During the first week of May, I attended a Council of Scientific Society Presidents meeting in Washington, DC. I especially enjoyed this meeting because I listened to and learned from other scientists with similar - and different - experiences whose thought-processes were similar to my own. They were, after all, trained in the scientific method which requires testing a hypothesis with data. Two days later I spoke at a Superior Court Judges conference in Washington, DC. This conference was designed to examine the “Role of the Court in an Age of Developing Science and Technology.” What an eye-opener that was! I was one of a few forensic scientist speakers on the program who had actually worked in a laboratory. All speakers were requested to discuss the state of forensic science with members of the judiciary. All seemed eager to listen and learn. Most of the attendees were judges. The other speakers were also judges, defense attorneys, other lawyers, social scientists, and statisticians. The conference program lists no current prosecutors on the panels.

When I accepted the invitation, I thought this opportunity to speak in a “lawyers’ forum” would be self-fulfilling and all that other “feel good stuff” I had come to expect from similar experiences behind a microphone. It didn’t quite work out that way. I walked away from this conference experiencing a “wake up call” best described as something from two movies I had recently viewed: “No Way Out” and the beach landing scene from “Saving Private Ryan.”

Social scientists do not view the world through the same prism as those of us who use the scientific method in directed problem solving. What I experienced was this: The validity of the arguments, “truth” or “fact,” call it whatever you choose, in the discussions that day were not based on what I will call substantive definitions of terminology. I rediscovered something I had intentionally downplayed in my own mind since I left the laboratory environment three years ago. In the legal setting, “truth” may be, and too often is, determined by the most passionate argument. In many instances speakers defined their own terms with their own definitions. (Does anyone care to guess how many definitions of “error rate” I encountered at that conference?) In discussions among some lawyers, truth has a way of being annoying yet negotiable. There are those who believe in a forensic science discipline (truth) when it works for them and against a forensic science discipline (invalid/invalid - choose any prefix which sounds good) when it does not work to their advantage. In fact, this apparent inconsistency forms the structure for the adversary system. In one case a defense attorney is expected to challenge forensic evidence because his client’s interest demands it. In another case he is expected to embrace the same evidence for the same reason. In science we test a hypothesis with data. One can be more confident in an opinion specifically because the weight of the science supports the conclusion. Many of us have encountered some legal settings where a tailored conclusion seems to have been constructed by finding the citation of another who agrees while overlooking the opinions of those myriad of others who disagree.

What I also experienced were some who manufactured partisan crises of doubt in everything “forensic.” There were others who through their presentations endorsed a term I encountered in a National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers publication dated March 5, 2010: “Culture of Conviction.” If that term was used to describe the relationship between law enforcement (including prosecutors’ offices) and forensic science laboratories, I disagree. This was not the world I have lived in these many years. Why would any organization want to convict the wrong person?

A week or so later I read a quotation from the Honorable John G. Roberts, Jr., from his 2005 Supreme Court confirmation hearing. The now Chief Justice of the United States said:

“Judges are like umpires...Umpires don’t make the rules. They apply them. The role of an umpire and a judge is critical. They make sure everybody plays by the rules. But it is a limited role. Nobody ever went to a ballgame to see the umpire.”

I came away from that conference with the impression that even some judges and lawyers might on occasion feel justified to insert their own beliefs into the criteria from appellate court decisions and statutes along with the rules of evidence to determine admissibility of forensic science testimony. Admissibility standards are and should be determined by statute or rules which are interpreted by court decisions, not by a partisan agenda.
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President’s Message cont.

In reading much of the commentary and discussing some purported factual statements which are out there regarding “The Report,” I am beginning to wonder whether everyone who has access to Wikipedia or Google, no matter what their background, believes they are experts at defining the rules to suit their own agendas regarding forensic sciences.

I am confident that the United States Congress in the pending draft outline of forensic reform legislation will bring those who have experienced forensic science in the laboratory in the real world on a daily basis into the process to play a major role in determining the best legislation to strengthen forensic science. The Inter-Agency Working Groups (IWGs) for the White House Subcommittee on Forensic Science of the executive branch will also examine how best to accomplish this goal. I admire the efforts from both of these branches of government for reaching out to forensic scientists from laboratories across this country and bringing forensic scientists into their fact finding processes.

I believe that the framework which will emanate from the legislative and executive branches of government on how best to strengthen forensic science will be based on the fact that what happens in the next 25 years will be predicated on our experiences and shortcomings of the past 25 years. Let’s not make the same mistake again by falling into the “it’s a good enough trap.” Good enough is not good enough. A lot of “justice” (exonerations and convictions) has occurred in our court system because of the advances in the forensic sciences. However, we have a long way to go to ensure that the best forensic science possible will be the work-product of the discussions and consensus building which will take place over the next few months.

President Obama, when speaking about those who have differing opinions, said:

“America evolves and sometimes those evolutions are painful. People don’t progress in a straight line."

Scientists are people and therefore science never has and never will progress in a straight line. Even though some mistakenly believe “linear” defines “good science,” those of us who have worked in a laboratory realize that the line does not always pass through all the data points. We look for the “best fit” of the data.

These next few years may be painful. People are reluctant to rock the boat when they are in the boat. However, it is time that we acknowledge the fact that we will not move forward by continuing to do things in the same way. Face the fact that all of us must pay attention to what we knew pre-February 2009; we must do a much better job formulating our conclusions, writing our reports, and enhancing the science in our scientific methods. I am talking about revisions in the way we approach our responsibilities to the justice system.

Forensic science is undergoing one of the most significant periods of evolutionary change that I have witnessed during my 32 years in the laboratory and three years teaching forensic science in the classroom. There are opportunities for enhancements and “doing it better” that I wish had occurred years ago. Let’s “get over it” and realize that while change can be painful, no change is permanent. Yet change for the sake of scientific improvement should be embraced. To my younger colleagues I suggest that you buckle up because you will probably be doing this again in a few years. You will be responsible for keeping this process moving forward. However, the only way to consistently improve any profession is to evolve by listening to those on all sides of the argument, realizing that there may be some words of wisdom in many comments viewed as inflammatory. Let’s build on what’s right and change what must be changed. Remember, we can learn from those with whom we disagree. Face the fact that we are all in this together. I respectfully request that everyone stop restating the problems and start proposing and implementing workable solutions. Let’s learn to listen to one another, find the common ground, focus on solutions, and minimize the rhetoric.
In the March/April 2010 issue of Academy News Barry Fisher predicted in his Legislative Corner essay that as a result of deliberations in Washington we were likely to see proposed increases in research funding and initiatives. It now appears that Barry’s prediction was on target.

Like many of you, I have been reading the “Preliminary Outline of Draft Forensic Reform Legislation” generated by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Many of us have participated in discussions with Senator Leahy’s staff (Senator Leahy is Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee) and others as they have developed this draft legislation. I have been impressed with the broad input that has been both solicited and received and the care taken in developing the draft legislation. Currently I am working with President Bono, the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors to draft our AAFS response to the circulated document based largely on the input received from many of you. While there are many issues addressed in the draft legislation document, a major segment is devoted to research. Although the extent of research funding is yet to be determined, the document strongly advocates the formation of two new research grant programs targeted specifically for forensic science. I was pleased to read that the outline seeks to increase and improve scientific research in forensic science, recognizing that research has always been a major component of our activities but adequate research funding has always been an issue. Hopefully legislation culminating from this document and our collective input will greatly augment research initiatives already underway in forensic science and target them toward the key issues.

Research in forensic science likely will benefit greatly from the outcome of current deliberations in both the legislative and executive branches of government. In the meantime, research continues and already has begun to target many of the topics being discussed in Washington. I was impressed with the large number of presentations in our recent meeting in Seattle that addressed key issues of the day. Although guidance and especially new funding from Washington are welcomed, quality research progress continues to be sustained through individual initiatives of our membership and the dynamics of the research process itself.

Researchers are innovative in finding funding for their programs. These sources vary widely and include not only agency resources but individual grants and financial support gleaned from other activities. A recent major boom to research in forensic science has been the National Institute of Justice’s Office of Investigative and Forensic Sciences (OIFS) whose sole goal is to strengthen the quality and practice of

continued on page 30
For the past few months, the press has been writing stories about a series of problems concerning the San Francisco Police Department Crime Laboratory. One of the lab’s employees, presumably with a substance abuse problem, allegedly pilfered small qualities of cocaine for personal use. The police investigated the theft and ultimately advised the District Attorney’s Office and ASCLD/LAB, the program under which the lab was accredited. A few in the San Francisco DA’s Office also held a belief that something was amiss with the criminalist in question. Once the story broke, the defense bar has been able to have a significant number cases overturned as a result of this situation.

These lamentable matters arise infrequently but are none-the-less troubling. They raise a number of issues that I will discuss. Some of the questions that come to mind are: What is the appropriate response to instances of malfeasance and moral turpitude? Whose responsibility is it to deal with these issues when they come to light and more specifically, what should be done? Can bad behavior be eliminated or minimized? And finally, the “elephant in the room” question: Should oversight of forensic service providers be enacted into law?

**What is the appropriate response to instances of malfeasance and moral turpitude?**

Under *Brady v. Maryland* (373 U.S. 83 (1963)), the prosecutor has an affirmative duty to turn over exculpatory evidence as well as information that may impeach a witness’ credibility to the defendant. Exculpatory evidence is “material” if “there is a reasonable probability that his conviction or sentence would have been different had these materials been disclosed.” *Brady* evidence includes statements of witnesses, physical evidence that conflicts with the prosecution’s witnesses, and evidence that could allow the defense to impeach the credibility of a prosecution witness.

The court presumes that the prosecutor has access to this information even if the DA is unaware of its existence. The police also have an obligation to advise the prosecution in instances where they have knowledge of some wrong doing. While the duty may not be as compelling for the police as with the prosecutor’s Brady obligation, failure to take action smacks of either a cover-up or perhaps a department’s ineptitude. At the least, it results in a lot of bad publicity for the police department and its chief. It is a step away from transparency, a requirement for affective law enforcement and particularly public support.

**Whose responsibility is it to deal with these issues when they come to light and more specifically, what should be done?**

Both prosecutors and police agencies who manage forensic science laboratories have a responsibility to be aware of what is going on in their labs and among the forensic science practitioners proffering evidence for the government. It’s no longer okay to assume that everything is all right. Some form of affirmative supervision is necessary. Think about this as a form of risk management or risk avoidance. Police executives and elected prosecutors should take an active interest in how well their labs are doing. The review needs to be in the areas of...  

*continued on page 30*
Reliable, Relevant and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy

Strengthening Forensics Through Dedicated Membership

Source: Matthew R. Wood, MS, Criminalistics Section Chair

The forensic scientist is in an interesting position. Expert witnesses, such as ourselves, conduct scientific testing, interpret results, and communicate our findings through opinions to an audience with little to no formal scientific training in evaluating these results. The prosecution and defense have the opportunity to question our credentials and our interpretations. However, they may not have a sufficient understanding of the scientific experiments conducted on the physical evidence. One may find it ironic that those responsible for making admissibility determinations often may possess less of an understanding of the scientific principles behind the procedures in question. The forensic science community has been very proactive in self-regulating by establishing good practices and high standards. We need to proffer these to the courts of law to establish them as generally acceptable.

The theme for the 2011 American Academy of Forensic Sciences Annual Scientific Meeting, “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy” reflects the guidelines established by the courts’ interpretation of science and the efforts of the membership of AAFS to strengthen forensics. The dedication of the members of the entire American Academy of Forensic Sciences, including the Criminalistics Section, toward improving Forensic Science is evident in the active participation in the profession and leadership roles taken to promote our field.

**Relevant** - Whether scientific inquiry, methods, or conclusions are relevant is sometimes difficult to establish. The analyst or his/her superiors, in the laboratory setting, determines what course of analysis is pertinent to the matter at hand. The laboratory management has an obligation to the customer to maintain scientific integrity and fiscal responsibility. It would be impractical to conduct every possible examination on every piece of recovered physical evidence, if that evidence or those tests had no significant or demonstrable bearing on the question at issue. This analytical tactic would further strain already limited laboratory resources. Well-designed experiments, thorough documentation, and communication of scientific ideas allow analysts to evaluate analytical strategy and make informed, logical, and rational decisions. The American Academy of Forensic Sciences and the Criminalistics Section promote research, open communication, and the exchange of ideas through the Forensic Sciences Foundation, support of the Young Forensic Scientists Forum, outreach programs, and through awards and grants.

**Reliable** - Aristotle’s dictum (Met., XIII, 10, 1086 b, 33) states that there is no scientific knowledge of the individual, where the word used for *individual* in Greek had the connotation of the idiosyncratic or wholly isolated occurrence. More contemporary interpretations include “History occurs once, Science is reproducible,” and “If it’s not reproducible, it’s not Science.” Reliability is one of the cornerstones of the Scientific Method. Is the method of experimentation or testing reliable? If all of the conditions can be reasonably controlled, are the results consistently reproducible? In an effort to promote reproducibility and reliability among laboratories and analysts, members of the Criminalistics Section have taken active leadership roles in many of the organizations created to promote uniformity in all aspects of forensic science.

Numerous dedicated individuals meet for two days to craft, revise, review, and discuss various analytical standards at the front end of every AAFS Annual Scientific Meeting. ASTM International’s E-30 Committee on Forensic Science has been busy preparing standards for use with forensic practices for decades. The scope of the documents produced include, but are not limited to, questioned documents, fire debris analysis, drug testing analysis, and collection and preservation of physical evidence. ASTM Committee E-30 on Forensic Science develops and maintains standards and protocols published in the Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Volume 14.02.

