President’s Message

The theme for the 2011 AAFS Annual Meeting is: Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy. How does an incoming AAFS President choose a theme for the coming year? I made this decision in September 2009 during a graduate class I was teaching at the university. A student informed me that her father had read an article in a “mechanics” magazine. The magazine included some questionable statements about forensic science. Her father asked why she would want to pursue a career (in the words of the magazine) in a “shaky” science, “weak” science, or “misleading” science. At the time, I realized there was much misinformation out there which presented misleading stories about forensic science. I mistakenly believed these stories were having little impact on the general public. With this comment from the parent of a student, I realized I was wrong.

Having worked for the government for 30 plus years, I also realized that most forensic scientists are not free to respond to criticisms in the media for political reasons. (Usually, we could say nothing without proper vetting through the public relations officer. Does anyone care to render an opinion on how long that might take in a bureaucracy?)

There were continuing media reports during 2009 and for a few years prior on what some have termed “faulty forensic science.” While driving home that evening, I decided that during my year of service to the membership I would make advocacy and promotion of forensic science in our Academy the focus for 2010-11. At the same time, I reaffirmed my practice of saying “STOP” when actual faulty forensic science was brought to my attention. I’ve done so in the past and I wasn’t about to change my approach to challenging those who claim “I’m right because I’ve been doing this for 30 years.” Being from Missouri, I’ve always said “Show Me the data or images and explain what it means.”

As the year progressed, I read more and more purported “authoritative texts” and “learned treatises” from those whom, in my opinion, were neither “authorities” nor “learned” in the forensic sciences. I believed that it was difficult to obtain totally objective and credible evaluations related to the forensic sciences from those who had never entered a forensic science laboratory, never evaluated a forensic science exhibit, or never given or been exposed to forensic science testimony in a specific forensic science discipline. These self-proclaimed experts were the same people disseminating their opinions “cloaked in the mantle of fact.” I became even more convinced that the time had arrived for a professional and calculated response through not only words, but also actions on behalf of the Academy.

As leaders in the forensic science profession, we recognize issues that must be addressed and strengthened. The words in the title of “The Report” were “Strengthening Forensic Science.” Granted, mistakes had been made and, perhaps, were continuing by forensic service providers. Those situations must be identified and addressed. But the vast majority of legitimate forensic scientists are doing everything possible to ensure the best forensic science work product one hundred percent of the time.

A re-evaluation of some forensic science testimony from the past disclosed that so-called forensic scientists had not properly examined the physical evidence they were responsible for analyzing. In other cases from the 1970s and 1980s, physical evidence had been properly evaluated and conclusions were rendered with strong caveats. Most of these cases included, but were not limited to, hair/fiber/soil/glass examinations, and blood-typing using A,B,O absorption inhibition techniques. There were no attempts to deceive, and results were reported based on protocols in existence at the time. Even
Inside This Issue

President’s Message ................................................................. 1
President-Elect’s Message ................................................... 3
Legislative Corner ..................................................................... 4
A Word From Your 2011 Program Co-Chair ............................. 5
Official Airline Selected for Chicago ........................................ 5
FSF Acorn Grants ..................................................................... 6
NIJ/FSF Research Program .................................................... 6
AAFS Topics of Interest & Continuing Education Needs Requested ......................................................... 6
FSF Travel Grants .................................................................. 7
FSF Lucas Grants .................................................................... 7
FSF Student Affiliate Scholarships ........................................ 8
FSF Jan S. Bashinski Grant ..................................................... 8
12th Annual FSF Emerging Forensic Scientist Award ................ 10
2011 Announcement and Call For Papers ............................... 11
Reliable, Relevant and Valid Forensic Science - Jurisprudence ................................................................ 15
The National Missing and Unidentified Persons System (NamUs) ............................................................ 16
Reliable, Relevant and Valid Forensic Science - Physical Anthropology ...................................................... 17
Forensic Science Educational Conferences (FSEC) ....................... 18
AAFS 2010 Tour IEOP France ................................................ 19
Section News ........................................................................... 23
FSF Contributors ................................................................... 29
In Memoriam ......................................................................... 29
Contributing Article: Fiat Lux: Instantaneous Death - Part I ...................................................................... 34
Applicants ............................................................................... 37
Young Forensic Scientists Forum Newsletter .............................. 40
Meetings & Conferences .......................................................... 42

