlock Hounds handlers Beth Kelly and Nita Bittner demonstrate the canines’ abilities.
The Schizophrenia of Academic Science

With the Obama administration, science has become more important than it has in many years. This increased interest brings with it badly needed funding for basic science; we can only hope a trickle down will occur for forensic science. A certain pragmatism, however, has crept into the voices of sciences leaders. For example, Bruce Alberts, Editor-in-Chief of Science said in a recent editorial, “I want to encourage and support not only research scientists, but everyone who would use science in productive ways for society.”

Ralph Cicerone, the president of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, in another Science editorial, said that scientists should provide the public with answers to questions such as “What do your results mean? What could they mean for the public?...Do you have any research connections with new or established businesses?” and further noted that the “positive impacts of research are not always visible from a distance.”

These sound suspiciously like things an applied science would do—provide practical results to society. Perhaps academia is feeling the social pinch of being too cloistered for too long without providing transparency or practical justification for its research funds. I find it disingenuous—although I’m sure it’s unintentional—when scientists and educators say forensic science is suitable to encourage students to study science but not good enough to be a “real” science. A recent New York Times article on forensic science as a educational tool neatly captured this schizophrenia. Compare the following quotes from the article:

“...schools everywhere are capitalizing on the subject’s sex appeal to inspire respect for the power of the scientific mind-set generally.”

“They [the high school students] end up getting a lot of serious science without necessarily realizing it.”

“Forensic science also emphasizes what scientists complain is too often lacking in standard science education: Hands-on lab work.”

Forensic science is so sexy it hoodwinks students into learning science without even realizing it, yet forensic science is an excellent science program because it teaches the students things they don’t get in other science courses. Yet the article goes on to describe the science behind many of the techniques the students use, which are the same as that used in forensic laboratories: The biology of hairs, the chemistry of stomach contents, the physics of blood stain patterns. Am I the only one seeing the gap here? Forensic science cannot be the mere candy-coating that makes the bitter science easier to swallow, the “science-lite,” the diet-science of academia. And if high school teachers can get their students to see the science underlying the forensic-specific techniques used in operational laboratories, why have we as a profession failed to do so for the courts, the public, and our critics? Most of the building blocks lie at our feet: The very methods we employ, the curricula in our educational programs, the research in our journals.

On another note, the economic downturn has jilted students away from business and towards other possible careers, including science. Students realize that government service is an honorable career option, many being inspired to public service in response to the September 11 attacks, and want to do things that help and support society; I’ve made this point about women in forensic science elsewhere. Forensic science embodies the combination of government and science and with over 390,000 government jobs unfilled, it would seem our discipline is ripe for expansion and increased recognition as a science that is current, effective, and relevant. What are we waiting for?

Section News

CRIMINALISTICS

Source: Barbara E. Llewlyn, MS, PhD
Section Program Chair

Changes have been made to the format of the 2010 Annual Meeting in Seattle. The scientific sessions will begin on Wednesday morning. We are planning a section-wide session on Wednesday morning to address the theme for the meeting, “Putting Our Forensic House in Order: Examining Validation and Expelling Incompetence.” The deadline for submitting abstracts is August 1. Please consider presenting an oral or poster presentation addressing this topic or any new research or methodology you would like to share with the community. Please follow the guidelines set forth by the Academy regarding abstract submission. The abstracts should be well written and conform to proper length and format. We are looking forward to making this an excellent meeting.

The section business meeting will be held after the morning session on Wednesday. It is extremely important that a quorum representing ten percent of our voting members attend. The business meeting offers members the opportunity to voice their opinions and influence the future direction of the section and the Academy. The business meeting is also an occasion to recognize the special accomplishments of the section’s Paul L. Kirk and Meritorious Service Award honorees.

Don’t forget to contribute to the Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF). The FSF supports research through Lucas and Acorn Grants, and helps to foster the next generation of forensic science leaders through the Emerging Forensic Scientist Award and FSF Student Travel Grants. Also, remember to contribute to the “High Five for Forensic Science Research.” Every member is encouraged to contribute at least $5. Information for contributing to these worthwhile causes can be found on page 34 of this newsletter.

Moderators are needed for the scientific sessions. As a moderator you will earn points towards promotion to Fellow. The moderators are responsible for collecting the presentations of their session before the meeting, introducing the speakers, and keeping the session on time. Please consider moderating a session, it is a great opportunity for the membership to make the annual meeting a success. We are in need of your help. If you are interested, please contact Section Program Chair Barbara Llewelyn (barb4n6@sbcglobal.net) or Co-Chair Ken Williams (ckwill@comcast.net).

DIGITAL & MULTIMEDIA SCIENCES

Sources: Eoghan Casey, MA
Section Program Chair
Jessica Reust-Smith, MFS
Section Program Co-Chair

The new Digital & Multimedia Sciences Section has generated significant excitement in the community and already has 66 members. We expect significant applications in 2009 and encourage qualified professionals to apply for membership before the October 1 deadline.

The Academy is becoming a focal point for advancement and professionalization of the field. In the past year, three papers and a technical note related to Digital & Multimedia Sciences have been accepted for publication in the JFS:

Identification of an Eccentricity in the Date / Time Metadata of a PAL MiniDV Recording by Lacey and Koenig

Individual Camera Identification Using Correlation of Fixed Patter Noise in Image Sensors by Kurosawa, Kuroki and Akiba

Investigation Delayed is Justice Denied: Proposals for Expediting Forensic Examinations of Digital Evidence by Casey, Ferraro, and Nguyen

Source Camera Identification for Heavily JPEG Compressed Low Resolution Still Images by Alles, Gerardts, and Veenman

continued on page 26
Section News cont.

To encourage broader participation in the community, the publication requirement for membership promotion within the Digital & Multimedia Sciences Section has been expanded to include any peer-reviewed journal or conference proceedings, in addition to the JFS.

On a related note, AAFS members can now obtain access to the online versions of two journals: Digital Investigation and Computer Law & Security Review (see http://www.sciencedirect.com/di-clsr).

The overarching theme of the 2010 Annual Meeting is “Putting Our Forensic House In Order: Examining Validation and Expelling Incompetence.” In keeping with the theme, we encourage people to draw inspiration for paper topic submissions from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report titled “Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward” that was released on February 18, 2009 (see http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12589). The challenges described for the digital and multimedia sciences field in the report (page 5-41) is copied below:

“Digital evidence has undergone a rapid maturation process. This discipline did not start in forensic laboratories. Instead, computers taken as evidence were studied by police officers and detectives who had some interest or expertise in computers. Over the past 10 years, this process has become more routine and subject to the rigorous and expectations of other fields of forensic science. Three holdover challenges remain: (1) the digital evidence community does not have an agreed certification program or list of qualifications for digital forensic examiners; (2) some agencies still treat the examination of digital evidence as an investigative rather than a forensic activity; and (3) there is wide variability in and uncertainty about the education, experience, and training of those practicing this discipline.”

Any relevant paper will be considered, and the following topics of interest include:

- Meeting the challenges set forth by the NAS report;
- Recent scientific advances in digital forensics;
- Case studies demonstrating novel solutions;
- Developments in processes and practices;
- What will digital forensics look like in 5 years;
- How digital forensics can support other forensic disciplines;
- How to deal with large data sets in any forensic discipline;
- Quality assurance and control in digital forensics; and
- Management of digital forensic units/labs.

Papers can be specialized and highly technical since these are directed at your peers. Pre-meeting workshops, on the other hand, are aimed at the entire AAFS membership, and the AAFS Program Committee will only select one or two workshops from our section. The AAFS Program Committee generally looks for workshops that will benefit the most people, so pre-meeting workshops should have broad appeal not just to practitioners in digital forensics, but other forensic disciplines as well. Be sure to submit papers for the upcoming annual meeting, and encourage your colleagues to participate as well.

Source: Roy R. Crawford, PE, Section Chair

During the second half of May, I traveled to Kazakhstan for a week and a half with Academy President Thomas Bohan and several members of the Academy. Our goal was to assist our hosts in bringing their crime laboratories and other forensic science work up to international standards so that they can gain accreditation and the pride that comes with being known for having modern world standards. Many hours were spent discussing business while socializing, especially around long dinners. During the days we participated in round table discussions and plenary sessions with members of the Kazakh forensic community as well as breakout sessions with people with specific common interests.

Some of my most enjoyable and productive times were spent with crash reconstructionists in their offices. There would normally be at least one Kazakh present who had a passing knowledge of English, and we’d switch the computer between English and Russian. A favorable aspect of being engineers is that many diagrams, formulas, and equations didn't require translation although hand waving often helped. For example, they understood instantly when I pressed my hand on the desktop and forcefully slid it along to show that “f” in an equation stood for the coefficient of friction. The reconstructionists from Kazakhstan were proud to use Russian computer programs to assist in their calculations.

Tom Bohan recommended they upgrade to PC-Crash and I pointed out the advantages of photogrammetry and laser scanning, tools they seemed to be unfamiliar with. Although in one location they had received some training by a reconstructionist from the United States, I was asked to return to hold seminars. Since I don’t know if that will fit into my schedule or that I am necessarily the best person to do this, you should consider going next time. I guarantee it will be one of the most interesting and entertaining trips you’ll ever take, especially if you enjoy horse meat, fermented mare’s milk, and having the honor of being presented with a sheep’s head, the latter after which you by tradition start by cutting off its ears and giving them to the children. You give each other part to a member of your dinner party according to which suits them best. Tom gave the brains to Smithsonian Institution Forensic Anthropologist Douglas Ubelaker for being the most intellectual, the eyes to his daughter Cecilia, who is an image analyst and picture editor for the New York Times, the tongue to the one he considered our best speaker, and, for me, a check, for being the cheekiest.