The Criminalistics Section recognizes the importance of individual board certification as a means of ensuring the quality and knowledge of persons conducting forensic analyses. The American Board of Criminalistics (ABC) is one of several certifying bodies in forensic science, each with their own specialties. The AAFS Criminalistics Section, as a contributing member organization, appoints one member to serve on the American Board of Criminalistics Board of Directors and one member to serve on the ABC Exam Committee. Above and beyond these two appointments, numerous other Academy members serve on both the ABC Board and Exam Committee as representatives of other contributing member organizations. The members of AAFS have embraced the ABC goals of establishing and maintaining professional levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities, and evaluating and recognizing professional competence. Over 700 individuals have received American Board of Criminalistics certification, successfully completing the examination and submitting the results of annual proficiency tests.

The American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) has been striving to improve, assess, and review the performance of laboratories involved in the criminal justice system for over 25 years. It is the largest forensic science laboratory accrediting body in the world with over 375 laboratories accredited worldwide. This monumental task involves the participation of practitioners from the entire forensic science community, many of whom are AAFS members. These individuals, have completed ASCLD/LAB-International Assessor Training, participated in one or more ASCLD/LAB-International assessments, and achieved the status of Certified Assessor in the continued on page 32
In my experience, there are differing views on what encompasses the domain of a forensic document examiner. The American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Guide for Scope of Work of Forensic Document Examiners E444-09 describes an examiner as one who “… makes scientific examinations, comparisons, and analyses of documents in order to: (1) establish genuineness or non genuineness, or to expose forgery, or to reveal alterations, additions, or deletions, (2) identify or eliminate persons as the source of handwriting, (3) identify or eliminate the source of typewriting or other impressions, marks, or relative evidence, and (4) write reports or give testimony, when needed, to aid the users of the examiner’s services in understanding the examiner’s findings.” Examples of examining identifying marks include those on photocopies, impressions from rubber stamps, and dry seals. An example of an examination for source is indentations in paper. The differentiation of inks is a common exam for document dating purposes. The work of those who claim personality and character assessment from handwriting is contrary to that of document examination.

As a charter section of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, the Questioned Document Section has, as of this writing, 212 members, and we are pleased that we have several trainee affiliates among our ranks. Regarding training, the AAFS Questioned Document Section, along with the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners, and the American Board of Forensic Document Examiners, Inc., recognizes the ASTM Standard Guide for Minimum Training Requirements for Forensic Document Examiners E2388-05. This guide, published in 2005, established basic qualifications for trainees and trainers as well as an extensive listing of training topics. Forensic handwriting examination has been regarded as a valid and reliable expertise for over 100 years in U.S. courts through repeated admissibility, federal statute (1913 U.S. Statute), laws (Frye ruling (1923)), and the Federal Rules of Evidence (specifically Rule 901(b)(3)). As the Supreme Court’s 1993 Daubert decision suggests, there are additional factors which may be applied to determine the reliability of an expertise. Applying these factors to forensic handwriting examination has resulted in over thirty-five successful federal Daubert decisions, and garnered twenty-four affirmations of admissibility by U.S. Appellate Courts.

The members of the forensic document examination discipline have addressed the Daubert factors as follows:

1. Standards: As mentioned, questioned documents utilizes ASTM as its publishing body for nationally recognized standards. The committee dedicated to forensic science (E30), contains a subcommittee dedicated to forensic document examination (E30.02). This subcommittee was established in the early 1970s and has seen its membership grow continually, recently breaching the 230 mark. The E30.02 subcommittee, which includes forensic handwriting examination, has published more ASTM standards (18) than any other forensic discipline, with several additional standards ready for ballot. ASTM Standard E2290 – 03, the Standard Guide for the Examination of Handwritten Items, articulates the systematic method used for decades by FDEs in handwriting examinations. Development of these standards has been due in large part to the Scientific Working Group for Document Examiners (SWGDOC), which meets twice a year to draft and revise standard terminologies and guides. SWGDOC is comprised of both government examiners and private consultants.

Certification available since 1977 by the American Board of Forensic Document Examiners (ABFDE) determines whether a forensic document examiner candidate has satisfied the minimum standards of competency. ABFDE is accredited by the Forensic Specialties Accreditation Board (FSAB). The American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) is an accrediting board of peers that determines whether a forensic laboratory complies with specific standards. ASCLD/LAB includes the inspection and accreditation of forensic document laboratory sections.

2. Error Rate/Reliability: Although no critical error rate in any forensic field has been substantiated, numerous studies conducted since the early 1990s have confirmed that FDEs are significantly more reliable than non-experts at reaching correct conclusions in the examination of handwriting, hand printing, and signatures, both natural and disguised (see Kam, JFS 1994 39: 5-14, JFS 1997, Vol. 42, No. 5 *, JFS 2001 46: 884-888, JFS 2003 48: 1391-1395; Found, 2002 Vol. 47, No. 5). In fact, Kam * found that non-experts are six times more likely to identify the wrong writer than an expert.
Reliable, Relevant and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy

What Could Be More Relevant Than Forensic Toxicology? But Is It Valid and Reliable?

Sources: Kenneth Ferslew, PhD, Phil Kemp, PhD, Ruth Winecker, PhD, and Loralie Langman, PhD, Toxicology Section

This year’s theme of “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science” can be applied to all facets of forensic toxicology. What can be more relevant than postmortem toxicology where forensic toxicologists are determining whether drugs and their metabolites in human tissues and fluids are the cause or a contributory factor in a death? Or human performance forensic toxicology where forensic toxicologists analyze blood, breath, and other biological specimens for the presence of ethanol and other drugs to evaluate their role in affecting human performance and behavior. And what about forensic urine drug testing for the presence or absence of drugs and their metabolites in the assessment of whether or not someone has used or abused drugs? All of these areas of forensic toxicology are extremely relevant to our society for the public good and in various situations to many of us individually.

Practicing forensic toxicologists know of this relevance and take this responsibility very seriously in performing our analyses and interpreting our results. It is why our profession has taken the charge of being a “reliable and valid forensic science” so seriously. It starts with the reliability of our basic function, the analysis of specimens for drugs and their metabolites. Our profession is built on the precise and accurate determination of the presence and concentration of drugs and their metabolites in biological specimens. This was accomplished by developing an approach in the application of our test procedures to identify and confirm the presence and concentration of the drug or metabolite by using multiple methods of analysis. These methods have been developed and validated so that their reliability to produce accurate and precise results can be substantiated.

The reliability and validity of forensic toxicology has been substantiated even further by the establishment of certification of our practitioners and the accreditation of our laboratories. The certification of forensic toxicologists establishes and maintains standards for the qualifications and competencies in our practicing professionals as well as their continuing education, while the accreditations of our laboratories demonstrates compliance with peer reviewed professional standards and successful completion of recognized proficiency testing programs for the procedures we perform. In an effort to document the reliability of our discipline, organizations such as the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS), the Society of Forensic Toxicologists (SOF), the American Board of Forensic Toxicology (ABFT), and The International Association of Forensic Toxicologists (TIAFT) have worked tirelessly putting guidelines in place to assist forensic laboratories with maintaining the highest degree of scientific integrity. There are now, for example, 25 laboratories that have been certified through the ABFT laboratory accreditation program. ABFT has also implemented a certification program for individual toxicologists as well with more than 300 diplomates and specialists having been certified. Many toxicology laboratories have gone through the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) for accreditation. The Forensic Toxicology Certification Board (FTCB) was established to validate the competence and conduct of practitioners of forensic toxicology. An important point to recognize is that these accreditation programs are not stagnant. The various organizations are constantly working to improve their programs. In these ways forensic toxicologists have been on the forefront of developing an environment in which our discipline is a relevant, reliable, and valid forensic science.

In support of these principles, our profession has initiated through our organizations (AAFS, ABFT, and SOFT), with the help of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the establishment of a Scientific Working Group on Forensic Toxicology (SWG-Tox). This has been in response to the National Academy of Sciences’ Recommendations for Strengthening Forensic Sciences in the United States. The SWG-Tox with representation from all the different organizations in forensic toxicology has undertaken the mission to investigate, analyze, develop, and disseminate consensus in the standards of practice for forensic toxicology. The three committees that make up SWG-Tox are: 1) Standards, Practice, Protocols and Accreditation; 2) Education, Ethics, Outreach and Certification; 3) Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation. Various advisors and consultants round out the composition of the working group. To fulfill its mission the SWG-Tox has set its objectives to establish minimum standards for the practice of forensic toxicology including practices, standards, and protocols for quality control and quality assurance, educational requirements, and acceptable certifications and accreditations. The SWG-Tox has also been charged with establishing a uniform code of ethics by which we should practice and identifying areas of research and development essential to the continued growth of our discipline. But all of this will be for not without adequate funding. Historically, questionable or less than satisfactory results in forensic cases have been due to extreme pressure on the forensic scientist to produce results using untested methods within insufficient time primarily due to inadequate resources. Hopefully the SWG-Tox’s efforts will be a continuation and refinement of these standards which have been already established in forensic toxicology and will promote the public awareness of the field of forensic toxicology as a relevant, reliable and valid forensic science in our country deserving adequate funding to perform its function.

The application of the theme of “Relevant, Reliable and Valid continued on page 32
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A Word From Your 2011 Program Chair

The articles presented in the May Academy News proved without a doubt that my “all for one and one for all” sentiments offered in the March/April Newsletter are universally held within the community. In the May Academy News, the section authors, without consulting with the other sections, hit the same targets: the AAFS 2011 theme and the NAS Report. At this point you may be thinking that this isn’t a real shocker since these issues are on everyone’s tongue and in everyone’s mind. The shock is that each author, although in different specialties, wrote with the same tone, the same urgency, and with the same desire to show what each field has and can strive for at the 2011 meeting.

This uniformity derived from independent thought confirms that we are one Academy. The May newsletter messages urged the membership to: consider presenting in their respective sections; write papers on the latest research; consider a section’s offered topics; dust off valuable raw data; and collaborate with other sections. The argument to give life to completed research existing as raw data revives real images from my own personal experiences. I have seen offices in scientific institutions filled with countless stacks of paper waiting to be compiled into a formalized article. These reams of paper hold years of research data that has yet to be synthesized into a legible document. What a loss to our profession if this information is never brought forth for public consumption. I can’t help but wonder how much information is out there. How much knowledge is the scientific community losing because there just isn’t the time to dig through all the data, figures, and notes? The urgency to take what has just been discovered and build the next research project tends to consume the energy and time that should be devoted to writing and publicizing. I understand that this direct appeal to stop the race and take the time to write conjures rolling eyes, but this raw data is the information needed to show that we scientists do have the research to support our positions and actions. The publishing of actual data in a format the public can read will bring credence and acceptance to the valuable service we provide.

For those of you in the position described above, consider taking just a portion of one of those stacks and put it in a formalized document for the August 1st submission deadline. Regarding our “One Academy” - I am proud to see that each section is reminding the membership to write and submit their knowledge for the benefit of all. With this attitude, the 2011 AAFS Annual Scientific Meeting will be a real eye opener.

AAFS Abstract Deadline: August 1, 2010
Submit your abstract online at www.aafs.org.
Submit your Call For Papers Form today.
(See page 15 for details)
The American Academy of Forensic Sciences has selected United Airlines as the official airline carrier for the 63rd Annual Scientific Meeting in Chicago. The meeting ID number for United Airlines is 585WH and should be used when booking travel on United.

The same code (585WH) may be used by international travelers. Reservations may be made through United’s Meetings Plus Reservation System or a travel professional. In the U.S. or Canada, contact United’s MeetingsPlus reservation service at (800) 521-4041. For international travel, contact your local reservation office.

AAFS Continuing Education Needs Identified

The following is a comprehensive list of recommended abstract topics based on the continuing education needs of the 2010 AAFS Annual Scientific Meeting attendees:

- Animal bites
- Basic DNA interpretation and procedures
- Curriculum development for forensic nursing education in undergraduate nursing program
- Domestic violence
- Ethics
- Explosion and fires - how labs work
- Forensic veterinary medicine
- Infectious diseases
- Mary Ripple to conduct a seminar on how to handle the investigation of a death involving tasers
- Melendez-Diaz and more NAS outcome research
- Molecular biology of diseases
- More advanced programs in forensic pathology issues - interpretive toxicology for the medical examiner
- More info of methods of data generation
- Odontology workshops
- Uncertainty measurement
- Vulnerable populations - disabled, elder, etc.

FSF Needs Your Help With the 2011 $ilent Auction!

With your help, the Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) Annual Silent Auction can exceed expectations during the 2011 meeting in Chicago, IL. 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, 2010. You and your agency will be recognized for your donation. Auction items received after the deadline will be accepted for the following year. Thank you in advance.

Suggested Ideas. . . . . . . .
FSF Student Affiliate Scholarships

The Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) will fund a limited number of AAFS Student Affiliate registrations for the 2011 American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) Annual Meeting through a “Scholarship Program.”

To qualify for the scholarship, AAFS Student Affiliates must submit an abstract for the AAFS 2011 program through the online submission system or Call For Papers 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.

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. The deadline for submission is August 1.

FSF Travel Grants

The Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) is pleased to offer Travel Grants this year for students to assist with travel expenses in attending the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) Annual Meeting in Chicago. The FSF Board of Trustees was able to approve the expenses, not to exceed $800 per student, for five (5) students this year, including complimentary meeting registration. This is a wonderful opportunity, and members are encouraged to promote it.

Travel Grant Eligibility Requirements:
- 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.

All submissions must be received and completed by October 15. The deadline is firm with no extension. Please submit the aforementioned Travel Grant Requirements electronically to Kimberly Wrasse at kwrasse@aafs.org, or by mail to: Kimberly Wrasse, FSF, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904.

FSF Jan S. Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Assistance Grant

Purpose: The Jan Grant Award 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.

Jan S. Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Assistance Grant Eligibility Requirements:
- 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 is $500. In addition, up to $1,200 is available for travel expenses to attend a future AAFS Annual Meeting where the awardee has an approved platform presentation of the completed research. The funding must be used to complete the research project.

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

All submissions must be received and completed by July 31. The deadline is firm with no extension. Please submit the aforementioned Jan S. Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Assistance Grant Eligibility Requirements electronically to Kimberly Wrasse at kwrasse@aafs.org, or by mail to: Kimberly Wrasse, FSF, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904.
**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 ______________________________
12th Annual FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award Competition Announced

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 12th 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, 2010, in compliance with AAFS abstract criteria, and indicate that the abstract is submitted for the Emerging 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, one abstract must be designated by the presenter as an EFSA entry. If multiple abstracts are submitted for review and one abstract is not designated by the presenter as an EFSA entry, none of the abstracts will be considered by the EFSA Review Committee.

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 2012 AAFS Annual Business Meeting in Atlanta, GA.

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 2011. 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, 2010.

THE AWARD: The award will cover the expense of the recipient’s attendance at the 2012 Annual 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 2012 AAFS Annual Business Meeting in Atlanta, GA.

**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, 2010, to: AAFS 2011 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 63rd Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) will be held February 21-26, 2011, in Chicago, Illinois.

The Program Committee solicits the submission of abstracts on topics of interest to the forensic science community. August 1, 2010, 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, 2010 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, 2010. 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.

General Information

Key Words

Each author is to provide three key words or terms in the space provided on the abstract form.

Oral Presentation

Each scientific session meeting room will be equipped with a lighted pointer, podium, microphone, LCD projector, and screen. 35mm projectors must be requested. A limited number of slide trays will be available. Speakers are encouraged to bring their own slide trays.

Requests for additional audio-visual equipment will be reviewed by the Program Committee and are subject to approval by the Section Chair. Speakers will be notified of the disposition of their requests.

Poster Presentation

Each author selected for poster presentation will be provided with a 4’ x 8’ tack board on which to display material related to his/her presentation. Thumb tacks will be provided. If material is better suited as a table top display, please indicate on the abstract form.

Illustrations

All tables and graphs should be converted to gray-scale.

Meeting Registration

All speakers and presenters (oral or poster) are required to register for the annual meeting. If your abstract is accepted for presentation, you will be required to pay the normal registration fee for the annual meeting.

The Journal of Forensic Sciences has the first publication rights to all previously unpublished reports and papers presented at the Academy’s annual meeting. The Journal’s right of this publication is limited to six months from the date of presentation.

Poster Presentations

Content

A well-designed poster should:

1. Inform the observer as to the subject matter, the information contained and the conclusions drawn;
2. Indicate how the experiments were designed and how the results were obtained; and
3. Facilitate discussion between the author(s) and the viewers.

Preparation

Authors have complete freedom to choose ways of displaying their information in figures, tables, text, photographs, etc. However, they should avoid crowding too much information into a limited space. The poster may be augmented by the use of manuscripts and sketch pads with marking pens.
Instructions for Abstract Submission & LCD Projection

AAFS Abstract Policy

Presentations at AAFS annual meetings and corresponding abstracts must be formulated to promote education and to elevate accuracy, precision, and specificity in the forensic sciences. Presentations or abstracts which promote a commercial product, company, entity or service will not be allowed at AAFS annual meetings. Presentations by commercial entities shall be limited to the science and not to an advertisement or promotion of their product over that of a competitor. Any abstract or presentation that is perceived by a section program chair or the Academy Meeting Program Chair as a product endorsement will not be approved for presentation at the Meeting. A presentation given at a Meeting that in the opinion of the section program chair or the Academy Meeting Program Chair to be a product endorsement may result in the presenter and corresponding company being barred from making presentations at future AAFS meetings.

Presentations and abstracts will be allowed to mention a product by name only in the context of describing a scientific methodology or the source of sample. For example, specimens often have unique physical or chemical properties that are the key to their identification or analysis (e.g. Dacron fibers, Glock rifling, 3M tapes, explosive formulations, coating materials, etc.). It is appropriate for those materials to be specifically identified since they are the relevant to formulations, coating materials, etc.). It is appropriate for these materials to be specifically identified since they are the relevant to the scientific results. Or references to specific reagents or instrumentation validated for use in the analytical procedure being presented where the use of a different product may affect the scientific results. Or references to specific reagents or instrumentation validated for use in the analytical procedure being presented where the use of a different product may affect the outcome of the analysis (e.g. Identifiler™ Amplification Kit, Agilent 5860 GC, HP-1 column, Olympus BHP microscope, etc).

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 included 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.

LCD Projection

Computers may not be provided as part of this package. It is your responsibility to provide the laptop or computer used for your presentation. A LCD projection unit will be available in the Speaker Prep Room. Please make certain your computer is compatible with the projector and that all is in working order and tested before your presentation.

Below are recommended guidelines for preparing your presentation:
• Dark background and light text give good contrast and show up well in the meeting room; however, a background too dark may blacken the room too much. Avoid color combinations such as red and blue, yellow and green, etc.
• ARIAL “Bold” is the recommended font style. Avoid using fonts that project poorly because the line width is too thin.
• Use as large a font as possible. Anything below 24 pt. is too small. Suggested font sizes are Titles: 48-54; Main text titles: 32; Smallest text lines: 24.
• Do not crowd the frame. Limit the number of text lines per frame to a maximum of seven.
• 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.
• Check your computer resolution by going to your computer's control panel, selecting “Display” then “Settings.” Recommended resolution is 1024 x 768 (XGA).

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, 2010, 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 his/her 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 # __________

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

   b. I hereby acknowledge by submission of this form that the

      i. J. Forensic Sciences

      ii. Proceedings

   If yes, where and when? ______________________________________________________________________

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

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

   b. I hereby acknowledge by submission of this form that the

      i. J. Forensic Sciences

      ii. Proceedings

   If yes, where and when? ______________________________________________________________________

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

   I. 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):

   ________________________________________________________________

   II. Is this activity/presentation financially supported?  □ Yes  □ No  If yes, by whom? __________________________________________

      and in what form?  □ Grant Support  □ Paid Consultant  □ Employee  □ Shareholder  □ Speakers Bureau

   III. 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. Representatives of the media are allowed to record my presentation.  □ Yes  □ No

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

   e. I acknowledge that all authors contributing on this paper have been properly cited. I understand that only the authors listed on this form and in the online system will appear in the printed materials (e.g., Programs, Proceedings).  □ 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 Next Page)
Complete form and return original, with attached C.V., one photocopy, and a copy on disk by August 1, 2010. If you wish to submit your abstract online, go to the AAFS website at: www.aafs.org.

- Type abstract, single spaced, 10 point size (or on attached separate page following format provided in Sample Abstract).
- Do not type in all capital letters. Type all copy, including title, author names, and addresses in upper and lower case; capitalize and punctuate exactly as you wish the abstract to appear.
- A single spaced, one-half page length document (minimum 500 to 700 words) is required. Please attach an additional sheet if required.

**Title**

**Authors**
Name(s) and Address(es):

**Learning Objective and Outcome**
Please state what the attendee can expect to learn, retain, or implement into his or her practice.

**Impact Statement**
Please state how your presentation will impact the attendees in terms of: knowledge, competence, or performance.

**Text**

Attach Additional Pages as Needed
VOLUNTEERS ARE NEEDED FOR THE 2011 AAFS ANNUAL SCIENTIFIC MEETING

The 2011 AAFS Annual Scientific Meeting is scheduled for February 21-26, 2011, in Chicago, Illinois. Volunteers are needed to accomplish an array of administrative and gatekeeping tasks throughout the week of the meeting. Volunteers who are not members of the Academy may receive complimentary registration to attend all non-ticketed sessions of the meeting with a minimum of eight hours of completed volunteer service at the meeting. This does not include sessions requiring pre-registration or fees other than the basic meeting registration fee. If you plan to attend any of the special sessions (i.e., workshops, breakfasts, luncheons, etc.), please contact the Volunteer Coordinator for the AAFS Registration Form. Inactive members of the Academy are not eligible to receive complimentary registration.

Although AAFS members do not receive complimentary registration for volunteering, the Academy needs its members to volunteer. Your service to the Academy is recognized as instrumental in making the event a success. Persons accompanying registered attendees are also welcome to volunteer if they wish.

Below is a list of the various areas where volunteers are needed as well as an information form. Credit card information is now required; however, your card will only be charged should you attend the meeting for free and fail to fulfill your volunteer commitment. *Volunteer applications must be received no later than December 1, 2010, and are accepted on a first come, first served basis. Incomplete forms will not be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAFS Office Assistant</th>
<th>Luncheons</th>
<th>Plenary Session</th>
<th>Registration Desk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Seminars</td>
<td>Special Sessions</td>
<td>AAFS Annual Business Meeting</td>
<td>Scientific Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Student Academy</td>
<td>Evening Sessions</td>
<td>Section Business Meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAFS 63rd Annual Scientific Meeting Volunteer Information Form*

Name: ___________________________________ Title: ____________________ Organization: __________________________

Mailing Address: __________________________________________________________________________________________

City: _________________________________________________ State/Province: _____________________________________

Zip/Postal Code: _______________ Country: _______________________ Home Phone: ________________________________

Fax: __________________________ Work Phone: ___________________________ Cell Phone: _________________________

Email: _________________________________________________   AAFS Member? Yes [ ] No [ ] Member #______________

The best way to contact me during the meeting is: [ ] Phone [ ] Email [ ] Other ____________________________

Ex. Date: ___________ MC [ ] Visa [ ] AE [ ]

Signature: ________________________________________ Credit Card #: _______________________________

AAFS is authorized to charge up to the 2011 Non-Member registration rate for registration fees should I attend the meeting and not fulfill my volunteer work assignment(s).

I plan to arrive in Chicago, IL, on __________________________ and depart on __________________________ (date) (date)

Please check all dates you are available to volunteer. Mark the time(s) of day you are available (am and/or pm) as well as the maximum number of days for which you are willing to volunteer. **Please Note:** Every attempt is made to fulfill your requests; however, there is no guarantee your requests will match our needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates Available</th>
<th>Time of Day Available</th>
<th>I prefer to work: [ ] Full Days [ ] Half Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, February 19</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, February 20</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 21</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 22</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 23</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 24</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 25</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, February 26</td>
<td>__________ am _____ pm</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum number of days willing to work: ________________________________________________

[ ] I am requesting "Complimentary" registration as a non-member with a minimum of eight hours of volunteer service.

*Return completed form by December 1, 2010, to:

Amber Corrin  
AAFS Volunteer Coordinator  
410 North 21st Street  
Colorado Springs, CO 80904  
Fax: (719) 636-1993  
acorrin@aafs.org

*Form must be filled out completely. Incomplete forms will not be accepted.
International Educational Outreach Program to France
September 20–27, 2010

President Joseph Bono and Mrs. Barbara Bono invite you to join them on an eight-day tour of France. The itinerary will include stays in Paris, Montpellier, and Lyon. Participants will have opportunities to meet with forensic science colleagues in France, participate in a conference in Montpellier, and, at the same time, take advantage of the cultural and historical riches of the three wonderful cities to be visited.

Travelers will make their own way to “The City of Lights” and meet in Paris on Monday, September 20. Located in northern France along the banks of the River Seine, Paris is the largest city in France with a population of two million, yet it only takes barely two hours to cross the city on foot. In the great local tradition of the flâneur, or thoughtful boulevard-stroller, Paris is a wonderful city for aimless wandering. Relaxed quarters such as the vibrant Marais, elegant St-Germain and romantic Montmartre are ideal for street-browsing, shopping and café-sitting, and the city’s minimal open space is redeemed by beautiful formal gardens, by the pathways and pavements that run beside the River Seine, and by endless hidden or unexpected havens. Everywhere you go, historic landmark buildings and contemporary architectural wonders remind you of the city’s pride and grandeur.

The group will then head to Montpellier, just six miles from the Mediterranean coast. Montpellier is a bustling and vibrant city filled with architecture and rich in history. It is lined with boutiques, sidewalk cafes, and is dotted with magnificent squares. It is also home to the University of Montpellier, the oldest school of medicine in the world—founded in 1220 by Cardinal Conrad and confirmed by Pope Nicholas IV in a papal bull of 1289. The university was suppressed during the French Revolution and replaced by faculties of medicine, pharmacy, science, and letters of the University of France. It was reestablished as a university in 1896. In 1970 it was divided into three units: University of Montpellier I (where the medical school is located), University of Montpellier II (also known as University of Technical Sciences, with faculties of engineering, sciences, and business management), and University of Montpellier III (Paul Valéry University, with faculties of arts, letters, philosophy and linguistics, languages, literature, human and environmental sciences, economics, mathematics, and social sciences).

Lyon, located in east central France, is physically the second biggest city in France. From the sixteenth century right up until the postwar dominance of metal-works and chemicals, silk was the city’s main industry, generating the wealth which left behind a multitude of Renaissance buildings. The city is now forging a role for itself within a new Europe, with international schools and colleges, the HQ for Interpol, a recently inaugurated eco-friendly tram system, a second TGV station with links to the north that bypass Paris, and high-tech industrial parks for international companies making it a modern city par excellence. It has embraced the monetarist vision of the European Union and is acting, with some success, as a postmodern city-state within it. With all of its advancements, Lyon certainly has maintained charms. Foremost among these is gastronomy; there are more restaurants per square metre of the old town than anywhere else on earth, and the city boasts superstars of the international chef circuit.