While you’re updating your passport to represent us on the next trip to Kazakhstan, please get a technical paper or two finished and submitted by August 1st. There will be some exciting changes in the annual meeting in Seattle next February that you won’t want to miss!
There is less than one month before the August 1st deadline for abstract submissions; we hope you are busy finalizing those abstracts! Program Co-Chairs Angela Geis and Claire Shepard strongly encourage early submission to alleviate any last minute problems with the online submission process.

As noted in the previous newsletter, the Plenary Session will be incorporated into the Tuesday night Welcoming Reception at the Seattle meeting. The section luncheons will be eliminated on Wednesday due to schedule changes and scientific sessions will begin on Wednesday morning. The General Section Business Meeting will be conducted as usual on Wednesday afternoon before the AAFS Business Meeting. We hope you participate in both business meetings. After all, you should have a direct interest in the organization that represents forensic science internationally. This is also your opportunity to express opinions about the direction not only of your section but the AAFS as a whole.

Due to the schedule change, we have an additional morning to view scientific session presentations. With the release of the NAS report, there should be plenty of people eager to share their knowledge and present their research and case examples. Remember, our scientific session is only as good as our members’ willingness and efforts to present. It is a direct reflection of our professionalism.

We also encourage you to consider presenting a workshop, which allows more in depth coverage of topics, particularly of multidisciplinary interest. If you are submitting an abstract for a workshop, please consider also submitting a condensed version for the scientific session.

For those who are Associate Members working towards promotion to Member, or Member looking to advance to Fellow, please complete your Application for Promotion now. The deadline for submission is October 1. Fellow is the highest rank obtainable by a forensic scientist and looks great on your CV! Benefits of being a Fellow also include voting privileges or serving as a section or AAFS officer.

If you know of a colleague who is deserving of recognition for their contributions to our section, please consider nominating them for one of the General Section Awards. Send your nominations to Alan Boehm, Awards Chair. Please take the time to recognize those who deserve it!

The General Section is severely under represented in applications for forensic science grants through the Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF). While the deadline for Lucas and Acorn Grants has passed (June 13), please take the time to read about the Student Travel Grant and Student Affiliate Scholarships. Details are in each AAFS newsletter and posted on the AAFS website. These funds are available to YOU if you meet the requirements and take the time to submit applications.

A speaker at a recent judicial conference commented to the crowd that "judges do not have to be the prisoners of crappy evidence offered by attorneys, nor does justice itself have to be a prisoner of crappy evidence." The lecture that followed emphasized that, with the demise of the Frye standard from a 45-state mandate to a mere 15 (and many of those hanging by a thread), the judicial gatekeeping function needs to be exercised actively by our judges to ensure the quality of the information given to our courts.

Daubert was supposed to allow for the admission of evidence that was the product of valid and reliable "hard" scientific theories and of the methods applying those theories. Kumho Tire applied the same critical analysis to the quality of evidence that is not the product of "hard" science. Nevertheless, (novel) innovative techniques that might be reliable are frequently confused and conflated with idiosyncratic "one-off" science whose application relies on nothing more than the single testifying expert's say-so. In this regard, judges have proven to be lackadaisical, credulous and ignorant gatekeepers.

Even in situations where proven scientific analyses (is) are employed, courts are giving short shrift to making the proponent of the evidence demonstrate the (adequate) proper application of method and technique before the result or opinion is admitted as evidence. Courts regularly confuse opinion with fact when it comes out of a mouth attached to a lab coat, though recent experience tells us that many people wearing lab coats practice disciplines that are not scientific. Transparency of method and technique are often treated as skunks at a garden party.

Recent news tells us that in Minnesota, it took massive litigation to (produce) force the disclosure of the computer programs that drive evidential (evidentiary?) breath test machines--programming language that one independent website indicated had flaws in how it caused the analysis to be conducted and reported within the machine. This requires further analysis, but I heard one proponent of keeping the program secret say that if breath test source code was ever released, the next step would be to look into the programming of voting machines, which would signal the end of democracy. I suggest that person got it backward: it is through transparency and honesty that democracy is best served.

In criminal cases, life and liberty are at stake. There is no excuse for withholding information underlying any evidence used to prove guilt. Critical analysis of the basis for that evidence, and skepticism of unfounded claims by an active judiciary must be encouraged by attorneys and especially by scientists and forensic practitioners who can speak to (instruct the law in) objectivity in analysis and to the proper application of the scientific method. There is a touch of the Golden Rule to the ethic of all this: I wonder if forensic practitioners whose evidence has resulted in wrongful convictions would want their own trials to rest on the quality of science they provided others. That is a profoundly ethical question.

continued on page 28
Section News cont.  
In the Academy, it is the existence of the Jurisprudence Section that keeps pointing to the purpose for forensic science—providing solid evidence to courts in the service of justice. Our section grows slowly but steadily. We can announce a new message board for section members, www.aafsjurisprudence.info. Please check it out. Between now and the end of summer, I would like to ask the Section to get the word out to colleagues and persons in the legal field who might be interested in membership in the Academy. I was recently pleasantly surprised when a public defender visited my chambers asking me how to sign up. After two big murder trials, and witnessing some very sloppy DNA analysis (not great control for contamination at the lab bench—she is a former researcher for drug research), this young lawyer wanted to know more about forensic science, and how to ensure the "science" is a part of things for her trials. Persons who are looking for advancement (and we are very interested in helping you advance in the Academy) should get in touch with program people or section officers to see what can be done to be a part of the next meeting and to advance their membership status.

Next, abstracts for papers, and planning for joint sessions continues apace. Get in touch with Paul Singer, Christine Funk, Andrew Northrup, and Andy Suhner, our program committee if you have ideas. The Academy is actively soliciting breakfast speakers—if you think you have something to wake people up, PUT IT IN WRITING!

Just a reminder that abstracts are due August 1 for February's meeting in Seattle - that's less than two months away! We've already received some great ideas and several sessions are already in the works - but it's definitely not too late to get involved and submit your paper. Remember, presenting a paper at a meeting is a quick and easy way to get yourself promoted up to Member and ultimately Fellow.

To make things easier, if you want to share ideas with others in the section, we've created a message board for that purpose - www.aafsjurisprudence.info - on it you can post messages and coordinate with other members to develop ideas, collaborate on papers, and get general feedback on your proposed topics. We look forward to reviewing your submissions soon.

A program is building that includes discussions of judicial and legal education to prepare 'our' side of the case to deal with evidence and its evaluation. The psychology of how fact finders perceive forensic evidence is a suggested topic, as is how to educate forensic scientists to better ply their trade. Evaluating the NAS report and ways it can impact forensic practice today and in the future are of primary concern, and we welcome all comers who might present something topical and useful.

Have a great summer, and get those members to apply, the abstracts submitted, and the arrangements made to travel to Seattle next February.

We also wish to congratulate long-time Fellow Bob Joling on the publication of his book Shame! Shame!: A Saga of Spade Cooley: King of Western Swing! It is a true story of one of the famous big band leaders of the late 1930s through 1960 involving spousal abuse - he beat up his first wife and killed his second wife - and Hollywood degradation - or development (depending on your viewpoint). It will be available from Amazon and on Kindle by July, we hope, and also found at booksurge.com.

ODONTOLOGY

Source: Paula C. Brumit, DDS, Section Program Chair

Time flies! It seems just a few weeks ago when we were attending the AAFS meeting in Denver. Now, August is right around the corner. The deadline for abstracts to present oral, poster, and workshop presentations is August 1. Submit your abstracts and CV online at the Academy website (www.aafs.org).

There will be a major change in the scheduling of scientific sessions at the AAFS meeting in Seattle. This year, all disciplines will begin their sessions on Wednesday at 9 a.m. and continue until 12 noon. The Wednesday afternoon business meetings will be at the same time as in years previous. Due to the earlier start of presentations on Wednesday morning, the scientific session will end at approximately 12 noon on Friday. Please be aware of the new change.

The Age Estimation Committee of the American Board of Forensic Odontology is planning an Age Estimation Workshop in conjunction with the 2010 AAFS Meeting in Seattle. The workshop will be held on Sunday, February 21, prior to the AAFS Meeting and will consist of both lecture and hands-on participation by the attendees. Its objective is to present accepted dental age estimation techniques for children, adolescents, and adults as well as some anthropologic techniques including hand/wrist, fetal age estimation, and bone ossification. If you have an interest to participate in the workshop, additional information and the registration information will be published in the next AAFS newsletter and will also be available on the American Board of Forensic Odontology website (www.abfo.org).

The American Board of Forensic Odontology will present its first Dental Identification Workshop in conjunction with the 2010 AAFS Meeting in Seattle. The workshop held February 26-27, 2010, and will accept “full participants” for the Friday and Saturday sessions, as well as “attendees” for the Friday evening lecture presentations only. The presentations will focus on forensic dental examination, comparison and identification techniques and will cover pertinent topics such as exposure and resection of jaws, dental features useful in comparative dental identification (restorative and anatomic), missing and unidentified person reports and databases (NCIC,NAMUS, VICTIMS), Odontosearch, XRF, CBCT, AM/PM radiograph superimposition, cremated remains examination, dental biological profiling, the role of the forensic dentist in mass fatality incident identification, preparation and components of a forensic dental identification report, and more. If you wish to participate, attend the lectures, or would like additional information about the workshop, please contact Peter Loomis (peterdds@msn.com; 505-271-2381or 505-463-1675).
PATHOLOGY/BIOLOGY

Source: Kim A. Collins, MD, Section Secretary

As Chair of Path/Bio Section of the AAFS last year, Scott Denton formed an ad hoc committee, “Independence and Integrity in Medical Examiner and Coroner Determinations” (IIMECD). After many recent reports of possible intimidation, testimony conflicts, and recent lawsuits specifically against forensic determinations, it was felt by the leadership that investigation was needed. Furthermore, the recent NAS Report stated that these were important points of focus in forensic sciences. The ad hoc committee has nine members from the Path/Bio Section: Scott Denton, Craig Mallak (Chair), John Howard, Jeffrey Jentzen, William Oliver, Jamie Downs, Fredric Hellman, Andrew Baker, and Lindsey Thomas. This will be the start of a formal analysis of the issues of independence and integrity, immune from outside pressures within the ME/Coroner system environment.

It is also advantageous that our forensic science colleagues outside of the Path/Bio Section lend their input, as the recent Academy statement on organ retention that was so successfully spearheaded by Victor Weedn and Tracey Corey. We will look for advice and support from the AAFS Board and Jurisprudence Section.

It is never too early to start working on the meeting abstracts for poster and platform presentations. Keith Pinckard is anticipating many excellent submissions for 2010 (which is really just around the corner!). If monies are needed for projects, don’t forget the Research Award Committee. Funds are available! Last but not least, remember our trainees and the scientific paper competition. The Best Research Paper competition needs support including quality entries and submission of completed manuscripts before the meeting!

Next newsletter, I hope to focus on national/governmental updates regarding regulations in forensic sciences. Stay tuned!

PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Source: Bradley J. Adams, PhD, Section Secretary

Hopefully everyone is aware that the abstract submission deadline for the 2010 AAFS meeting is right around the corner. All abstracts must be submitted by August 1st. Please be aware that the Academy tracks “no shows” and late cancellations for both poster and platform presentations during the meetings. A list of names is subsequently distributed to section program chairs.

Michael Warren would like to announce this year’s William R. Maples Scholarship Award winners at the University of Florida. The two winners are Carlos Zambrano and Laurel Freas. Each receives a $2,000 award. The Maples Endowment Fund was established in February of 1997 with the University of Florida Foundation. The endowment is funded by generous private donations and all proceeds go towards the Maples Scholarship. The goal of the endowment is to provide a scholarship for graduate students at the University of Florida specializing in forensic identification and trauma analysis.

Peer Moore-Jansen would like to announce that Christina Malone is the winner of this year’s J. Lawrence Angel Student Presentation Award Competition. Her presentation at the 2009 AAFS meeting in Denver was A Radiographic Assessment of Pediatric Fracture Healing and Time since Injury.

Also, congratulations go out to Todd Fenton who received the 2009 Kerley Award from the Ellis R. Kerley Forensics Foundation. His paper, A Forensic Pathology Tool to Predict Skull Fracture Patterns - Part 1: Investigations on Infant Cranial Bone Fracture Initiation and Interface Dependent Fracture Patterns, was co-authored with Nicholas Passalacqua. Timothy Baumer, Brian Powell, and Roger Hau.

The Scientific Working Group for Forensic Anthropology (SWGANTH) Board met May 19-21 in Washington, DC. Paul Sledzak hosted the meeting at the NTSB conference facility. Drafts of procedural guidelines were discussed, as was the proposal to organize a SWGAN TH symposium at the 2010 AAFS meeting. The proposed symposium would offer a public vetting of the draft guidelines prior to being finalized at the spring 2010 SWGAN TH Board meeting. Current versions of the draft guidelines can be located at the group’s website: www.swnth.org, and anyone working in the forensic anthropology realm is encouraged to send their comments to the SWGAN TH Secretary, Angi Christensen, at secretary@swganth.org.

Lastly, it is with great sadness to announce the passing of Craig Lahren. Craig, a Fellow of the Academy, had a long history as a forensic anthropologist, and was a good friend to many of us.

Hugh Berryman reports that two funds have been set up in Craig’s name. One is the Children’s Education Fund (for Craig’s two daughter Tina and Douglas), and the other is the Washburn Methodist Church Building Fund. Checks for either fund can be mailed to Rebecca Lahren at her home address: 3112 11th Street SW, Center, ND 58530.

PSYCHIATRY & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

Source: John L. Young, MD, Section Chair

It’s time to be planning for the fall conferences, and high on members’ lists should be the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law (AAPL) annual meeting in Baltimore. Included in the program will be the customary Forensic Sampler, focusing this year on forensic aspects of fire-setting and bombing. Douglas Carpenter from the Engineering Sciences Section will explain how forensic engineers investigate fires and explosions. Douglas Ubelaker from the Physical Anthropology Section will review thermal alterations in bone and how they relate to case interpretations in forensic anthropology. Allan Warnick from Odontology will illustrate how new hand-held x-ray units, digital radiographic systems, and computer generated identification systems enable the identification of deceased victims of fires and explosions. Daniel Martell from Psychiatry & Behavioral Science

continued on page 30
will explore the arson victim’s experience, with attention paid to issues of loss, survivor guilt, problems involving the perpetrator, and a range of psychological sequelae including depression and post-traumatic stress. Additionally, issues involved in the treatment of arson survivors will be discussed. Robert Weinstock and Alan Felthous will co-moderate the session.

Above all, the session and the meeting itself will provide an enjoyable learning and integrating experience. For further information, visit www.aapl.org.

News for this column from members is always warmly welcome at jlmyoung@pol.net.

**QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS**

**Source:** Carl R. McClary, BA, Section Secretary

With summer upon us, our thoughts turn to regional meetings being held around the country. I attended the Southeastern Association of Forensic Document Examiners (SAFDE) annual meeting in April and was impressed with not only the presentations, but the in depth inkjet printing workshop given by Gerald LePorte. SAFDE always organizes an informative and thought provoking agenda. If you haven’t attended, you should join them next year. The meeting is usually held in the Atlanta area.

Speaking of meetings, the annual conference of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners (ASQDE) will be held August 8-13, 2009, at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Dearborn, MI. The technical program begins August 9. This year’s theme is “Document Deja Vu - What Was Old is New Again,” and among the local sites not to be missed is the Ford Museum including Greenfield Village. Program Chairs Larry Olson and Rigo Vargas promise a great program including an indentations sequencing workshop, a challenging signatures workshop, an identification of inkjet printing workshop, panel discussions on the NAS report, and the evolution of the discipline since the “exorcism” article. For more information, visit the website at www.asqde.org. For additional information you may contact Larry Olson (312-533-7025, larry.olson@ci.irs.gov) or Rigo Vargas (312-533-7021, rigo.vargas@ci.irs.gov).

If you have any questions regarding the AAFS program for next year, be sure to contact Karen Runyon or Kathleen Storer.

**TOXICOLOGY**

**Source:** Phil M. Kemp, PhD, Section Program Chair

As has been stated before, the Toxicology Section program for the 2009 meeting was excellent. Kudos to all who were involved in the planning and implementation of the social events and scientific sessions. As I am finding out, these things don’t just happen. There are a myriad of people working tirelessly behind the scenes to make our section’s meeting a success.

The preparations for the 2010 meeting in Seattle are well underway and it looks like it will be another super time for learning from colleagues through conversations and presentations. If you plan on submitting a workshop or abstract for the 2010 meeting, get with it! August 1 is your hard and fast deadline (no exceptions). Ruth Winecker (winecker@ocme.unc.edu; 919-445-4428), the Toxicology Section Workshop Chair for 2010, is putting together an excellent menu of workshops. If you have an idea for a workshop, contact her and she will help you get through the submission process. While the Academy has the final say on the workshops offered, Ruth and the section officers will have input. So get to work on your ideas!

As for me, Phil Kemp (pkemp@arlok.com; 405-271-1144), your 2010 Section Program Chair, the task of putting together the overall scientific and social programs is moving steadily forward. We are excited about an additional scientific session on Wednesday this year as a result of a change in the Academy meeting schedule. This means more presentations and more information getting to the members! In addition, plans are being finalized for the Annual Lectureship in Toxicology. Dr. Caleb Banta-Green from the University of Washington has graciously accepted my invitation. Dr. Banta-Green, along with environmental chemist Dr. Jennifer Field of Oregon State University, has been involved in research into the analysis of municipal wastewater as a mechanism for studying the epidemiology of drug use. This research is fascinating and will pique your interest as to how environmental chemistry and forensic toxicology might collaborate in future research.

A number of the section members have offered their help with all aspects of the 2010 meeting. To them I say a big thank you and I’ll be in touch. We always need assistance with the program, whether it be moderating a session or changing the oil of the program chair’s car. If you can help, please let me or any of the section officers know. Section Chair, Jeri Roper-Miller (jerimiller@rit.org), Section Secretary, Kenneth Ferslew (FERSLEW@mail.etsu.edu), and I are willing and able to assist with any issues you may have. Thanks, everyone, and we’ll see you in Seattle!
The Forensic Sciences Foundation, Inc., gratefully acknowledges the generous contributions made to the Foundation and its Endowment Fund. Please accept our apologies if your name has been inadvertently omitted and contact the AAFS office as soon as possible with the correction. This listing reflects contributions received from 8/01/08 through 5/31/09.