The program will conclude with a daylong cultural tour to Versailles. The Château de Versailles is one of the largest castles in the world. The Chateau de Versailles has ... more than 2,000 windows, 700 rooms, 1,250 fireplaces, 67 staircases and more than 1,800 acres of park. The paintings, tapestries, sculptures, furniture of this fabulous castle, have been executed by the best Italian and French artists of the time.

Schedule:
September 20, Monday - Arrive Paris - remainder day leisure
September 21, Tuesday - Medico Legal Institute of Paris and welcome evening dinner
September 22, Wednesday - Depart for Montpellier
September 23, Thursday - University of Montpellier
September 24, Friday - Depart for Lyon
September 25, Thursday - French Police Crime Laboratory Headquarters
September 26, Sunday - Depart for Paris - remainder day leisure
September 27, Monday - Cultural tour and farewell dinner - tour ends

Hotel accommodations and rates will be available three days prior to and three days after the conclusion of the program for those interested in arriving early and/or extending their stay. A separate, historic tour of Normandy will be offered for those extending their stay (Note: The Normandy tour will require a minimum number of registrants and is subject to cancellation if registration is not met). More details can be found on the AAFS website www.aafs.org, or you may contact Nancy Jackson at njackson@aafs.org.
AAFS 2010 France Educational Outreach Program
September 20-27, 2010

President Joseph P. Bono and Mrs. Barbara Bono invite you to join them on an eight-day tour (September 20-27, 2010) of France. The itinerary will include stays in Paris, Lyon, and Montpellier. Following the design of previous tours, AAFS members will have opportunities to meet with forensic science colleagues in France, and, at the same time, take advantage of the cultural and historical riches of the wonderful cities to be visited.

APPLICATION

Please complete the following application and return it to Nancy Jackson by fax (719-636-1993), or by U.S. Postal Service to the attention of Nancy Jackson, AAFS, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904. This is your opportunity to secure space only and does not obligate you to participate until complete details have been completed and posted.

*Please ensure that you have the proper documentation. All necessary travel documents for France must be presented at airport check-in. Refunds will not be granted for failure to secure proper travel documentation. Presently, all American citizens entering France must possess a valid U.S. citizen passport.
IEOP Package Details

The cost of the AAFS 2010 International Educational Outreach Program (IEOP) to France is $2,495 per person, based upon double occupancy at all hotels. The single rate is $2,995.

The $2,495 ($2,995 single) tour package includes the following:

**Hotels (8 Nights):**
Paris - Holiday Inn Paris Opera: September 20 - 22 and September 26 - 28 (four nights)
Montpellier - Holiday Inn Metropole: September 22 - 24 (two nights)
Lyon - Holiday Inn Villeurbanne: September 24 - 26 (two nights)

**Meals:**
Breakfast: A full buffet breakfast each morning is included.
Lunch: Cultural Day in Versailles September 27.

**Other (as indicated in Itinerary):**
Luggage transfer, motor coach with driver, rail transfers, English speaking tour staff, forensic science meetings and visits, and private rooms (single or double occupancy per application preference) at the three hotels, and Cultural Day fees. Holiday Inn Paris Opera check-in is guaranteed by 3:00 p.m. Guests are asked to notify Nancy Jackson if early arrival is required.

**Items not included:**
1. Round trip airfare to France.
2. Tips, meals other than those noted on the itinerary, and personal items.
3. Extended stay hotel nights.
4. Optional Normandy tour.

Please note: All hotels have guaranteed the group rate for early arrivals and/or extended stays.

**Payments:**
Payments of $2,495 ($4,990 per couple), or $2,995 single rate, may be made by check to the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS). MasterCard, American Express, and VISA credit cards are also accepted. A cancellation policy applies. Please see page 23 of this newsletter for cancellation policy details.

**Payment Schedule:**
Participants may guarantee their places by making full payment by August 1, 2010.

If using a credit card, please include the following with the application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name As It Appears On Card:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Card Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Card Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Approval:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CANCELLATION POLICY FOR AAFS 2010 INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH PROGRAM TO FRANCE

All requests for tour cancellations must be made in writing and sent by fax (719-636-1993) to the AAFS Headquarters. Phone cancellations will not be accepted. If a registration is cancelled, fees will be refunded based upon replacement availability and tour refund policies negotiated with Ovation Coordination, Paris, France, less a $50 administrative fee. Restrictions and fees will apply, and, refunds are not guaranteed.

The quoted price ($4,990 double occupancy or $2,995 single occupancy) is good through Aug 1, 2010, based upon the limit of the tour group at 35 persons.

All taxes, fees, and charges (any related penalties and interest) imposed on any portion of a passenger’s travel are the responsibility of the passenger, regardless of the date of purchase or travel, or any retroactive imposition of such taxes, fees, charges, penalties, and interest.

RELEASE OF LIABILITY:
I/we hereby acknowledge that I/we have voluntarily applied to join this program (AAFS 2010 IEOP) and to engage in activities conducted during the program by the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, their associates and agents, and with this registration I/we certify that I/we have no physical, mental, or other condition or disability that would create a hazard for me/us or other program participants.
I/we am aware that participation in this program and its activities involves the risk of injury and property damage from any cause whatever arising from my/our participation in the program. I/we understand that baggage and personal effects are at all times the sole responsibility of the program participants.

By the act of joining the program and participating in its activities, I/we, my/our heirs, personal representative and assigns will not make any claims, actions, or demands against or sue the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, its associates and agents in connection with any cause whatsoever arising from my/our attendance and participation in the program, including matters involving injuries or property damage. The American Academy of Forensic Sciences, its associates, and agents act only as agents for the suppliers of transportation, lodging, meals, sightseeing activities, and other program activities, and have no responsibility for any damages, injuries, or accidents that might occur in relation to the use of these suppliers. Neither are they nor the suppliers to be held responsible for damages, injuries, or accidents that occur due to Acts of God, natural disasters, weather conditions, terrorism, or any other matters beyond their control. They retain the right in their sole discretion to decline to accept or retain any person as a member of a program. They are not liable for any penalty cost of a nonrefundable air ticket purchased in connection with this program.

Participant Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Email Approval: ________________ (Please check)
As you read through this issue of Academy News, please take note of the various funding opportunities offered by the Forensic Sciences Foundation, and pay particular attention to the deadlines for each. While some of the deadlines have passed (Acorn Grants and Lucas Grant had a deadline of June 15; the NIJ/FSF Grant had a deadline of June 30), other opportunities are still available - you have until July 31 to apply for the FSF Jan S. Bashinski Criminalistics Graduate Thesis Assistance Grant, August 1 to apply for a Student Affiliate Scholarship, and October 15 to get in the running for an FSF Travel Grant. As I mentioned, details of all of these funding programs are available throughout this issue and on the FSF website (www.forensicsciencesfoundation.org). AAFS Student Affiliates and Trainee Affiliates, don’t forget the opportunity to submit an abstract to be considered for the FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award competition. The deadline to submit an abstract is August 1. In addition, the Foundation is working on an award to help defray the cost of attending the 2011 IAFS Meeting in Funchal, Portugal. Details about this award should appear in the next issue of Academy News.

Of course, none of these awards would be possible without the generous support of the Academy membership. If you haven’t contributed yet, please consider making a contribution to the FSF Endowment Fund. Contributions can be made as a general gift, or to the “I Gave an Hour” program. Of course, all contributions are tax deductible.

2010 FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award Recipient Announced

The 11th Annual FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award paper competition was hosted this year in Seattle. Jordan C. Brough, BS, a Masters student at The George Washington University, was selected as the 2010 winner by a panel of judges for his oral presentation entitled “A Method for Determining the Software Used to Print a Questioned Inkjet Document Utilizing Microscopy and Computerized Imaging.” Congratulations to Mr. Brough who will receive all expenses paid to attend the 63rd Annual Meeting in Chicago.

The deadline for paper submission of the 12th Annual FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award is August 1. Please see page 14 for submission guidelines.
Preparations for the 2011 Annual Meeting are well underway. The theme for the meeting is “Reliable, Relevant and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” The Criminalistics Section Program Chair Ken Williams and Section Program Co-Chair Jennifer Mihalovich are busy putting together what will surely be an outstanding program for this meeting. Contributors are encouraged to submit abstracts before the August 1 deadline. Submissions should reflect the great work being done in our field highlighting the reliability, relevance, and validity of the science.

I am pleased to report the progress of several important committees. The Criminalistics Section Ad Hoc Policy and Procedures Committee, fearlessly led by Carla Noziglia, is busy reviewing and crafting much needed changes to the section’s policies and procedures. This is no easy task. Over the past years, our section has grown tremendously and it has become necessary for the policies and procedures that govern our section to evolve with the changes in our membership and field.

Criminalistics is the largest and most diverse section of the Academy. Several concerns have been raised regarding the interpretation of the criteria for student and trainee affiliate membership status, as well as the specific disciplines accepted by the section. Approximately 400 membership applications are reviewed each year. Many times the applicant’s field of employment doesn’t fit the disciplines traditionally accepted by the section or the applicant is employed in a field that overlaps other sections of the Academy. The Section Membership Committee, guided by Chair Sanford Angelos, is fine tuning the membership application process. The committee hopes to clarify these issues through recommendations at next year’s section business meeting in Chicago.

Persons interested in being considered for election/appointment to section offices should: (1) review the requirements set forth in the Policy and Procedure Manual, Section 7.5.1.III. (available on the AAFS website, www.aafs.org); and, (2) submit a curriculum vitae, especially highlighting those activities which meet the requirements contained in the Policy and Procedure Manual to Hiram Evans (hiram.evans@verizon.net), Chair of the Criminalistics Section Nominating Committee. Traditionally, offices in the Criminalistics Section are filled in succession commencing with appointment as section program co-chair and advancing annually to section program chair, section secretary, and section chair, followed by service on both the Section Nominating and Awards Committees.

Important deadlines are quickly approaching and will be here before you know it. Abstracts for proposed presentations, workshops, and poster sessions for next year’s Annual Scientific Meeting in Chicago, IL are due August 1. The theme for the meeting is “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” The section would like to build upon the excellent showing it had at this year’s meeting in Seattle, and continue to provide high quality research presentations, case reports, and workshops for the benefit of not only its members, but the Academy as a whole.

For those Associate Members and Members interested in promotion, applications must be completed and received by October 1, for consideration at the Chicago meeting. This deadline also applies to any individuals wishing to join the AAFS as an Associate Member, Trainee Affiliate, or Student Affiliate, so spread the word to your interested colleagues and associates.

Also, section members should be aware of several papers slated to be published in the JFS in the coming months, including the following:

Speech Watermarking: An Approach for the Forensic Analysis of Digital Telephonic Recordings, Marcos Faundez-Zanuy, Jose J. Lucena-Molina, Martin Hagmüller
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Measurement Uncertainty When Estimating the Velocity of an Allegedly Speeding Vehicle from Images, Bart Hoogeboom, Ivo Alberink

Pore Sub-Features Reproducibility in Direct Microscopic and Livescan Images—Their Reliability in Personal Identification, Abhishek Gupta, Raul Sutton

ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Source: Thomas L. Bohan, PhD, JD, AAFS Past President

The Engineering Sciences Section has long agitated moving the scientific sessions to a point earlier in the week. In 2010, they got their wish, with the sessions starting on Wednesday morning instead of Thursday. It is of interest to see how the Academy as a whole reacted to the rearrangement of events that was necessary to achieve this change. It appears that our section was not alone in its desires. The table below sets out the results of a survey taken during the 2010 meeting, to which twenty-five percent of the meeting attendees responded.

| Strongly Prefer [the 2010 structure] | 118 |
| Prefer                           | 164 |
| Neutral                         | 518 |
| Oppose [the 2010 structure]     | 50  |
| Strongly Oppose [the 2010 structure] | 32 |

Only 9% of the respondents opposed the new structure. Of the 339 expressing a non-neutral opinion, 77% preferred the 2010 structure. I hope that subsequent Presidents will take these results from the membership into account when optimizing the structure for the annual meeting.

The changed meeting structure made impracticable the section’s usual pre-business-meeting catered luncheon. This turned out to be a benefit in disguise. At the instigation of 2010 Section Chair Roy Crawford, the luncheon venue was moved to a nearby restaurant. It is unclear whether this was an inspired idea or an excellent one so obvious that it should have been implemented years ago. It permitted a midday escape from the Convention Center and the opportunity for each member to choose his or her meal at half the customary price. Moreover, members’ companions were able to join in, enhancing the enjoyment of the hour. May this become the practice of the future!

GENERAL

Sources: Julie A. Howe, MBA, Section Secretary

The NAS Report and Senate Judiciary Committee “Draft Outline of Forensic Reform Legislation” emphasized future needs for forensic practitioners to include mandatory professional certification, development of discipline-specific practice standards, and high-quality, stringent education, training and continuing education opportunities for those working in forensic science. Since our section consists of disciplines that have existing certification, accreditation, and standards, these are topics that could be highlighted at the 2011 meeting. Let’s showcase the steps that have been taken to prove the scientific strengths of our disciplines. Get busy finalizing those abstracts before the August 1st deadline! Program Chairs Claire Shepard and Alan Boehm strongly encourage early submission to alleviate any last minute problems with the online submission process.

Current General Section membership status is as follows: Retired Members = 3%; Fellows = 12%; Members = 9%; Associate Members = 49%; Trainee Affiliates = 11%; and Student Affiliates = 14%. The Regional Representative Committee will be contacting Associate Members and Trainee Affiliates offering assistance with the promotion process in the coming months. October 1 is the deadline for promotion applications.

As forensic educators, we should encourage research projects and publications incorporating new and sound methodologies and statistical or quantitative methods in forensic examinations. Presentations could emphasize the current state of research. We could also highlight how our various disciplines interact with each other in collaborative efforts to achieve valid scientific results.