The Fund’s balance through 6/01/09 was $440,359.96. Additionally, the Endowment has provided $117,383 in awards and grants since its inception in 1990.
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FSF “I Gave An Hour” Contributors

Former FSF Trustee Gil Brogdon came up with a great idea for Academy members with advanced degrees. The idea was for everyone to consider contributing to the FSF the equivalent of one hour of their annual salary or the equivalent of the fee charged for one hour of consultation. The forensic sciences have been good to all of us. If you make a lot, consider contributing a lot! For salaried persons, one hour represents about 1/2000th of annual income. For those who receive consulting fees, please consider contributing an amount consistent with one hour (or more) of what you charge for consultation. Below is a list of the “I Gave an Hour” contributors thus far. The fund’s balance through 06/01/09 was $14,795. For those of you who would like to contribute, please complete the IGAH form and return to the AAFS office.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td>Anne R. Manly, AB</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Kevin M. Dugan, DDS</td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td>Robin A. Scheper, DDS</td>
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</tr>
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<td>John L. Sang, MS</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David R. Senn, DDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jay A. Siegel, PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Richard R. Souviron, DDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda C. Sozer, PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Duane E. Spencer, DDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Warren Street, JD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Suggs, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose A. Lorente, MD, PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Sweet, DMD, PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles N. Derrick, PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anjali R. Swienton, MFS, JD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren D. Tewes, DDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert L. Thompson, MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. Thompson, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diane K. Tolliver, MPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. Thompson, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas H. Ubelaker, PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril H. Wecht, MD, JD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard S. Westberry, DMD</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Barbara C. Wolf, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert E. Wood, DDS, PhD</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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*Muzzling Scientists via Litigation: Cases Galore*

Peer review is the mainstay of scientific rectitude. But peer review can be highly critical of that which is reviewed. As such it could be or could border on being libelous and as such actionable in the courts. It is one thing to be scrupulously honest. It is another to reign in one’s true analysis for fear of being sued.

In a recent “opinion” article by David Allen Green in New Scientist magazine (16 May 2009 titled “Don’t criticize, or we’ll sue”) he warns scientists of the dire consequences of telling it as it is in critiquing the work product of another scientist or manufacturer of scientific equipment. Although this short “opinion” piece addresses, mainly, the situation in England, the author does comment that “English libel law can be used to discourage or prevent publication anywhere in the world if what is published will be seen by even a few readers in England or elsewhere.”

This essay highlights a libel action before the High Court in London in which, at a preliminary hearing, British science writer Simon Singh was censured for an article he wrote for the Guardian newspaper in April 2008. In that article (Singh, “Beware the Spinal Trap, The Guardian, April 19, 2008) Singh called the alternative medicine practiced by the British Chiropractic Association in treating children’s ailments “bogus.” The English high court has now found this statement to be libel.

In another English defamation action, later withdrawn by the plaintiff, Matthew Rath, also writing in the Guardian, was sued, and the Guardian as well, for panning vitamin supplements in Africa to fight the spread of AIDS.

And in yet another case, involving a purported new-fangled polygraph technique the two researchers who wrote a heavy-handed critique (Anders, Eriksson & Francisco Lacerda, “Charlatanry in Speech Science: A Problem to Be Taken Seriously,” in the International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law, vol. 14: 169-193 December 2007) of this claimed new technology were threatened with a legal action if they resolutely plodded on with the publication of their hypercritical research findings. It is said the threats caused the publisher to remove the challenged article from its website but only the online availability of the article.

Of course truth, as Oscar Wilde found to his embarrassment, is a complete defense to a libel action. Better yet is the New York statute preventing “libel tourism” so that “English libel judgments” cannot be enforced in New York courts.

In a worst case, for scientists that is, Peter Wilmshurst, a consultant cardiologist at a hospital in England and co-leader of a clinical trial of a medical device said to aid persons suffering from migraine headaches was sued in England for comments made by him to a U.S. online news service disparaging a medical device promoted by NMT Medical of Boston. Dyer, Clare, “Cardiologist is sued for comments on potential migraine device,” B.M.J. 2008, 337:a2412.
The author of this New Scientist essay sums up this litigious situation by saying “there is something deeply wrong that legitimate scientific criticism can be silenced in this say.” He could also have pointed to its deleterious impact on the matter of peer review.

A discussion of the litigation spawned by the use of Tasers by the police involving the manufacturers attempts to curb criticisms of its Tasers by anyone, including the reports of autopsies conducted by medical examiners, appears in Scientific Sleuthing Review, vol. 32, No. 4, P. 8 (Winter 2008)

Document Examination: A Post-Conviction CUSUM Revisitation

What is the CUSUM technique as applied to the discipline of document examiners? And how reliable is this technique in resolving legal issues? A recent decision (unreported) from Ireland’s Court of Criminal Appeals provides an inkling.

Michael Joseph Kelly was convicted of the murder of Ms. Glynn on March 24, 1983.

Now in February 2008 Kelly’s application for post-conviction relief, claiming a miscarriage of justice in his conviction, was rejected by the Court of Criminal Appeal.

Among his other claims of error, occurring at his trial in 1983, Kelly maintained that his signed written confession was not in fact his but that of the policeman (garda) who drafted it. In support of this position Kelly submitted the testimony of Dr. Michael Farringdon who, after applying the CUSUM technique to Kelly’s confession, concluded that “that statement had been made by more than one contributor,” and not by Kelly alone. The suggestion implicit in Farringdon’s testimony was apparently that the other contributor was a policeman, giving support to Kelly’s argument that the confession was not his but that out of the mouth of the police.

Dr. Farringdon explained the CUSUM technique as utilizing “a statistical cumulative sum analysis to determine the origin” of spoken or written words. His analysis, as he is reported to have said, was based on an examination of “habit words.”

Dr. Farringdon is the co-author of Analyzing for Authorship: A Guide to the CUSUM Technique, Univ. of Wales Press. He is also known to have responded to a Dublin, Ireland’s judge’s query that “You could do this (CUSUM testing) using an abacus, couldn’t you?” by saying “Yes, indeed, my Lord, but it would take a very long time...!” The technique itself has a long history, having originated with Andrew Morton in 1988 while studying the books of the Bible. (Morton, A., Literary Detection: How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literary Documents, Scribner’s 1978) in an effort to remove the likelihood of a writer’s conscious effort to change his/her handwriting. It is said to be very controversial but to have appeared in use on the authorship of many documents including suicide notes, confessions, anonymous calls, recorded conversations etc. Lindskoop, K., “Analyzing for Authorship with the Cusum Technique,” The Discovery Institute, Issue 69, Summer 1996, Lewis-Legacy Issue. A lengthy analysis of the subject appears in Broeders, A.P.A., “Forensic Speech & Audio Analysis,” A review from 1998 to 2001. 13th Interpol Forensic Science Symposium, Lyon, France, 10/16-19/01. My thanks to Alan Smithee for his research on this issue.

Contrariwise a report from Professor David Canter, a professor of psychology in the Division of Investigative Psychology of the University of Liverpool and a published author of a bookshelf of books in his field, took exception with the testimony of Farringdon. According to Canter, the CUSUM technique has “no established scientific validity.” He was particularly suspicious of Farringdon’s technique since it evolved from a testing without “blind samples - where the analyst should be unaware whether the sample for testing is from one contributor or more than one contributor.”

The Court of Criminal Appeal rejected the CUSUM technique declaring itself unsatisfied of the technique’s “properly established scientific provenance or that it has achieved the requisite degree of expert peer approval.” Kelly v. DPP, unreported, Ct. Crim. App., 2/1/2008, commented upon in Byrne, John P., “Evidence and Procedure Update,” Irish Crim. Law J., Vol. 18, No. 3 (2008), p. 89 to 92.

Document Examination: The Judge as Gate-Keeper or Instrument of Keeper-Gate

Certain locutions in the law which impact forensic science have a well-established meaning. That the trial judge is the gate-keeper against the presentation of unreliable expert evidence is one such, which springs from the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1993 seminal decision in Daubert v. Merrill Pharmaceuticals, Inc. However, as a gate-keeper, a trial judge is admonished not to take it upon him/herself to function as a super expert to resolve disputes among experts, leapfrogging over the responsibilities of a jury.

Thus when the experts’ disagree, it is not for the court to decide which of the conflicting opinions is to be accepted by reason of its greater persuasiveness. No, that is the sole and constitutionally-mandated exclusive task of the trial jury.

When a trial judge rejects the gate-keeping function as articulated in Daubert then we have not a gate-keeping activity in play but rather a kind of keeper-gate, verging on the unorthodoxies of travel-gate, water-gate and lately in Massachusetts “Pottygate” (because the case was said to involve the use of a bathroom key inappropriately. see 37 Mass. Lawyers Wkly 1587, May 18, 2009)

So a trial judge who strays from the strict confines of Daubert invites being criticized as a keeper-gater rather than a gate-keeper.

The foregoing comments spring from the text of United States v. Ozuna, 2009 WL. 902293 (C.A. (Ill.)), a federal prosecution for possession with intent to distribute more than five kilograms of continued on page 38
cocaine. Modesto Ozuna challenged the admissibility of the cocaine seized by federal agents of the DEA from the tractor-trailer he had been driving. The trial judge at the suppression hearing decided to suppress the evidence in light of the government’s failing to prove by expert testimony that Ozuna had signed the consent to search form that the government used to support the search.