In April 2009, the Scientific Working Group on Bloodstain Pattern Analysis (SWGSTAIN) published a Recommended Terminology list for bloodstain pattern analysis, which is available at SWGSTAIN.org. Noticeably absent from this recommended terminology list are the terms High Velocity Impact Spatter, Medium Velocity Impact Spatter, and Low Velocity Impact Spatter. This represents an obvious change in the terminology currently recommended for use in the discipline of bloodstain pattern analysis. During the annual meeting of the International Association of Bloodstain Pattern Analysis (IABPA) in Portland, OR, in October 2009, the membership voted to endorse the SWGSTAIN Recommended Terminology. In addition, Collaborative Testing Services, Inc. has adopted the SWGSTAIN Recommended Terminology list for their bloodstain pattern analysis proficiency test.

JURISPRUDENCE

Source: Andrew Sulner, MSFS, JD, Section Secretary

The AAFS, the ABA Sections on Criminal Justice and Science & Technology Law, and several other organizations co-sponsored a program entitled “Prescriptions for Criminal Justice Forensics,” which was presented on June 4, at New York City’s Fordham University School of Law. A distinguished panel of speakers comprising academics, prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, scientists, accountants, and others discussed a myriad of issues concerning the future of forensic science and various forensic science disciplines. Panel sessions focused on controversial issues raised by the NAS Report, including the establishment of a National Institute of Forensic Sciences, cutting edge issues
involving various forms of pattern and impression evidence, ethical and disclosure obligations imposed upon participants in the criminal justice system, pre- and post-trial DNA applications, and effective fraud and forensic accounting investigative techniques. AAFS President Joseph Bono served as the conference luncheon speaker and the Jurisprudence Section of the Academy is proud to report that several of its members participated in this program, including Betty Layne DesPortes, Paul Giannelli, Ken Melson, Melissa Mourges, and Barry Scheck.

Donald Shelton was recently awarded a PhD from the Grant Sawyer Center for Judicial Studies at the University of Nevada, becoming one of only seven judges in the U.S. to have earned a PhD in Judicial Studies.

If you haven’t already, please start thinking about presenting a paper for the 2011 meeting in Chicago, keeping in mind that all abstracts must be received by the Academy office no later than August 1. Any inquiries should be sent to our 2011 Section Program Co-Chairs, Christine Funk at christine.funk@state.mn.us and Stephanie Domitrovich at sdomitrovich@eriecountygov.com

Remember, this is YOUR column, so please send your personal news or any other newsworthy items to andysulner@aol.com. Have a great summer!
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Three ad hoc committees are also in existence at this time: the Positive Accomplishments and Reports of the Forensic Pathologists/Biologists, which is comprised of Wendy Gunther, Kathryn Haden-Pineri, Sam Simmons, Michele Catelli, Sharon Boone, Linda Perrott, and Elizabeth Richards; the Best Forensic Biologist Trainee Research Paper Award, which is comprised of Elizabeth Richards, Amy Gruszczcki, Shashi Jasa, Paul Stein, Duarte Vieira, and Mary Gilliland; and in order to assess the current state of diversity within the section, an ad hoc committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Forensic Biologists in the Pathology/Biology Section has been created. Members of this ad hoc committee include Jeff Tomberlin, Duarte Vieira, Summer Decker, Jamie Downs, Ellen Riemer, and Jason Byrd. It is charged with assessing current membership in the section and determining novel methods for recruiting new members. The responsibilities of the other committees listed above can be accessed through the Policy and Procedure Manual on the American Academy of Forensic Sciences website, www.aafs.org. With this said, there are numerous opportunities to get engaged with the Pathology/Biology Section, and all are welcome! It also demonstrates the dynamic nature of our section and its commitment to addressing current concerns and interests of its members. If you have any suggestions in regards to new interests that need to be explored, please do not hesitate to contact our Section Chair, Kim Collins.

PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Source: Susan M.T. Myster, PhD, Section Secretary

Chair Brad Adams would like to solicit nominations from section members for the prestigious T. Dale Stewart Award. The T. Dale Stewart Award is presented annually to a member of the Physical Anthropology Section in recognition of exceptional contributions to the field of physical anthropology. Posthumous nominees, as well as those still living, will be considered by the T.D. Stewart Award Committee. Please send your nominations to either Brad Adams or Susan Myster.

Bill Belcher and Ann Ross, Physical Anthropology Section Program Chairs, would like to remind everyone that program submissions (oral presentations, posters, workshops, etc.) must be received by August 1 for consideration. This is a firm deadline for both electronic and hard-copy submissions. The online abstract system is currently open. AAFS members can submit abstracts via the AAFS People Web. Non-members can register for a user name and password on the AAFS website. If you have any questions, a user’s guide can be found at: https://data.aafs.org/pms/Submission/abstractstartpage.aspx. Please refer to the Announcement and Call for Papers on page 15 for general information on content, time, as well as general and specific instructions for abstract submission.

Turhon Murad, Eric Bartelink, and P. Willey are pleased to announce that Colleen Milligan will be joining the Department of Anthropology at CSU, Chico. Dr. Milligan received her PhD this past spring from Michigan State University and her dissertation research focused on the paleopathology of a large skeletal sample from the Milwaukee County Institution Grounds Cemetery.

PSYCHIATRY & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE

Source: Manuel Lopez-Leon, MD, Section Secretary

The 2011 AAFS Annual Scientific Meeting abstract submission deadline is August 1, which is just around the corner, so please mark your calendars. Program Chair Karen Rosenbaum has issued a “Call for Papers” for the upcoming meeting in Chicago. As a reminder, the theme for the annual meeting is “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” Papers related to evidence based forensic psychiatric practice are of particular interest; however, all topics are encouraged and welcome.

The American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law (AAPL) will hold its 41st Annual Meeting in Tucson, AZ at the Marriott Starr Pass Resort & Spa, October 18-24. The program is about to be announced (please watch this column) and always includes broadly interesting presentations as well as luncheons enticing for collegial fellowship and well-known speakers. For further details please consult the AAPL’s website at www.aapl.org.

Our section continues to undertake a membership drive and each member of the section is challenged to bring in at least one new person. New residents and fellows will be starting their training soon; therefore, now is a good time to think of a colleague, fellow, resident, intern, or student that you could bring into our section. Let them know of the many benefits the Psychiatry & Behavioral Science Section has to offer. Applications can be found easily at www.aafs.org by clicking on the “Membership” tab and selecting “How to Become an AAFS Member.” The individual responsible for bringing in the most new members will be formally recognized during our section business meeting and in the Academy News.

We encourage all members in contact with those graduating and starting forensic psychiatry fellowships to enhance their curriculums by: 1) presenting their forensic psychiatry research projects at our annual meeting; and, 2) as fellows in forensic psychiatry or forensic psychology, submitting their papers for consideration of the prestigious Richard Rosner Best Paper Award.

News for this column is always welcome at manuel.lopez-leon@nymc.org.

QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS

Source: Martha A. Blake, MCrin, Section Secretary

This issue of the Academy News includes an article presented by Section Chair Carl McClary that addresses the theme for the 2011 Annual Scientific Meeting: “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” The article
summarizes the significant research and professional engagement of the questioned document examiner community and serves to solidify the vital role of the QD Section within the Academy. Many thanks go to all who contributed to this article with special thanks to Jane Lewis, William Riordan, John Sang, and Kirsten Singer.

Keeping the theme in mind, do you have a case or a research project that required some partnering with another discipline within the Academy? Perhaps you consulted an expert in ink chemistry, forensic linguistics, or forensic biology/DNA to expand/enhance the examination of a document. These types of collaborations provide additional evidence of the relevance, reliability, and validity of forensic science, and would support the theme of the program. Please contact Section Program Chair, Robin Hunton (hunton@ci.irs.gov) and Co-Chair Larry Olsen (larry.olsen@ci.irs.gov) with your ideas or suggestions. Don’t delay—the deadline for abstracts and workshop proposals is August 1.

Section Chair McClary has recently formed the nominating committee so please send your recommendations for the Ordway Hilton Award to Jane Lewis at lewisja@doj.state.wi.us.

Meeting Reminders

The American Society of Questioned Document Examiners and the Southwestern Association of Forensic Document Examiners are holding a joint meeting in Victoria, BC August 28 – September 2, 2010 (www.asqde.org). The Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists QD Section is sponsoring three workshops for the Fall meeting being held October 4-8, 2010, in Kansas City (www.mafs.net).

TOXICOLOGY

Source: Ruth E. Winecker, PhD, Section Program Chair

The theme for the AAFS 2011 Annual Meeting (Chicago, IL - Feb 21-26) is Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy. This premise gives us a chance to address overlapping areas of interest between sections and it is my wish that our program reflects this cooperative theme. I trust that you read the forensic toxicology special article What Could Be More Relevant than Forensic Toxicology? But Is It Valid and Reliable? on page 8, and that it has given you food for thought and encouraged you to submit an abstract for next year’s meeting!

I know that the August 1st deadline has a tendency to catch you by surprise and is not the best time of year for many with end of fiscal year issues and university related deadlines; however, the Academy is a large and busy organization and the deadline is firm, so please plan ahead. The process for submission of abstracts, special sessions, and workshop proposals is entirely online via the Academy website (www.aafs.org).

Plans for the program are taking shape with the focus on recruiting special sessions and workshops. Robert Middleberg (robert.middleberg@nmslabs.com) has once again graciously agreed to moderate a special session on pediatric toxicology. This topic is a highly regarded staple of the scientific program which is not routinely covered elsewhere and therefore of much importance to the AAFS membership. If you have an interest in presenting a case or being involved in this session, please contact Rob or me. At present, we have three potential workshop chairs that have contacted Loralie Langman (langman.loralie@mayo.edu) with various topics that they intend to submit. Thank you to these brave souls who are venturing to provide AAFS attendees with quality continuing education options.

Of course, we could still use more ideas and volunteers to help coordinate workshops and special sessions. As a bonus and incentive, the advantage to moderating a special session over a workshop is that there is no need to provide handout materials to the attendees so the AAFS deadlines are a bit more forgiving. I would encourage you all to think about participating in this way. Again, anyone with an interest in chairing workshops or moderating special sessions should contact Loralie or me.

Ken Ferslew (ferslew@etsu.edu), Section Chair, and Phil Kemp (pkemp@arlok.com), Section Secretary, are both busy with section duties as well. As you know, the Toxicology Section is privileged to have generous financial contributors who contribute greatly to the success of our section’s coffee breaks and social events, and we hope that this support will continue. Interested contributors should contact me directly. Volunteers are also needed to help make the meeting run like clockwork, so if you have an interest in moderating or volunteering in any other capacity just let us know.

Finally, as your 2011 Toxicology Section Program Chair (winecker@ocme.unc.edu), I would like to take this last opportunity before the August 1 deadline to encourage you to take the proverbial horse by the reigns, get involved and make this program a success!
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forensic science. Over the past two years, OIFS has channeled over $300 million to this end, of which over $45 million directly targeted research. Support for research is channeled through three portfolios: Forensic DNA Research and Development, General Forensics (non-DNA) Research and Development, and Fundamental Research.

Through the Forensic DNA portfolio OIFS attempts to harness the tremendous growth in fields such as molecular biology, genetics and biotechnology and direct it toward the development of highly discriminating, reliable, cost-effective, and rapid forensic DNA testing methods. The General Forensics Research initiative supports research in many areas of forensic science not involving DNA.

In 2009, the Fundamental Research Portfolio was created to improve understanding of the accuracy, reliability, and measurement validity within forensic science disciplines, directly targeting many of the issues under current intense discussion. In its first year, this program funded 16 competitive awards, totaling over $8 million. These projects addressed strengths and limitations of procedures within forensic science disciplines; identified sources of bias and variation; quantified uncertainties created by these sources; measured performance; and implemented methods to continuously monitor and improve steps in forensic evidence examination.

Projects funded through OIFS involve many areas of forensic science and relate directly to key issues of the day. In fiscal year 2009, seven awards were made under an impression evidence solicitation totaling over $4.5 million. Five awards totaling $1.6 million targeted trace evidence issues. In the past two years, over $12 million has been awarded through 32 cooperative agreements focusing on forensic DNA research. Research funding support has been directed toward issues in latent print analysis, firearms and tool mark studies, shoecprint/tire tread evaluation, questioned documents, human factors, error rates, bias, general quantification, trauma analysis in bone and cartilage, duct tape physical matches, digital evidence, biometrics, fire debris analysis/fire investigation, geometric morphometry of skulls, recovery and analysis of burned human remains, crime scene processing, radiometric studies, evaluation of taphonomic factors, sex estimation from crania, isotopic and elemental analysis of human remains, thin layer chromatography, field detection of explosives, ignition studies, evaluation of pediatric skull fracture patterns, topics within forensic toxicology and many more.

In 2010, OIFS released a number of forensics research program solicitations, repeating portfolios in DNA and fundamental research but also including targets of crime scene and medico legal investigation, instrumental analysis, and pattern and impression evidence. As before, review panels for proposals are assembled from the forensic science community assuring that quality science is supported that targets key issues. Soon we can anticipate a new round of awards that will continue to augment quality research in forensic science.

Legislative Corner cont.

quality of the effort as well as timeliness – how long does it take the lab to report out cases? If no one ever asks those questions, laboratory effectiveness may suffer.

Laboratory managers and supervisors also have a responsibility to manage their personnel. When laboratory directors and their staff uncover questionable conduct they need to inform their superiors. And by informing superiors, that should take the form as a written advisement.

Can bad behavior be eliminated or minimized?

Ultimately we are dealing with people and people are not perfect. Mistakes happen, and no manner of checks and balance will change that. However, mistakes, and even malfeasance, can be minimized through adequate quality assurance, meaning lab accreditation, practitioner certification, proficiency testing, and continuing education. However, no program can guarantee that nothing of an embarrassing nature will ever happen. But ongoing checks and course corrections when needed can lessen these problems.

And, of course, the big question: Do such cases call for oversight of forensic service providers?

Unquestionably, there will to be a great deal of ongoing discussion on the need for oversight of forensic science providers: Is it a federal or a state responsibility? How should it operate? If there is oversight, who does it?

I know of no other profession that has no mandatory oversight. I am not speaking of voluntary programs, which are generally quite good. After all, even hair stylists and barbers are regulated by state agencies. There are a number of states that have forensic science commissions in place already, but those represent the minority. Some work better than others. And naturally there is the funding issue. But is it unreasonable to concede that some sort of mandatory oversight of practitioners and agencies conducting forensic science is needed? It seems to me that the time has come.
3. Testing of Basic Principles: One of the basic principles of forensic handwriting examination is that no two persons with mature, individualized handwriting will share the same combination of handwriting characteristics. Studies that support this principle are:


All of these works came to the same conclusion: with a sufficient amount of handwriting samples, it was always possible to distinguish the handwriting of identical and fraternal twins.

b. The United States Secret Service (USSS) and The Federal Criminal Police Office of Germany (BKA) maintain databases known as the Forensic Information System for Handwriting (FISH), with the USSS version containing handwriting specimens from a combined 110,000+ writers. To date, no two writers have been found to have the same combination of handwriting characteristics.

c. The Center of Excellence for Document Analysis and Recognition (CEDAR), at the State University of New York, continues to conduct studies using computer software to measure handwriting features. In a published study of over 1,500 writers (Srihari et al., 2002 JFS, Vol. 47, No. 4), the computer system was able to identify the correct writer with a 95% confidence level.

d. A recent study utilized a group of writers from the same New York neighborhood and elementary school and concluded that forensic document examiners were able to ascertain inter-writer variation and identify significant characteristics towards identification. The examiners rendered definitive conclusions of authorship with an overall accuracy score of 98%. Durina, M. and Caligiuri, M.P., “The Determination of Authorship from a Homogenous Group of Writers,” Journal of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners, (2009) 12: 77-90

4. Peer Review and Publication: Numerous articles that address forensic document examinations have been published in the following peer-reviewed journals:

- Journal of Forensic Sciences
- Journal of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners
- International Journal of Forensic Document Examiners
- Canadian Society of Forensic Science Journal
- Journal of Forensic Identification
- Forensic Science International
- Journal of Police Science and Administration
- Journal of the Forensic Science Society
- Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

5. General Acceptance in the Forensic Community: Forensic handwriting examination was one of the original sections of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences and has had its own national organization, the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners (ASQDE), since 1942. It is an expertise that is provided in all major law enforcement organizations, and numerous state and local agencies.

Forensic document sections are also included in the following multi-discipline organizations:

- International Association of Identification (IAI)
- Mid-Atlantic Association of Forensic Scientists (MAAFS)
- Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists (MAFS)
- Northeastern Association of Forensic Scientists (NEAFS)
- British and Canadian Forensic Science Societies

Forensic document examination is or has been a part of the curriculum taught at the following schools:

- The George Washington University
- Michigan State University
- John Jay College
- National University (San Diego)
- University of Alabama at Birmingham
- University of New Haven
- University of Central Oklahoma
- University of Illinois at Chicago
- Oklahoma State University

Research continues in our field and is being conducted in various areas of document examination, especially in the areas of ink and handwriting examination. Currently, there is additional research in the area of handwriting that is similar to Dr. Srihari’s work using computer software to measure handwriting features. This extensive research, presented at the AAFS annual meeting, is called Forensic Language-Independent Analysis System for Handwriting Identification (FLASH-ID) and is being conducted by the FBI, George Mason University, and Gannon Technologies. FLASH-ID software performs
The AAFS Questioned Documents Section Plays a Principal Role con’t.

critical assessments of handwriting features using graphemes. Thus far, the system has returned a significant matching rate on even short samples. As forensic document examiners and members of the AAFS, we endorse and promote ongoing research, and encourage independent scientific groups to continue their endeavors in the field. We are especially proud of the education gained through presentations and workshops conducted annually at the Academy’s Annual Scientific Meeting. It is our hope that as education and technologies advance, new horizons in our discipline will be reached.

Strengthening Forensics Through Dedicated Membership con’t.

program. The dedication of these participants ensures the quality of forensic science laboratories around the world.

The Forensic Science Education Programs Accreditation Commission (FEPAC) brings standards, reliability, and quality assurance to forensic science education. In 2001, based upon recommendations by the National Institute of Justice, the Technical Working Group for education and training in forensic sciences (TWGED) was formed to establish national standards for forensic science education and to create minimum curriculum recommendations for forensic science degree programs. The members of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, recognizing the significance of forensic science education, created FEPAC from the initial foundation of TWGED. FEPAC, utilizing the TWGED recommendations, created accreditation standards against which to assess forensic science degree programs. To date, 29 Forensic Education Programs across the United States and Canada have been accredited by the FEPAC. The accreditation process involves a thorough review of the school’s admissions, curriculum, and support services; on-site evaluations; and interviews with students and faculty. Coursework requirements include core natural science courses and specific forensic science courses, including quality assurance standards and ethics. The Members of FEPAC consist of an equal distribution of academicians and forensic practitioners to ensure a balanced program review.

Valid – Ongoing research and review of practices and procedures is the most effective method of ensuring valid forensic science practices. The American Academy of Forensic Sciences provides several forums for demonstrating the validity of science and testing methods.

Over the past ten years, the Criminalistics Section averaged nearly 175 presentations during the scientific sessions of the AAFS Annual Scientific Meeting. The presentations cover a wide range of topics. Some broadly span the eleven sections of the Academy, many specific to the numerous subdisciplines of Criminalistics; all are an integral component of the scientific process. The oral and poster presentations allow for peer review of the science being conducted in crime labs and universities around the world. The setting of the scientific sessions allows researchers to present their ideas, results, and findings to an appropriate audience of peers, and to subject their work to comment and criticism.

Valid scientific research is crucial to the improvement of the field of forensic science. Ensuring the accuracy, reliability, and validity requires the scientific research to be subjected to a peer-review system. The dedication of the AAFS membership to the peer review process is evident in the composition of editorial board of the Journal of Forensic Sciences. Over 80 members of the Academy are on the editorial board and participate in the review of over 700 papers annually.

We have been very proactive in regulating our profession. It is up to us to demonstrate to the courts and the critics the progress made in Strengthening Forensic Science and ensuring that our work product is Relevant, Reliable, and Valid. By supporting all eleven sections and working as one Academy, we will achieve these goals.

What Could Be More Relevant Than Forensic Toxicology? con’t.

Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy” is so apropos because we as forensic toxicologists do not work alone. The need for our specialty is called upon by many of our fellow forensic scientists and practitioners: forensic pathologists performing their autopsies and trying to determine the cause and manner of death in their cases; lawyers litigating their cases involving potential impairment of an individual from drugs and/or ethanol; forensic psychiatrists determining if their patient is psychotic and/or under the influence of drugs; and criminal investigators determining if their case was a crime of drug facilitated sexual assault. In these and many other forensic examples, the cumulative product of the forensic sciences is only as strong as the individual parts provided by each of our disciplines. This is why it is so important that the principles of reliability and validity be applied to the ethical practice of all the forensic sciences. The American Academy of Forensic Sciences gives all of us such a platform in which to interact and to do just that.
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 8/01/09 through 5/31/10.

The Fund’s balance through 5/31/10 was $312,789.59. Additionally, the Endowment has provided $133,359 in awards and grants since its inception in 1990.
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FSF “I Gave An Hour” Contributors

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 05/31/10 was $26,010. For those of you who would like to contribute, please complete the form below and return to the AAFS office. Please consider digging deeper than you ever have before to support the Forensic Sciences Foundation’s grant and research fund.
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A merry heart doeth good like a medicine: but a broken spirit drieth the bones
- Proverbs 17:22

One begins to think that the forensic science wall is falling in when it is not, just because the National Research Council of the National Academies has pinpointed flaws, even serious flaws, in the fabric of the forensic sciences.

It is well to recall that the NAS’s book *Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward* is not the first nor the most explosive of past tomes that have taken the forensic sciences and many of its practitioners to task, all, according to the doomsayers, rending the forensic sciences asunder without so much as a discernible dip in the ongoing course of the forensic sciences.


Other substantiating texts are kept in reserve for the moment as are many blistering reports of formal inquiries such as the 2008 four part report of *The Inquiry into Pediatric Forensic Pathology in Ontario* initiated principally by the disclosures of the flawed testimony of Dr. Charles Smith and also in 2008 the Forensic Investigations Council Report on the Washington State Toxicology Laboratory and the Washington State Crime Laboratory as well as the 2007 New York State Office of the Inspector General’s Investigation of Drug Test Irregularities at the NYPD Forensic Laboratory in 2002. And to make matters more worrisome the NYPD forensics lab has once again been news reported as fouling its work product with the testimony of a “longtime lab technician” who is “accused in one case of falsely labeling a sample of suspected drugs as positive for cocaine after it actually tested negative – because she allegedly didn’t want to walk to another part of the building and fill out paperwork to have it tested further...”

These references are cited simply to point to the fact that forensic science both near and far (need one mention Detroit, Houston, and San Francisco?) has survived some pretty hard knocks over recent, as well as long-term, years.

And the result: the glass of forensic science is still half-full and certainly not half-empty. Let us explore why the heart of forensic science is still merry and will likely continue to be so.

This less than despairing state of forensic affairs arises, in part, from an objective assessment of the crimes reported as having occurred where, for one reason or another, forensic science does not bear the brunt of solving the crime or pinpointing the offender(s). In other words the applications of the instrumentalities of the forensic sciences and the special talents of its votaries are in the mainstream in the investigations of a limited compass of crimes, such as so called victimless crimes (drug law violations), and offenses involving violence to the person but not in others deemed to be of a much less intrusive or publicly demanding type.
So, for example, New York has a state-wide “fortune telling law” (N.Y.S. Penal Law sec. 165.35) which when enforced, as it was on October 29, 2009, as to one Tiffany Evans at the Smith Haven Mall in Lake Grove, New York, (see Shaffer, Ryan, “Entertainment, Fakery, and Ambiguity: Examining New York’s ‘Fortune Telling Law’, Skeptical Inquirer, vol. 34, Issue 2, Mar-Apr 2010) will not cause any angst in any crime laboratory for there are just simply no issues for the forensic sciences to seek to resolve.

Of course many, if not most, of the crimes which elude the grasp of the forensic sciences are misdemeanors rather than felonies. However, there are many states with confidence game statutes protecting the gullible citizenry from the consequences of their own credulity by penalties equivalent to those for felonies. In any event, it is not the possible penalty that brings a crime home to the forensic sciences but whether there is a tangible scientific issue aglow in the investigation of the crime, be it minor or major.

If the crime laboratory door were to be opened to all manner of crimes, large or small, then crime laboratory backlogs as constantly reported today would be as nothing in contrast to that which would surely be the hellacious situation. If the glass of forensic science is to be become half-empty, a crime laboratory backlog would only be rewarded with lengthier backlogs.

Some examples of USA Today reported “non-forensic science” crimes:

No Fuel for a Law & Order Episode Here
To the pair of young thieves (some might call them hoodlums) it was just a joke. But to James Davis, 40, it was no laughing matter. Davis, a blind Oregonian, was walking via his cane in the Clackamas Town Center in Portland, Oregon on Friday, May 14, 2010, when he was rudely attacked by two young men bent on stealing his cane. When Davis resisted, his cane was wrenched from him causing injury to his shoulder. The thieves, laughing mirthlessly, made off with Davis’ cane with no good samaritan available to intercept them, nor any forensic scientist able to help Davis.

In the meantime and while the search is on for the thieves, all is not lost. Davis reports he has secured a replacement cane.

More Than a Bottle Bomb
Explosives, especially improvised ones, come in all sizes, shapes, and contents. The dispersion of such contents, nails, and other metallic objects, can do widespread and devastating damage. The fall-out from the explosion of such an improvised explosive can have more than untoward and dangerous consequences as witness the explosion of a bottle bomb at a construction site in Lorain County, Ohio.

The bomb was implanted in a portable toilet at the construction site when a local bomb squad decided to detonate it. One of the bomb squad members was chosen (the method of selection, in view of the consequences, was not reported) to be the detonator. A .22 caliber rifle bullet was fired into the toilet setting off an explosion of the suspect bottle bomb.

The result was almost unprintable in a family newspaper for debris (excrement) flew hither and yon covering one bomb squad member with the foul-smelling fecal matter.

Four 18- and 19-year-olds have been taken into custody, charged with criminal trespassing and the unlawful possession of a dangerous ordnance. There is no reported more serious charge of assault with a foreign object on the bomb squad member who was layered with the putrid stuff nor how far and wide the laughter reigned (sic). Fortunately, no forensic scientist was called to the task of analysis of the debris.

No Crime, Just an “Oops”
For ninety minutes on April 29, 2010, the Esposito family of Mastic Beach, NY suffered the painful and emotionally draining experience of being unexpectedly notified that their 26-year-old son Freddy was dead.

The police, however, got it wrong. That was the sum and substance of the tragic incident. In reality, the deceased auto driver, driving the Esposito’s car on a Pennsylvania highway, was Freddy’s erstwhile frat brother, 18-year-old Paul Richards and a companion with him, both of whom died in the crash.