Upon the government’s motion the trial judge granted a rehearing on the suppression of the cocaine and heard the testimony of a document examiner from both prosecution and defense on the question of whether it was Ozuna’s signature that was appended to the consent to search form.

The defense expert, Ellen Schuetzner, reported finding “several inconsistencies and ‘voids’ in the pen strokes that ‘could’ indicate forgery. However she thought that these inconsistencies in the pen strokes could have resulted from the chemical treatment of the form in the search for fingerprints on it. In sum she saw ‘indications’ of Ozuna’s having signed the form but, as to that, hers was said to be “a very weak opinion of authorship.”

The prosecution’s expert, James Regent, needless to say, was of a wholly different mind. He stated with “the highest degree of confidence” that Ozuna had signed the consent to search form. To Regent, the written signature “appeared natural” with no evidence of simulation and the dissimilarities he detected were “within the expected range of variation.”

The trial judge “gave little credence to Regent’s conclusion that Ozuna had in fact signed the form” but conducted “its own evaluation of the signature and concluded by a preponderance of the evidence” that Ozuna’s authentic signature appeared on the consent form. As a consequence the motion to suppress was denied.

On appeal the court was unimpressed by Ozuna’s reliance on Daubert for the proposition that the trial judge had acted in violation of his gate-keeping function as defined in Daubert. The appellate court did not view the Daubert requirements as applying with full force in suppression hearings. Consequently it did not find the trial court’s choosing “to credit some of the experts’ analysis and discard certain conclusions that it found unconvincing” to be in error. The trial judge was permitted to allow the expert’s testimony merely “to guide its own analysis” and to decide on its own whether Ozuna had signed the form. (If this decision does not effectively make a trial judge, at least in suppression hearings, a super expert then its plain meaning and language are incomprehensible.)
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A Law Enforcement Misstep: When a Lab Report is not a Lab Report

It would be nice. Indeed it would be ever so nice if this were the first and only instance of the police misuse of a spurious crime lab report to obtain a confession. But it is not and probably will not be the last.

Ronald Wilson’s law enforcement travail started when he informed the police in Bexar County, Texas (San Antonio) on January 1, 2006 that he had discovered a dead body which it turned out was that of Amos Gutierrez, a victim of a murder. On January 6, 2006, after Wilson’s arrest on an outstanding misdemeanor warrant (a subterfuge to justify a murder interrogation?) he was interviewed (interrogated?) by Detective Raymond Roberts about his having killed Gutierrez. As a part of that interview Roberts showed Wilson a lab report which, unbeknownst to Wilson, the detective had fabricated using his computer.

The spurious lab report said that Wilson’s fingerprints were found on the murder weapon’s magazine. That was enough, together with other evidence incriminating Wilson for him to see the evil of his ways and to confess to the murder.

At Wilson’s capital punishment murder trial the defense moved to suppress Wilson’s confession arguing that it was obtained in violation of Texas Code of Criminal Procedure 38.23 which clearly interdicts the admission into evidence of the confession obtained by officer Roberts.

Furthermore, Texas Penal Code 37.09 declares the use of “falsity” in an interrogation to be a violation of Texas law. The prosecutor disputed the fact that Roberts had violated this statute. According to his lights Roberts’ conduct constituted “a valid interrogation technique” as promoted and recommended by the authors (Inbau & Reid) of a number of manuals on proper police interrogation techniques. The defense disputed the fact that these manuals espoused the use of procedures akin to that of Roberts.

On this appeal of Wilson’s conviction, the Texas reviewing court decided that Roberts’ obtaining Wilson’s confession in the manner that he had was blatantly contrary to Texas statutory law. Therefore, it should be suppressed. Wilson’s murder trial was authorized to continue with the other evidence of his guilt, not infected by the fictitious lab report.

Such inculpatory evidence warranting a new trial included: 1 Wilson’s grandmother did not confirm his alibi; 2. witnesses would testify that, after the murder, Wilson tried to sell a gun to them which was lacking a clip (sic magazine); 3. witnesses would testify tat Wilson tried to buy drugs with “bloody money”: 4. several witnesses would say they saw Wilson running from the scene of the murder and that they identified Wilson in a photo line-up. So with the loss of the confession, the prosecution was not totally lost. Wilson v. State, 277 S.W. 3rd 446 (San Antonio Ct. App. Tex. 2008)

In other states, most notably Florida, what was done by officer Roberts to secure the confession would more likely be prohibited as in contravention of due process.

Decisions by Definition: When is a Child Not a Child

Homicide is defined as the killing of one human being by another. Further, for there to be a homicide the death of a person must be causally connected to the injury from which the death ensued. It seems plain, therefore, that no injury to a fetus which is thereafter born alive but shortly and tragically dies of the pre-birth
injury is homicide. That is the position taken by New Mexico courts and many others.

However it has lately been held in New Mexico that, unlike homicide, a charge of child abuse resulting in death cannot be maintained for an injury to a fetus while *en ventre sa mere*, when the fetus dies after being born alive.

The New Mexico Court of Appeals, in precedential bondage to its earlier opinion in *State v. Martinez*, has now held that a third person, on the authority of *State v. Martinez*, cannot be charged with child abuse resulting in death because, even though there was a live birth, the fetus was not a child at the time of the fatal injury suffered by it. Being a child, living and breathing outside the mother’s womb, was not enough without proof that the fetus was a child when the injury was inflicted that brought about its post-birth demise.

Although the New Mexico appeals court points to its understanding that this result was the intention of the New Mexico legislature, the court leaves open the possibility that the same defense argument would not be credited if the attacker had been charged with homicide for the death of the child. Why so?

Because the deceased child victim was born alive and because there was no overriding (essential) need for the injury causing the death to have been inflicted on a child.

Such is the mumbo-jumbo that is the (life) or the death of the law as well as the life (or death) of a wrongdoer, not to mention that of the fetus (child). *State v. Mondragon*, 203 P.3rd 105 (N.M. Ct. App. 2008)

**SIDEBAR**

In *State v. Martinez*, 137 P. 3d 1195 (N.M Ct. App.) a mother gave birth to a child who manifested serious signs of cocaine withdrawal. The mother was prosecuted for child abuse for her using cocaine during her pregnancy knowing of its harmful effects on the unborn child. The prosecution was dismissed since the court read the legislative purpose in enacting the child abuse statute as not to include injuries to a fetus, it not being a child, whether viable or not

**A Sticky Wicket: Verifying a fingerprint match is improper bolstering**

In today’s scientific world, obtaining a second and concurring opinion is *de rigueur*. That applies to fingerprint matching as well, even though there are those who view the process of fingerprint matching to be less than scientific.

The problem this second opinion creates is how, procedurally, to introduce it as an integral part of the testimony of a fingerprint expert without violating the prohibition of bolstering one’s own testimony with that of another non-testifying expert. That difficulty underscores the decision in *State v. Bunche*, 5 So. 3d 38 (Dist Ct App Fla 2009).

Jeffrey Bunche was prosecuted for burglary of a dwelling and grand larceny from the dwelling. The sole incriminating evidence introduced against Bunche at his trial was that of a fingerprint expert who identified Bunche’s prints as having been lifted from a box which had contained a Rolex watch which was found on the burgled premises.

To solidify his opinion the expert (unnamed in the appellate court opinion) stated that “we have a second person to make an evaluation” after the initial conclusion is reached by another fingerprint examiner. Upon the defense’s objection to such a statement as constituting hearsay, the trial court found it unobjectionable as simply evidence “of the process employed in identifying the defendant’s prints” on the Rolex box.

At another point in the fingerprint expert’s testimony he reiterated that “we always have two people look at it.” Once again the defense objection was rebuffed. But on appeal the Florida Appeals Court found it to be error to allow “the fingerprint expert to bolster his fingerprint identification by testifying that another examiner verified his work.”

The appeals court sought to clarify its decision finding erroneous bolstering by noting that the fingerprint expert’s ultimate opinion calling the prints a match “did not rely on the second examiner’s identification to assure his certainty” which would have been permissible but rather that the second opinion “improperly bolstered the testifying expert’s (already formed and finalized) opinion.”

This was the first Florida case to evaluate this issue but decisions from other jurisdictions, both pro and con but mostly against bolstering, were cited by the appeals court.

After all was said and done, the Florida court refused to reverse Bunche’s convictions by reason of the bolstering since the error of the trial court was deemed to be harmless. (the defense conceded that the prints on the Rolex box were those of his client and only argued that the prints were not proved to be time dated to the day of the burglary.).

**To sleep, perchance to sleepwalk and to sexually assault**

Adrian Scott had a stepdaughter. That was conceded. Adrian Scott was a sleep walker (somnambulist) who engaged in sexual assault of his 13 to 18 year old stepdaughter while sleep walking. That was not conceded.

Scott was charged in a Tennessee state court with sexual battery as an authority figure against his stepdaughter as well as two counts of rape as to her. Scott’s sole defense was that he lacked the intent (*mens rea*) to commit the crimes charged because he was sleep walking when they occurred.

Scott sought to introduce the testimony of Dr. J. Brevard Hayes, the medical director of a hospital specializing in sleep disorders. Upon the prosecutor’s objection to such testimony, the trial court found that the crimes charged to Scott did not require proof of an intent and that Dr. Hayes testimony would not aid the jury and that Dr. Hayes’ methodology and principles were not “sufficiently reliable and trustworthy” to be submitted to the jury. Scott appealed to the Tennessee Supreme Court.

That court decided that the trial court had erred in refusing to allow the testimony of Dr. Haynes since:
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1. contrary to the trial court, the crimes charged to Scott do require proof of an intent (mens rea);
2. Dr. Haynes testimony was reliable since not based on mere speculation. The reliance by Dr. Haynes on the self-reporting of Scott was not grounds to exclude his testimony since Haynes’ was fully qualified; his conclusions were not analytically distinct from the data upon which he based his opinion; and the methods and principles upon which Haynes’ relied were accepted within the scientific community and that those methods and principles had been peer reviewed in published studies (citing a number of them) proving that the field encompassing this disorder had been developed outside the confines of litigation.
3. the evidence of Scott’s wife that on a number of occasions Scott, while asleep, “had fondled her groin while the family was sleeping in close quarters” and that he had done the same on three or four occasions “when he had fallen asleep in her room” as well as at other times when seated in a chair while watching TV with his wife.
4. there was no evidence that Scott had ever displayed these sexual proclivities while awake.
5. “the State presented meager evidence to support” the exclusion of Haynes’ testimony.
6. the testimony of Dr. Haynes did satisfy the requirement that his expert evidence should be of aid to the jury

The upshot was that Scott’s convictions were reversed and the case remanded to the Davidson County Criminal Court for trial, if such be desired. State v. Scott, 275 S.W.3d 395 (Tenn. 2009) Interestingly nothing was said by the appeals court nor by the trial court as to whether the conduct in the sleepwalking encounters with Scott’s teenage stepdaughter had not only the requisite intent (mens rea) but also the required voluntary act (actus reus). Actus reus, to be proved, requires a conscious choice to perform the prohibited acts. And that is precisely what Scott says as well as his expert would declare was lacking in his charged conduct. There is one case, of record from England (Regina v. Charlson) where a loving father, while sleep walking threw his young and well-loved son out an open window to his death many floors below. So stranger things have happened in the trance that is sleep walking than was said to have transpired in Tennessee in State v. Scott, 275 S.W. 3rd 395 (Tenn. 2009).

Do You Remember When?

Source: Ken Field, Academy Historian

1949...

...The planners of the 1950 AAFS Organizational Meeting had to resort to phone calls and letters during the 1949 planning year because the computer had not yet been invented and there were no funds for committee meetings. The budding American Academy of Forensic Sciences’ only asset was the loose change left over from the 1948 meeting in St. Louis. (Treasurer Turner had taken the coins home in an old brown paper bag.) Consequently, all the expenses incurred in planning the 1949 were borne by the individual committee members.

1959...

...Potpourri:

1. In the mid 1950s the Academy’s Pathology Section petitioned the American Medical Association (AMA) to certify its qualified members as Forensic Pathologists. AMA responded in January 1959 by appointing the American Board of Pathology to do the certifying. Forty-four members of the Pathology Section were certified in 1959.

2. The current AAFS Membership Certificate was first approved for sale by the Academy’s Executive Committee at its 1959 mid-year meeting. It was styled after a certificate used by Case Western Reserve University for its seminar speakers. It was first called a “Certificate of Fellowship.”

1969...

...In 1969 a definition of forensic science was proposed that included the words social and behavioral sciences. The publication of that definition raised the question: should the Academy be an exclusive or an inclusive organization? Obviously, the definition favored being inclusive. A Select Committee of Past Presidents was formed to study the issue and one enduring paragraph in their report warrants repeating, “In simple terms, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences was conceived (in 1948) as an inclusive not exclusive, expanding not limiting, open not closed, dynamic not static, professional society.”

In Memoriam

Cland C. Blake, MD. Retired Fellow of the Pathology/Biology Section, May 2009
Thomas F. Gilchrist, MD. Fellow of the Pathology/Biology Section, March 2009
Craig H. Lahren, MA. Fellow of the Physical Anthropology Section, April 2009
Melvin A. Williams. Retired Fellow of the Toxicology Section, July 1986
The following individuals have submitted applications for Associate Member, Trainee Affiliate, or Student Affiliate. Applications that are received and completed by October 1, 2009, will be considered for approval at the February 2010 Board of Directors Meeting. Due to space constraints, AAFS does not list members who are applying for promotion to Fellow or to Member. Comments or concerns regarding an applicant should be submitted in writing to: Cheryl Hunter, Membership Coordinator, AAFS, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904; chunter@aafs.org. Comments must be received by February 19, 2010.

Applicants

CRIMINALISTICS

Associate Member
Acosta, Carole M., MS
Los Angeles, CA
Bailey, Jodi R., MS
West Palm Beach, FL
Bencivenga, Patricia A., BS
Clearwater, FL
Boreen, Anne L., PhD
Chicago, IL
Buckleton, John S., PhD
Auckland, New Zealand
Burchfield, Jacob W., BS
Jackson, MS
Butler, John M., PhD
Gaithersburg, MD
Chin, George W., BS
Hamilton, NJ
Cipoletti, Michael, MS
Amity, PA
Custer, Diana M., MS
Wailuku, HI
Dianic, Angela A., PhD
Colby, KS
Fu, Jun, PhD
Tulsa, OK
Gomez, Katrina M., BS
Chicago, IL
Grover, Celeste M., MSFS
Clackamas, OR
Hunsicker, Heidi A., MS
Santa Ana, CA
MacMillan, Kevin J., MS
Houston, TX
Marchesini, Lorenzo MR.
Dondeno, Italy
Nathanson, Fidely
Santa Fe, NM
Perskvist, Nasrin, PhD
Linkoping, Sweden
Postlethwait, Ryan J., BS
Morgantown, WV
Ramos, Lisa M., MS
Lansing, MI
Scott, Michelle A., MFS
Gaithersburg, MD
Sun, Dahong, PhD
Meriden, CT
Woods, Michelle T., MS
San Bernardino, CA
Workman, Courtney
Springfield, MO
York, Jessica L., BS
Fairfield, OH

Trainee Affiliate
Brown, Jennifer L.
Waretown, NJ
Burleson, Garrett L., MS
Lawrence, KS
Dellibovi, Marybeth, MSFS
Washington, DC
Dolene, Allison A., MFS
Salt Lake City, UT
Fernengel, Aja N., BS
Richfield, OH
Hurston, Heather H., MS
Austin, TX
Jackson, David, MSc
Pleasanton, CA
Jubelirer, Sara L., BS
Okemos, MI
Lopez, Kristen M., MS
New York, NY
Luce, Coral L., MS
San Diego, CA
Swiss, Rachel L., MS
Hamden, CT
Wallace, Vashone, BA
Lyndhurst, NJ

Student Affiliate
Amman, Jennifer
Livonia, MI
Baldwin, Diesel A.
Woodridge, IL
Barr, Marshawn S., BS
El Cajon, CA
Chelland, Lynzee A.
Richmond, VA
Clendenen, Caitlin H.
Hanalei, HI
Farnham, Elizabeth N., BS
Bel Aire, KS
Fitzpatrick, Melanie E., BS
Stevensville, MT
Green, Matthew K.
Akron, OH
Mead, Breanna K., BS
Willis, TX
Ngo, Laurie S., BS
Germantown, MD
Nomoto, Maya E.
Wesley Chapel, FL
Outman, Aian M.
Canton, NY
Sandifer, Randy A.
Oxford, MS
Scott, Kenneth
Richmond, CA
Simmons, Britanni N.
Amarillo, TX
Waffle, Debra A., BS
Glendale, AZ
Walter, Rachele L., BA
Lincoln, NE
Wiley, Rachel E.
Missouri City, TX

DIGITAL & MULTIMEDIA SCIENCES

Associate Member
Ferguson, David G., MS
Woodbridge, VA
Manes, Gavin W., PhD
Tulsa, OK

ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Associate Member
Anderson, Russell L., MS
Tempe, AZ
Bowley, Susan M., PhD
Sunnyvale, CA
Lanoue, Mark A., BS
Bay Saint Louis, MS
Muzzy, William H., III, BS
Ocean Springs, MS
Tjaden, Richard J., BS
Bloomington, IL

continued on page 42
Applicants cont.