The error was attributed to Richards’ carrying Esposito’s driver’s license and “a general match” with the deceased (nothing more scientifically accurate being stated). Happily, Freddy’s older brother was a police officer in Brooklyn, New York, with whom Freddy was living at the time of his supposed fatal accident. The older brother, Chris, rushed home only to find a large lump on a couch which upon awakening turned out to be his sleeping brother, Freddie.

The news reports make no mention of police procedurals requiring a firmer (possibly scientific) identification before giving relatives notice of the death of a loved one, nor does the commanding officer, Capt. James Murtin, of the Pennsylvania State Police’s Troop N.

Individualizing Marks: Tattoos
Everything about a person is said to be, like each individual snowflake, distinctive. But further individualization can be accomplished by alterations, whether intentional or not, which take a person out of the mob of mankind.

Colorado’s Anthony Brandon Gonzales, aged 20, is readily identifiable from the tattoos he sports and their location on his body. Unfortunately for Gonzales his tattoos gave him away to the police who were investigating a burglary at the home of an Elvis (Presley) impersonator in Pueblo, Colorado.

Gonzales had a tattoo of the words “East Side” on his upper lip and another for the numerals “13” on his chin in the shape of a goatee. These tattoos were plainly visible even though Gonzales was wearing a mask at the time of the burglary. Sgt. Eric Bravo of the local police was delighted to be able to identify Gonzales due to the visibility and unusual nature of his tattoos, saying “it’s hard to miss him.” No hard science needed to come into play.

continued on page 40
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**Kids Can Do the Ugliest Things**
A nine-year-old boy and his friend were walking their dogs in Salina, Kansas when a car pulled up next to them. Two girls, aged 15 and 18, jumped out of the stopped car demanding that the nine-year-old give them his German shepherd puppy. When he refused the 18-year-old punched him in the eye and made off with his puppy. Would a forensic veterinarian be of any help in identifying the dog-napped puppy?

**War Time Bilking**
Bethany Sanders, 23, of Gillette, Wyoming, found a way to profit from her husband’s head injury. She claimed it resulted from his service overseas with the Air Force. Her “con” gained her $3,000 in charitable donations before the scam was revealed without recourse to a crime laboratory or a forensic scientist.

And in Green Bay, Wisconsin, a man has been arrested on suspicion of forging checks in the names of Wisconsin soldiers killed in Iraq. Three computers, software, and a printer apparently used to print the checks were found. The man has a long history of fraud convictions.

**Plotting the Angles**
A math teacher, Gregory Harrison, at Birmingham’s (AL) Corner High School, who thought he knew all the angles, has been placed on administrative leave while being investigated on possible criminal charges. He is accused of employing “a hypothetical assassination plot” on President Obama as an instructional method to educate his students on “geometric angles.” Harrison used as an example “where an assassin would stand to get the best shot at killing the president.” Apparently Harrison did not realize that he does not know all the angles, after all.

**She Took a Runner or Did She?**
Nancy Salas, 22, was a student at UCLA, or so her parents believed until their daughter disappeared from her Glendale, California home after telling her parents she was going for a run. And run she did, metaphorically speaking. In fact, Ms. Salas vanished because she was ashamed to tell her parents she had dropped out of UCLA. The Merced Police Department plans to file a report with the local DA charging Ms. Salas with filing a false kidnapping report. Ms. Salas was located 300 miles north of her Glendale home on the day after her presumed abduction. She had made a false 911 call saying she had been abducted at knife point and sexually assaulted. It did not take the intervention of the forensic sciences to pierce the veil of her fraud.

**Once a Swindler, Always a Connniver**
Dennis Bolze, 60, of Gatlinburg, Tennessee, has pleaded guilty to a Madoff-sized fraud in which he admitted to swindling $20 million. Before sentence is imposed he has asked the U.S. District Court Judge to exclude from his computation of the appropriate sentence the frauds by Bolze perpetrated on European investors. Is Bolze simply and plainly trying to snooker the Federal judge? Forensic science will not tell us.

Richmond, Virginia’s Charles L. O’Brien is said to have made a mockery out of home detention by using it to borrow his ex-wife’s identity to apply for a car loan for a Mercedes Benz. O’Brien’s scam came apart when a credit inquiry was made to his ex-wife and she notified the FBI of O’Brien’s continuing shenanigans. O’Brien, a former loan officer for Sun Trust Bank, was convicted in 2008 of approving a $450,000 loan to a fictitious foundation and “funneling the proceeds into his personal accounts to buy golf club memberships, luxury cars, and other items” but due to his claim of suffering from a bipolar disorder was put on home detention for three years. But that did not stop O’Brien’s frauds.

**Child Abuse?**
In Algood, Tennessee, a 15-year-old boy who was shot in the leg was in the first instance thought to have been a victim of a hate crime perpetrated in a drive-by shooting. As a result of the investigation, however, the boy was determined to be a runaway from Bolivar, Tennessee who falsely notified the authorities that the shooting had occurred out-of-doors. Two women have been arrested in connection with the shooting. One has been charged with filing a false report and the other to contributing to the delinquency of a minor. The sketchy investigative details give no leads as to where forensic science might come to the aid of the police in this incident.

**Naked to His Enemies**
A man has been arrested while dressed in Lady Godiva-like non-clothes. He was seen to be walking down the streets of Thibodaux, Louisiana when an obscenity complaint was filed against him, resulting in his arrest for obscenity. The arrestee, Shafiq Mohamed, protested he was only answering God’s injunction to walk the streets naked to save his soul.

**A Slight Language Problem**
A nine-year-old Liberian girl was gang-raped by four boys after being lured to a storage closet at an apartment complex in Maricopa County, Arizona (Phoenix). The child’s Liberian parents were charged with seven counts of felony child abuse but were set free when the court could not find interpreters who speak the Liberian language. The parents speak two dialects of a language called Grebo. The local crime laboratory could not provide any assistance in this regard.

The above array of crimes in summary is intended to provide evidence not only that crimes exist which have sidestepped the forensic sciences but that matters could be worse for the forensic sciences if many of these crimes were deemed to be rightfully within the purview of the forensic sciences. So it is time to lighten up, to embrace a merry heart, and to deal with the here and now, recognizing that all is not well in the forensic sciences but that corrective measures taken now without rancor or hesitation can ensure that the glass of forensic science gets no lower than half full and possibly higher yet.
The following individuals have submitted applications for Associate Member, Trainee Affiliate, or Student Affiliate. Applications that are received and completed by October 1, 2010, will be considered for approval at the February 2011 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 11, 2011.

Applicants

**CRIMINALISTICS**

**Associate Member**
Adesunkanmi, Seniat Omoregbor, MSc
Ikoyi Nigeria
Agbo, Benedict, MSc
Lagos, Nigeria
Beaven, Mary A., MFS
Cheyenne, WY
Bobyn, Michele L., MS
Pueblo, CO
Bride, Mollie K., MS
Baton Rouge, LA
Brunner, Lorne L., MS
Chamberlain, SD
Cabral, Meiling, MS
Los Angeles, CA
Cohen, Peter A., PhD
Honolulu, HI
Colen, Alan H., PhD
Kansas City, KS
Corbin, Kerre, BS
Springfield, VA
Fogelberg, Christopher W., BA
Sacramento, CA
Fratpietro, Stephen W., MSc
Thunder Bay, ON Canada
Frazier, Nicole R., MS
Fayetteville, GA
Fu, Jun, PhD
Tulsa, OK
Goltz, Kristina L., MFS
Fullerton, CA
Graves, Joseph W., BS
Pensacola, FL
Hokanson, Stephen P., BS
Norfolk, VA
Hurston, Heather H., MS
Austin, TX
Jackson, Bruce A., PhD
Wayland, MA
Jimenez, Malena B., BS
Jefferson City, MO
Jones, Patrick J., BA
Kansas City, MO
Marchen, Michael S., MA
Toronto, ON Canada
Mathis, Andrea M.
Arlington, VA
Meth, Michael G., BS
Crystal, MN
Mundo, Jose A., III, BS
Buford, GA
Murray, Lola J., MS
Albany, NY
Okorocha, Okorie C., JD
Pasadena, CA
Sertif, Odeniel, PhD
Phoenix, AZ
Shaw, Dirk A., BS
Indianapolis, IN
Siliva, Michael L., MS
Albany, NY
Southall-Malone, Amy L., BA
Jackson, MS
Sran, Gagandeep, BS
Cleveland, OH
Steven, Colin R., MS
Ellicott City, MD
Striebel, Robert J., BS
Colorado Springs, CO
Taylor, Shaena M., BSAS
Cleveland, OH
Tidwell, Mark A., BS
Fort Worth, TX
Uzoemeka, Elias, MSc
Ikoyi Nigeria
Valentine, Jennifer A., MS
Fort Worth, TX
Verma, Ritu, MS
New Delhi INDIA
Warner, Adrienne L., MS
Dallas, TX

**Trainee Affiliate**
Burleson, Garrett L., MS
Houston, TX
Bybelezer, Michael R., MFS
Boston, MA
Call, Michelle M., MS
Westminster, CO
Cossota, Kristen P., MS
Irving, TX
Cox, Hannah M., BS
London, OH
Delph, Janet B., BS
Euless, TX
Edwards, Jamie L., MA
Joliet, IL
Felix, Jeremy Ryan, BS
Stockbridge, GA
Harris, Jennifer K., MS
Richmond, VA
Hayes, Ashley N, MS
Mullersville, MD
Krieger, Caroline E., BS
Des Plaines, IL
Lambert, Lindsay M., MS
Maryland Heights, MO
Lazarecki, Lisa M., BS
Milford, CT
Nguyen, Diana M., MS
Runnemede, NJ
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Stoffel, Michelle C., BS
Spera, Joseph V., BS
Scott, Kenneth
Riggs, Jennifer R., BSE
Outman, Alan M.
O’Hehir, Catherine M., BS
Mulawka, Marzena H., MFS
Miller, Caitlin E., BS
Martinez, Adrienne Marie
Malley, Barbara, BS
Roche, Kathryn M., MSFS

Associate Member
Baird, Stephen D., MS
New Fairfield, CT
Glickman, Jeff B., BS
Woodinville, WA
McLendon, Keith, JD
Scottsdale, AZ
Olivier, Martin S., PhD
Pretoria, South Africa
Sammons, John E., MS
Ona, WV

Student Affiliate
Rinehart, Kathryn J., BSEE
Patrick AFB, FL

Associate Member
Lanoue, Mark A., BS
Bay Saint Louis, MS
Pedder, Jocelyn, PhD
North Vancouver, BC Canada
Zweig, Gil, MS
Randolph, NJ

DIGITAL & MULTIMEDIA SCIENCES

Associate Member
Agellon, Al B., BS
Tucson, AZ
Akin, Jennifer T., MS
McKinney, TX
Anderson, Crissie E., MS
Destin, FL
Beard, Von Gretchin, MS
Manassas, VA
Bencivenga, Patricia A., BS
Clearwater, FL
Bizois, Joseph, BS
Wantagh, NY
Cebra, Karen, MSFS
Davis, CA
Childers, James M., MS
Lubbock, TX

Student Affiliate
AI Oraer, Dina
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Bell, Beth A.
Lead Hill, AR
Eilers, Katherine J., BS
Honolulu, HI
Fiorini, Kristin N.
Erial, NJ
Hartsell, Jeffery S.
Anchorage, AK
Hoge, Anastasia M.
Grand Forks, ND
Keith, Sarah A.
San Jose, CA
Li, Jiayi, BS
New Haven, CT
Matias, Maria R.
Carrollton, TX
Myers, Linda
Los Angeles, CA
Park, Christy, BA
Honolulu, HI
Richardson, Sandra, BS
East Haven, CT
Sevilla, Samantha
Seattle, WA
Smith, Sarah C.
Glenwood, IN

ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Associate Member
Christian, Donnell R., BS
Lake St. Louis, MO
Delporte, Steve, BA
Evergem, Belgium
Denning, Alexandra, BA
New Hope, PA
Earle, James H., PhD
Colorado Springs, CO
Harvell, Karen D., BA
Pensacola, FL
Holt, Michelle Y., BS
Riverdale, GA
Hooper Marosek, Stephanie F., PhD
Fayetteville, NC
Jensen, Eric E., MS
Quantico, VA
Jones, Patrick L., PhD
West Lafayette, IN
Kinsey, Amy, MS
Newbury, FL
Lancaster, Elizabeth F., BA
Fort Pierce, FL
LeFebvre, Aaron K., PhD
Farmers Branch, TX
Ludvico, Lisa, PhD
Pittsburgh, PA
Lynch, Michael J., BS
Alea, HI
Malagon Bolanos, Felipe, MS
Bogota, Colombia
Marchesini, Lorenzo M.R.
Bondero, Italy
Ray, Glynda, MA
Dallas, TX
Reina Camacho, Santiago, BS
Bogota, Colombia
Reinert, Anja, PhD
Jena, Germany
Schweitzer, Susan C., PhD
Colorado Springs, CO
Sperry, Kathy L., PhD
Lubbock, TX
Tolomison, Chet L., BA
Saint Johns, FL
Womack, Kimberly A., DHSc
Gulf Breeze, FL
Yap, Roland W., BS
Honolulu, HI

Trainee Affiliate
Bebee, Caroline M., BA
Bala Cynwyd, PA
Carney, Jodie L., MS
Whites Creek, TN
Kelly, Jeffrey D., MS
Dallas, TX
Schneider, Heather M., BS
Las Vegas, NV
Stauffer, Cameron M.
Bluffton, SC
Tigchelaar, Marijke L., BS
Bundamba, Australia

GENERAL

Associate Member
Tigchelaar, Marijke L., BS
Glenside, PA

Student Affiliate
Forrester, Scott M.
Spokane, WA

Jurisprudence

Assistant Member
Erie, Erwin P., MD
Quezon City, Philippines
Levco, Stanley M., JD
Evansville, IN
Lusa, Vincenzo, JD
Roma, Italy
McShane, Justin J., JD
Harrisburg, PA
Straight, R. J., JD
Brooklyn, NY
Swege, Ann E., JD
Wichita, KS
Vigil, Jami L., JD
Rome, Italy

Student Affiliate
Forrester, Scott M.
Spokane, WA
Do You Remember When?