Zweig, Gil, MS
Randolph, NJ

Whitfield, Timothy A., BS
Dunedin, FL

Yap, Roland W., BS
Honolulu, HI

Zaldivar, Max E.
Fayetteville, NC

GENERAL

Associate Member
Agellon, Al B., BS
Tucson, AZ

Boles, Velva, MD
Alexandria, LA

Brown, Catherine L., MS
Sterling, VA

Cebra, Karen, MS, MSFS
Davis, CA

del Valle Arroyo, Carlos J., MBA
Caguas, PR

Dilbeck, Lisa, MSc
Scottsdale, AZ

Dunkley, Robert, PhD
Victorville, CA

Foster, Harry L., MD
Mississauga, ON Canada

Francis, Larry N., MD
Moreno Valley, CA

Gilbert, Barbara A., MSN
Canton, NY

Goodman, Elizabeth A., BSN
Winston Salem, NC

Griffey, Kiyomi M., MFS
Sanford, NC

Gundemann, Carla Q., MS
Clifton Park, NY

Jensen, Eric E., MS
Quaintico, VA

Lichty, Jessica E., MFS
Sioux Falls, SD

Ludvico, Lisa, PhD
Pittsburgh, PA

Lynch, Michael J., BS
Alta, HI

Mann, G. Rick, MD
London, ON Canada

Mauriello, Thomas P., MFS
Laurel, MD

Moldovan, Emil, MPA
Dublin, VA

Overton, Denise L., BS
Nashville, TN

Pettem, Silvia, BA
Ward, CO

Progovitz, Shelly A., MFS
La Plata, MD

Reid, Sharon M., BS
Winston-Salem, NC

Reina Camacho, Santiago
Bogota, Colombia

Richardson, Joanne L., MFS
Frisco, CO

Schindell, Jennifer R., BSN
Albany, OR

Student Affiliate
Acevedo, Cristina
Dallas, TX

Bowers, Kristine G., BS
Houston, TX

Brungard, Jamie S., BS
North Wales, PA

Burns, Jordan C.
Bloomington, IL

Cannon, Ashley M.
Powell, WY

Darrah, Thomas H., MS
Rochester, NY

Dooley, Melinda K.
Austin, TX

Farid, Karen J., MA
Staten Island, NY

Galioti, Mario
Killeen, TX

Hoffman, Stephanie L.
Honolulu, HI

Kleinfielder, Deanna J., BS
Fort Myers, FL

Lopez, Aileen K.
El Paso, TX

Lucas, Kaylyn
Whitehall, MT

McDonald, Lisa M., BA
West Haven, CT

Mount, Brandon L., BS
Lubbock, TX

Pinto, Amanda K.
Richmond, VA

Romaine, Lori J.
Sandy Hook, VA

Shammel, Ashley
Great Falls, MT

Taylor, Pamela A.
Honolulu, HI

Wilson, Shannon L.
Roberta, GA

Trainee Affiliate
Bell, Beth A.
Lead Hill, AR

Brown, Clare S., BS
Houston, TX

Hinze, Angela M.
Lodi, WI

Tator, Lisa M., BA
Mission, KS

Vincent, Rebecca D., BA, BS
Mission, KS

Waters, Kevin A., BS
Cape Coral, FL

Westlund, Lindsey N., MS
Brooklyn Park, MN

Jurisprudence

Associate Member
Baez, Jose A., JD
Kissimmee, FL

Mercer, Stephen B., JD
Rockville, MD

Priest, Lesley, JD
Jackson, MS

ODONTOLOGY

Associate Member
Beehler, Richard, DDS
Victoria, BC Canada

Fischer, Ken, DDS
Villa Park, CA

Sanford, Steven S., DDS
Galt, CA

Trainee Affiliate
Fanucher, James P., DDS, PhD
San Antonio, TX

Michael, Margaret
Flushing, NY

PATHOLOGY/BIOLOGY

Associate Member
Barry, Michelle B., MD
Albuquerque, NM

Bulic, Predrag, MD
Daytona Beach, FL

Castro, Hugo, MD
Lima, Peru

Cohen, Peter A., PhD
Honolulu, HI

Cordeiro, Cristina, MD
Coimbra, Portugal

Davenport, Eloi M., MD
Phoenix, AZ

Feigin, Gerald, MD
Sewell, NJ

Gavin, Lisa D., MPH
Albuquerque, NM

Goldschmidt, Ariel, MD
Kansas City, MO

Hammers, Jennifer L., DO
New York, NY

Iliescu, Michael D., MD
Chandler, AZ

Jackson, Bruce A., PhD
Wayland, MA
Jackson, Lorren W., MD
Albuquerque, NM
McElligott, Hilary S., MD
Forest Park, IL
Schmidt, Matrina J., MD
Morgantown, WV
Souffrant, Claudele, MD
San Juan, PR
Uptegrove, Russell L., MD
Dayton, OH

Trainee Affiliate
Evans, Samantha R., MD
Knoxville, TN
Trusa, Sandra A., PhD
Yonkers, NY

Student Affiliate
Martinez, Adrienne Marie
Oklahoma City, OK
Osterman, Nicole, BS
Big Rapids, MI

---

**PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY**

**Associate Member**
Kim, Yi-Suk, MD, PhD
Seoul, Korea
Tidball-Binz, Morris
Ferney Voltaire, France
Wieberg, Danielle A.M., MA
Oak Ridge, TN

**Trainee Affiliate**
Al Na’imi, Khudooma S., MSc
Al Ain City, United Arab Emirates
Baker, Kristen N., MA
Honolulu, HI
Cortis, Lucy, MSc
Cleckheaton, United Kingdom
Gipson, Desina R., MS
Arcata, CA
Henderson, Julie A., BA
Morton, WA
Huntington, Sarah M., BSc
Kingston, WA
Reveal, Malina L., MSc
Chico, CA

**Student Affiliate**
Ballard, Kristina M., BS
Gainesville, FL
Cornelison, Jered B., MS, MA
East Lansing, MI
Ferreira, Jennifer E., BS
Albuquerque, NM

Juarez, Jessica K., BS
Helotes, TX
Powanda, Allysia L., BA
Brooklyn, NY
Welri, Elizabeth G., BA
Cincinnati, OH

---

**TOXICOLOGY**

**Associate Member**
Arango, Elba J., BS
Flushing, NY
Artis, Monica R., BS
Jackson, MS
Fogelberg, Christopher W., BA
Sacramento, CA
Gluodenis, Tom J., PhD
Wilmington, DE

**Trainee Affiliate**
McElligott, Hilary S., MD
Morgantown, WV
Schweitzer, Susan C., PhD
San Juan, PR
Souffrant, Claudele, MD
San Juan, PR
Uptegrove, Russell L., MD
Dayton, OH

**PSYCHIATRY & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE**

**Associate Member**
Gascon, Santiago
Zaragoza, Spain
Gimelli, Cinzia
Reggio Emilia, Italy

Kunkle, Christopher D., PsyD
Ogdensburg, NY

Pratt, Janise M., PhD
Laguna Beach, CA

Shnaidman, Vivian, MD
Princeton, NJ

Tramell, Michael S., MD
Mission Viejo, CA

**Trainee Affiliate**
Krakower, Scott, DO
Glenoaks, NY

**Student Affiliate**
Workman, Kara M., BS
Dallas, TX

Wright, Erica L., BA
Lincoln, NE

---

**QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS**

**Associate Member**
Bey, Robert F., BS
Rockville Centre, NY
Flores, Dianne C., MA
Miami, FL

Guzowski, Anna, BS
Jamaica, NY

Singer, Adam M., BS
Jamaica, NY

**Trainee Affiliate**
Bybelezer, Michael R., MFS
Washington, DC

---

Academy News
The Young Forensic Science Forum is deep into the planning phase. Year around we are looking for ways to improve our already successful sessions. The 2010 AAFS meetings are right around the corner and we are all looking forward to seeing you all in Seattle. Our Special Session promises to be very eye-opening and informative with a look at where we are and where we are going in forensic science. As young forensic scientists, you are the future of forensic science and it will be exciting to see how we can all make contributions to the future of forensic science.

There are many ways for young forensic scientists to be a part of our sessions, including presenting research at the Bring Your Own Slides and Bring Your Own Poster sessions. Also, attending the Breakfast Session, which is much more intimate, and is a great place to get your questions answered.

One of the biggest goals of the Young Forensic Science Forum is to help young forensic scientists learn about all the opportunities available to them. One way of doing this is to visit the American Academy of Forensic Science’s new website, at www.aafs.org. Not only is the website a great resource but it also provides information about becoming a new member. Being a member of a professional organization is very important to professional growth, as well as an honor and responsibility. Also, on the AAFS website is a link to the YFSF website. There you can read the newsletter archives and find out more ways to become involved in our events.

I forgot to introduce myself in the last issue, so I thought I would do it now. My name is Arliss Dudley-Cash and I am the current President of the YFSF. I am currently working on my PhD at the University of Iowa, in the Biosciences program. Go Hawkeyes! I attended my first AAFS and YFSF meeting in 2006, at Seattle. I have been hooked ever since and been very impressed by the way we have been able to raise the bar every year! If you have any questions or comments please don’t hesitate to contact me at dudleycash@gmail.com.

Arliss I. Dudley-Cash, BA
YFSF President

2010 YFSF Special Session
The theme for the 2010 Young Forensic Scientist Forum Special Sessions has been decided and we are very excited about it. The theme is “Future of Forensics: Where we are and where we are going.” We have selected this theme because we are the next generation of forensic scientists and the possibilities are limitless for us. We want to show not only what the field of forensics currently has to offer, but where we are going with forensics. We want to explore new techniques that are emerging and how we can build upon and improve what we currently have. We want all of the participants to be excited about what forensics has to offer and excited about what the future holds. This is a great opportunity to learn more about their
specific area of interest, but to learn about other areas they may not be aware of or may not have a lot of information on. Keep your eyes open for more updates throughout the year and please do not hesitate to contact us with any ideas and suggestions. You can contact Tanisha Henson (Tanisha.henson@yahoo.com) or Rachael Lehr (Rachael.lehr@gmail.com)

Tanisha Henson
YFSF Program Chair

2010 YFSF Financial Support
Every year the YFSF relies on the support and contributions of the forensic community to make our Special Session a success. The events held at each meeting include a day long scientific session, a working breakfast session, a poster session, and a “Bring Your Own Slides” presentation. The goal of the YFSF is to assist these scientists in establishing a solid foundation in their field; these sessions are critical in the professional development of our audience.

If you, or your group, is interested in supporting the newest generation of forensic scientists by providing support, whether it is financial or materials, for the 2010 YFSF Special Session, please feel free to contact the Financial Support Chair, Samantha Neal at Samantha.Neal@mail.wvu.edu.

Samantha H. Neal
YFSF Financial Support Chair

My Co-Chair is Melissa DeBerry. Melissa works in the Technical Assistance Section of the Mississippi Crime Laboratory accepting items of evidence from different submitting agencies. She attended her first AAFS meeting in Denver and met a member of the YFSF committee. Our enthusiastic member recruited her to join the YFSF and she volunteered as the breakfast co-chair. I think Melissa is still trying to figure out what she has gotten herself into, but she is looking forward to the breakfast session in Seattle, as am I.

Opportunities to Speak Out
I wanted to take a moment to outline how new forensic scientists (both young and old) can speak out to their peers. YFSF is designed for forensic scientists with 5 years or less in the field to learn more about their new and exciting profession. As such we offer many opportunities to hone the skills that will help you succeed. As you will read in this newsletter, we are looking for scientists interested in sharing their casework, research, and experiences at the 2010 AAFS Annual Meeting. However, there is an opportunity to reach your peers throughout the year of which many may not be aware. If you are a forensic scientist with a great experience to share (such as obtaining an internship, preparing for your first testimony, or landing a great job), please write a short article and submit it for publication in the YFSF Newsletter. Please send all newsletter questions and submissions to jennifer.w.mercer@gmail.com.

Jennifer Mercer
YFSF Secretary

2010 Breakfast Session
It is a new year for the YFSF Breakfast committee and we thought we would introduce ourselves. My name is Jenna Oakes-Smith and I am this year’s Breakfast Chair. I am employed as a Criminalist in the DNA section of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department Crime Lab. I attended my first AAFS meeting and YFSF session two years ago in Washington, D.C. I really enjoyed the presentations at that meeting and when the organizers announced that they needed help planning for the next year I gladly volunteered. I became the Co-Chair for the breakfast event and helped to recruit members for a resume panel. It was an enjoyable experience and gave me the opportunity to network with personnel from other labs and other disciplines. I enjoyed the time so much I am back again this year.
National and International meetings of interest to forensic scientists are included as space permits. For a complete list, go to the AAFS website (www.aafs.org) and click on the “Meetings” link.

Meetings and Conferences

**JULY 2009**

16-17  
**Association of Forensic DNA Analysts and Administrators Summer Conference**—To be held at the Austin Convention Center in Austin, TX.  
CONTACT: William Watson  
WatsonDNA@comcast.net  
www.afdaa.org/upcomong.html

20-23  
**Masters Conference**—To be held at the Saint Louis University School of Medicine in St. Louis, MO  
CONTACT: Mary Fran Ernst or Julie Howe  
mldi@slu.edu  
http://medschool.slu.edu/masters

20-24  
**2009 Taphonomy in Forensic Anthropology**—To be held at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, TN.  
CONTACT: Rebecca J. Wilson  
fac@utk.edu

27-29  
**2nd Annual Green Mountain DNA Conference**—To be held at the Sheraton Burlington Hotel & Conference Center in Burlington, VT.  
CONTACT: www.greenmountaindna.com  
Eric Buel: ebuel@dps.state.vt.us  
Deb Jasinski: djasinsk@dps.state.vt.us  
Trisha Conti: tconti@dps.state.vt.us

27-31  
**Modern Polarized Light and Chemical Microscopy**—To be held at the McCrone Group’s College of Microscopy in Westmont, IL.  
CONTACT: Chuck Zona  
czona@mccrone.com  
www.collegeofmicroscopy.com

31  
**Alcohol in the 21st Century: New Standards, New Technology**—To be held at Georgia State University in Atlanta, GA.  
CONTACT: Amory Caron  
amory.caron@bac-tracker.com  
www.bac-tracker.com

**AUGUST 2009**

2-7  
**Trace Evidence Symposium 2009**—Sponsored by NIJ and the FBI Laboratory—To be held in Clearwater, FL.  
CONTACT: www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/events/welcome.htm

8-13  
**The 2009 ASQDE Annual General Meeting**—To be held at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Dearborn, MI.  
CONTACT: Rigo Vargas: rigo.vargas@ci.irs.gov  
Larry Olson: larry.olson@ci.irs.gov  
Tom Riley: rileytp@michigan.gov  
www.asqde.org

9-13  
**36th Annual New England Seminar in Forensic Sciences**—To be held at Colby College in Waterville, ME.  
CONTACT: www.colby.edu/administration_cs/special_programs/

10-14  
**Usenix Security Symposium**—To be held in Montreal, Quebec, Canada.  
CONTACT: www.usenix.org/events/sec09/

12-13  
**Lifeguard Systems: Homicidal Drowning Investigation Program**—To be held at the CS Police Dept Training Academy in Colorado Springs, CO.  
CONTACT: Sgt. Chuck Rabideau  
(719) 444-7339  
Bo Tibbetts  
(970) 261-1334  
www.psdive.com

13-14  
**3rd International Workshop on Computational Forensics**—To be held at the Netherlands Forensic Institute in The Hague, The Netherlands.  
CONTACT: http://iwc09.arsforensica.org/
17-19
Digital Forensic Research Workshop—To be held at the Hotel Delta Centre-Ville in Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
CONTACT: www.dfrws.org

17-21
Medicolegal Death Investigator Training Course—To be held at the Saint Louis University School of Medicine in St. Louis, MO.
CONTACT: Contact: Mary Fran Ernst or Julie Howe
mldi@slu.edu
http://medschool.slu.edu/mldi

18-20
Body Fluid Identification—To be held at the McCrone Group's College of Microscopy in Westmont, IL.
CONTACT: Chuck Zona
czona@mccrone.com
www.collegeofmicroscopy.com

SEPTEMBER 2009

8-11
Triennial Meeting of the European Academy of Forensic Science—To be held in Glasgow, Scotland, UK.
CONTACT: www.eafs2009.com

14-18
23rd World Congress International Society for Forensic Genetics—To be held at the Hilton Hotel in Buenos Aires, Argentina.
CONTACT: Analia Procopcz
secretariat@isfg2009.org
www.isfg2009.org

14-18
Basic Facial Reconstruction Sculpture Workshop—To be held at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, OK.
CONTACT: Betty Pat. Galiff
www.skullpturelab.com

15-17
IMF 2009—To be held in Stuttgart, Germany.
CONTACT: http://imf-conference.org/

21-25
Advanced Facial Reconstruction Sculpture Workshop—To be held at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, OK.
CONTACT: Betty Pat. Galiff
www.skullpturelab.com

21-25
Forensic Soil Examination—To be held at the McCrone Group’s College of Microscopy in Westmont, IL.
CONTACT: Chuck Zona
czona@mccrone.com
www.collegeofmicroscopy.com

OCTOBER 2009

5-9
Scanning Electron Microscopy—To be held at the McCrone Group’s College of Microscopy in Westmont, IL.
CONTACT: Chuck Zona
czona@mccrone.com
www.collegeofmicroscopy.com

12-14
Particle Isolation, Manipulation and Mounting—To be held at the McCrone Group’s College of Microscopy in Westmont, IL.
CONTACT: Chuck Zona
czona@mccrone.com
www.collegeofmicroscopy.com

12-15
20th International Symposium on Human Identification—To be held at the JW Marriott Las Vegas Resort and Spa at Summerlin in Las Vegas, NV.
CONTACT: Carol Bingham
carol.bingham@promega.com
www.promega.com/
geneticsymposium20/

18-23
MAAFS, MAFS, SWAFS, SAJS Joint Meeting—To be held at the Wyndham Orlando in Orlando, FL.
CONTACT: Emily Varan
emilyvaran@fll.de.state.fl.us
Desiree Reid
desireereid@att.net
http://www.maaafs.org/
2009jointmtg.htm

18-30
Forensic Laboratory and Medical Examiner's Office Operations Course for Human Rights Field Investigators—To be held at the Tarrant County Medical Examiner’s Office, Fort Worth, TX.
CONTACT: Lindsay Welch
lwelch@phrusa.org

23-24
The Cyril H. Wecht Institute of Forensic Science and Law's 9th Annual Conference: A National Symposium on the Collection, Analysis and Legal Applications of Digital Evidence—To be held at the Power Center Ballroom at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, PA.
CONTACT: wechtinstitute@duq.edu

NOVEMBER 2009

4-6
Raman Microscopy—To be held at the McCrone Group's College of Microscopy in Westmont, IL.
CONTACT: Chuck Zona
czona@mccrone.com
www.collegeofmicroscopy.com

4-7
35th Annual NEAFS Meeting—To be held at the Ocean Place Resort & Spa in Long Beach, NJ.
CONTACT: Laura Tramontin
latm6@hotmail.com
www.neafs.org/annualmeeting/

OTHER COURSES:
February 2010 – October 2011 (18-Month Online Course)—Statistics and the Evaluation of Forensic Evidence Course Offered by the School of Criminal Justice of the University of Lausanne, Institut de Police Scientifique.
CONTACT: sfe@unil.ch
www.unil.ch/formcont/
page66616.html
Do you know someone who may be interested in AAFS membership?

Please provide the information below and AAFS will send an application to:

Name: ______________________________________________________________________

Address: _____________________________________________________________________

City: _________________________________________________________________________

State: ____________________________________________ Zip: _________________________

Please provide your name so the potential applicant will know who requested the application. AAFS will also recognize you by placing a Sponsor ribbon in your 2010 Annual Meeting registration packet. Please detach form and return to AAFS. Thank you.

Your name: ___________________________________________________________________