Source: Kenneth S. Field, Academy Historian

1950...
...The Academy’s “Organizational Meeting,” held in Chicago in 1950, took place on the campus of Northwestern University’s School of Law. Fred Inbau, an Academy member (and our 1955-56 President) handled the local arrangements. The fact that he was a Senior Professor of Law at Northwestern may have had some bearing on our acquiring the use of such a prestigious site. Mary Cowan (Toxicology) who became the Academy’s first woman member, handled the administration of the meeting. Ninety-nine scientists attended including Erle Stanley Gardner, the author of the Perry Mason stories. Erle was a member of the Academy’s Jurisprudence Section until his death in 1970.

1970...
...The 1970 Annual Meeting included a fascinating three-hour Evening Plenary Session devoted to the 1969 trial of Sirhan Sirhan for the murder of Robert F. Kennedy on June 5, 1968. Cyril Wecht served as the Program Moderator. Tom Noguchi, who was then the Chief Medical Examiner for the City of Los Angeles, presented the “Post Mortem Examination and Findings” and Seymour Pollack discussed the “Psychiatric Problems.” Lynn “Buck” Compton, the Assistant District Attorney for Los Angeles and the chief prosecutor in the case, presented the “Prosecutor’s View” and F. Lee Bailey, an eminent criminal trial lawyer, presented the “Defense View.” That case remains controversial because, among other things, it is contended that a second gun was involved.
A Letter from the YFSF President
Greetings Young Forensic Scientists! The Young Forensic Scientists Forum’s program committee is deep into the planning phase for a fantastic meeting next February. The 2011 Special Session promises to help broaden the minds of new and young forensic scientists. In addition to attending the special session on Tuesday, everyone is encouraged to participate by presenting a case at the Bring your Own Slides Session on Wednesday night or present fascinating research at the Bring Your Own Posters Session on Tuesday night. To round off a fantastic week with the Young Forensic Scientists, come to the Breakfast Session on Thursday morning. Have more questions answers? Participate in a resume review panel and hear a couple more amazing speakers. One of the biggest goals of the Young Forensic Scientists Forum is to help new and young forensic scientists discover the many opportunities available to them. One way for new and young forensic scientists to become familiar with some of the many opportunities available to them is to visit the American Academy of Forensic Scientists website at www.aafs.org. The website not only provides information about membership, how to become a member, how to upgrade membership but also about education and training opportunities, as well as employment opportunities. As you familiarize yourself with the various sections of AAFS, please stop by the YFSF website and see how you can become more involved with us. A link for YFSF can be found on the AAFS website under resources. If you have any questions, comments or suggestions, please feel free to contact the YFSF President (tanisha.henson@yahoo.com).

For those new to the Young Forensic Scientists Forum, I would like to introduce myself: my name is Tanisha Henson and I am the current President of the YFSF. I am currently completing my Masters in Forensic Science degree at National University. I attended my first AAFS meeting in Seattle, WA in 2006, attended my first YFSF meeting in San Antonio, TX in 2007, and have been involved ever since. With each passing year I grow more and more impressed at how the YFSF continues to raise the bar.

Tanisha Henson, BS
2011 YFSF President

A Note from the YFSF Secretary
Greetings everyone! I hope you had a happy spring and are having a wonderful summer. With the sun staying out longer and the temperatures getting warmer, you may find yourself spending most of your free time outdoors rather than inside in front of your computer. However, I want to remind you that the August 1 deadline for abstract submissions will be here before you know it. Young Forensic Scientists, I encourage you to share your research with your peers either at the YFSF Poster Session or the YFSF Bring Your Own Slides Session; please do not hesitate to contact me (lpharr1@tigers.lsu.edu) or the other officers if you have any questions or concerns about either presenting at or attending the upcoming meeting in Chicago. Until we meet again, take care, happy researching/writing, and enjoy the rest of your summer!

Lauren Pharr, MA
YFSF Secretary
Financial Liaison
Show your support for the YFSF by making a financial contribution! For more information on how you can help support or contribute to the YFSF, please contact me at j.jenkins71@gmail.com.

Jackie Jenkins
YFSF Financial Liaison

YFSF Breakfast Session
Plans for the 2011 YFSF Breakfast Session are currently underway. Details pertaining to the breakfast session will be provided in upcoming newsletters, so stay tuned for more information. If you have any questions or suggestions related to the 2011 Breakfast Session, please contact me at mdeberry@mcl.state.ms.us.

Melissa DeBerry
YFSF Breakfast Session Chair

Special Session Co-Chairs
Science has always been a very collaborative subject with researchers working together to develop new experiments and theories. Forensic science is no different as multiple analysts work together to put together a case for court. It can be hard to remember how collaborative forensic science can be, however, when bent over a bench focusing on a particular piece of evidence.

This year, the Young Forensic Scientists Forum will be highlighting the collaborative aspect of forensic science in our program “Interdisciplinary Approaches to Solving Crime in Forensic Science.” The program will include speakers who will not only share information about their own work, but also discuss how that work builds upon, or fits in with, other disciplines. The special session will culminate with a lawyer discussing how many different disciplines can come together in a single court case. Be sure to watch for details about program speakers and topics in upcoming newsletters. Feel free to send any questions or comments to the special session co-chairs Jenna Oakes-Smith (jloakes-smith@slmpd.org) and Amanda Kittoe (akittoe@gmail.com).

Jenna Oakes-Smith and Amanda Kittoe, BA
YFSF Special Session, Co-Chairs

YFSF Bring Your Own Slides
Hello everyone! We are now in the planning phase of next year’s Bring Your Own Slides event. The YFSF is looking for individuals who are willing to present their research, case studies, or any other relevant information at next year’s meeting in Chicago. The Bring Your Own Slides Session is a fantastic way to build your C.V., sharpen communication skills, and make important connections and contacts in the forensic community.

In addition, I am also pleased to announce that the BYOS has a new co-chair.

Greetings from Chicago—home of the 2011 AAFS Annual Meeting! My name is Ali Mostrom; I am a Forensic Chemist at the DEA North Central Laboratory and must say that I love my job. In 2009, while pursuing my MSFS degree from the University of Illinois at Chicago, I attended my first AAFS meeting (Denver, CO) and took part in the YFSF programming. I am very excited to help plan the Bring Your Own Slides event and to see the amazing research and casework being done by so many of you.

If you are interested in presenting or have any questions, we would love to hear from you—contact us at either martin.overly@mail.wvu.edu or alison.p.mostrom@usdoj.gov.

Martin Overly and Ali Mostrom, MS
YFSF Bring Your Own Slides, Co-Chairs

YFSF Poster Session
There is still time to submit your abstracts for the 2011 Young Forensic Scientists Forum’s Poster Session! The YFSF Poster Session is a great way for undergraduate and graduate students to showcase their research and get feedback from peers and academy members alike. If you have an abstract you would like to submit for the 2011 Poster Session, please email it to crider_sm@yahoo.com.

Stephanie M. Crider, MA
YFSF Poster Session Chair
Meetings and Conferences

JULY 2010

12-16
Advanced Laboratory Methods in Forensic Anthropology—To be held at the Forensic Anthropology Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
CONTACT: Rebecca J. Wilson
fac@utk.edu

12-16
Inter/Micro 2010 Microscopy Symposium—To be held at the McCrone Research Institute in Chicago, IL.
CONTACT: Therese Newman
(312) 842-7100
intermicro@mcri.org

14-16
Symposium On Usable Privacy and Security—To be held in Redmond, WA.
CONTACT: http://cups.cs.cmu.edu/soups/2010/

17-18
National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Dental Coding Workshop—Sponsored by the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division—To be held at the Marriott Country Club Plaza in Kansas City, Missouri.
CONTACT: Stacey C. Davis
(304) 625-2618
Fax: (304) 625-5090

17-19
CSF 2010 - 23rd Computer Security Foundations Symposium—To be held in Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.
CONTACT: www.floc-conference.org/CSF-home.html

19-23
Advanced Crime Scene Reconstruction Course—Hosted by and held at the University of South Florida in Tampa, FL.
CONTACT: Erin H. Kimmerle, PhD
kimmerle@cas.usf.edu

19-23
Forensic Taphonomy—To be held at the Forensic Anthropology Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
CONTACT: Rebecca J. Wilson
fac@utk.edu

21-24
2nd World Conference on Research Integrity—Co-sponsored by AAAS—To be held in Singapore.
CONTACT: Dr. Nick Steneck
nsteneck@umich.edu

26-28
3rd Annual Green Mountain DNA Conference—To be held at the Sheraton Burlington Hotel & Conference Center, Burlington, VT.
CONTACT: Trisha L. Conti, PhD
(802) 241-5436
tconti@dps.state.vt.us
www.greenmountaindna.com

AUGUST 2010

2-4
Digital Forensic Research Workshop (DFRWS) 2010—To be held in Portland, OR.
CONTACT: http://dfrws.org/2010/

2-7
2010 Continuing Education for Forensic Professionals Program—Hosted by the West Virginia University Forensic Science Initiative—To be held in Boston, MA.
CONTACT: http://fsi.research.wvu.edu/
Syracuse University Dialogues In Forensic Science—DNA—To be held at Syracuse University in Syracuse, NY and the SU Minnowbrook Conference Center, Blue Mountain Lake, NY
CONTACT: forensics@syr.edu
www.forensics.syr.edu

8–12
37th Annual New England Seminar in Forensic Sciences—To be held at Colby College in Waterville, Maine.
CONTACT: Special Programs
(207) 859-4740
summer@colby.edu

9–13
Forensic Imaging Training—Hosted by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the Univ. of South Florida (USF)—To be held at the USF in Tampa, FL.
CONTACT: Glenn Miller
(703) 837-6280
gmiller@ncmec.org or
Erik H. Kimmerle, PhD
kimmerle@cas.usf.edu

9–13
Medicolegal Death Investigator Training Course—Sponsored by Saint Louis University—To be held in St. Louis, MO.
CONTACT: Mary Fran Ernst or Julie Howe
(314) 977-5970

11–13
19th USENIX Security Symposium—To be held in Washington, DC.
CONTACT: www.usenix.org/events/sec10/

15–19
30th International Cryptology Conference—To be held in Santa Barbara, CA.
CONTACT: www.iacr.org/conferences/crypto2010/

28–Sept. 2
68th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners (ASQDE)—This is a joint meeting with the Southwestern Association of Forensic Document Examiners (SWAFDE)—To be held at the Fairmont Empress Hotel in Victoria, BC.
CONTACT: Samiah Ibrahim
Samiah.Ibrahim@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca
Tobin Tanaka
Tobin.Tanaka@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca
www.asqde.org

SEPTEMBER 2010

5–9
20th International Symposium on the Forensic Sciences (ANZFSS)—To be held at the Sydney Convention and Exhibition Centre, Australia.
CONTACT: Conference Managers
+61 2 9265 0700
Fax: +61 2 9267 5443
anzfss2010@tourhosts.com.au
www.anzfss2010.com

7–10
6th International Conference on Security and Privacy in Communication Networks—To be held in Singapore.
CONTACT: www.securecomm.org/
index.shtml

7–10
Association of Forensic Quality Assurance Managers Annual Meeting—To be held at the New Orleans Riverside Hilton in New Orleans, LA.
CONTACT: Zoë M. Smith
z6849s@yahoo.com
www.afqam.org

12–16
American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors 38th Annual Symposium—To be held in Baltimore, MD.
CONTACT: www.ascld.org/content/2010-symposium

13–16
To be held in San Diego, CA.
CONTACT: http://bingweb.binghamton.edu/~ychen/SCC2010.htm

14–17
Armed Forces Institute of Pathology Oral and Maxillofacial Surgical Pathology Course—To be held at the Doubletree Bethesda Hotel, Bethesda, MD.
CONTACT: Oscar Molina, TSgt, USAF
(202) 782-2637
Fax: (202) 782-5020
came@afip.osd.mil
www.askafip.org

15–17
13th International Symposium on Recent Advances in Intrusion Detection—To be held in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
CONTACT: www.raid2010.org/

20–22
2010 HTCIA International Training Conference & Exposition—To be held in Atlanta, GA.
CONTACT: www.htciaconference.org/

20–22
European Symposium on Research in Computer Security—To be held in Athens, Greece.
CONTACT: www.esorics2010.org/

21–23
New Security Paradigms Workshop (NSPW) —To be held in Concord, MA.
CONTACT: www.nspw.org/2010

26
ASTM International Committee E52 on Forensic Psychophysiology—To be held at the Hilton Myrtle Beach Resort in Myrtle Beach, SC.
CONTACT: Joe Koury
ASTM International
(610) 832-9804
jkoury@astm.org
www.astm.org/COMMIT/E52.htm

27 - Oct 1
Northwest Association of Forensic Scientists (NWAFS) Annual Meeting—To be held in Portland, OR.
CONTACT: Celeste Grover
(971) 673-8245
celcerte.grover@state.or.us
http://nwafs.org/meetings.htm

29-Oct 1
VB2010 Fighting Malware and Spam—To be held in Vancouver, BC, Canada.
CONTACT: www.vmsb.net/conference/vb2010/
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 2011 Annual Meeting registration packet. Please detach form and return to AAFS. Thank you.

Your name: ___________________________________________________________________