Future AAFS Annual Meeting Dates

February 21-26, 2011
Hyatt Regency Chicago
Chicago, IL

February 17-22, 2014
Washington State Convention & Trade Center
Seattle, WA

February 20-25, 2012
Atlanta Marriott Marquis
Atlanta, GA

February 16-21, 2015
The Peabody Orlando
Orlando, FL

February 18-23, 2013
Marriott Wardman Park
Washington, DC

Rio Las Vegas Hotel
Las Vegas, NV

Academy News (ISSN#: 0739-7666) is published bi-monthly by the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, 410 North 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904. Periodicals postage paid at Colorado Springs, CO 80904. Postmaster: Send address change to Academy News, 410 N. 21st Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80904. The deadline for inclusion of material in the next issue of Academy News is June 1, 2010.
As we were about to begin our early Saturday morning Board of Directors meeting in Seattle February 27th, Physical Anthropology representative Norm Sauer asked me if I had heard the breaking news of an earthquake in Chile. I had not, but a quick check on my iPhone revealed the unfolding story of the devastation that had occurred during the early morning hours. On the trip back to Washington, later that day, I followed the developing story on airport television monitors with great concern. Over the last few years, I have worked closely with dedicated colleagues in Santiago on various forensic issues, mostly relating to staff training and the identification process. This experience impressed upon me the quality of the program there and reinforced my long-held respect for the international nature of forensic science.

In the days that followed the earthquake, communication with colleagues in Chile was difficult; but, gradually information emerged on the loss of life there and the tremendous destruction sustained to property and facilities. Now I am pleased to report that Chilean authorities have made a monumental effort to integrate trained forensic scientists, including those I have worked with, into the recovery and identification process. I am also pleased to report that through a conference call, our AAFS Executive Committee unanimously approved a motion by President Bono to make a donation to the Chilean relief effort. Through my contacts, arrangements have been made for these funds to be used in direct support of the integration of forensic scientists into the general Chilean recovery and identification process. This support was vitally needed and much appreciated. I am very proud that our Executive Committee, Board of Directors, and organization recognize the international nature of forensic science and offered the unanimous agreement to help in this way. Our colleagues working in Chile appreciate the monetary donation, and especially the accompanying sense of empathy and solidarity.
As of this writing, the Administration and the Congress are moving forward on some aspects of the NAS Report.

Federal Judge Nancy Gertner, U.S. District Court of Massachusetts, recently issued a procedural order, citing the NAS Report:

**PROCEDURAL ORDER: TRACE EVIDENCE** March 8, 2010

In the light of the 2009 report to Congress of a Committee of the National Academy of Sciences’, NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON IDENTIFYING THE NEEDS OF THE FORENSIC SCIENCE COMMUNITY, STRENGTHENING FORENSIC SCIENCE IN THE UNITED STATES: A PATH FORWARD (2009) [hereinafter cited as NRC 2009], this Court orders the following:

At or prior to the pretrial conference, parties are ORDERED to:

a) identify whether or not they seek to introduce trace evidence;
b) state whether or not either party seeks a Daubert/Kumho hearing prior to trial; and,
c) state the witnesses required for the Daubert/Kumho hearing and the exhibits that the parties seek to admit.

No later than two months before the pretrial conference, counsel must also indicate:

a) if counsel is appointed, whether expert funds are sought to deal with the trace evidence;
b) whether all discovery obligations under the Local Rules have been met or whether additional discovery required.

The NRC 2009 report, building on the writing of academic commentators, called for sweeping changes in the presentation and production of evidence of identification involving fingerprints, bullets, handwriting, and other trace evidence. The report noted that the forensic science disciplines exhibit wide variability with regard to techniques, methodologies, reliability, level of error, research, general acceptability, and published material. . . . Many of the processes used in the forensic science disciplines are . . . not based on a body of knowledge that recognizes the underlying limitations of the scientific principles and methodologies for problem solving and discovery. . . . [S]ome of these activities [encompassed by the term “forensic science”] might not have a well developed research base, are not informed by scientific knowledge, or are not developed within the culture of science.

While the report does not speak to admissibility or inadmissibility in a given case, it raised profound questions that need to be carefully examined in every case prior to trial: “1) the extent to which a particular forensic discipline is founded on a reliable scientific methodology that gives it the capacity to accurately analyze evidence and report findings and (2) the extent to which practitioners in a particular forensic discipline rely on human interpretation that could be tainted by error, the threat of bias, or the absence of sound operational procedures and robust performance standards.”

The Report noted that these fundamental questions have not been “satisfactorily dealt with in judicial decisions pertaining to the admissibility” of evidence. Id. To be sure, the court’s treatment of this evidence relates...
A couple of months have passed since we left Seattle and the February 2011 meeting in Chicago seems far away. However, the August 1st deadline for abstracts is only three months away. Each AAFS section has program chairs who are more than willing to assist you in the preparation of your abstract. I encourage you to use their knowledge and expertise to facilitate your abstract creation. By presenting at the AAFS Annual Meeting, you not only share your knowledge and experience with your colleagues, but you also take a step forward in meeting one of the requirements for promotion within your section and the AAFS. Speaking of promotions, I was surprised to find the low numbers of full Members and Fellows in the respective sections. To put it in perspective, 16% of the Academy membership are Fellows and 21% are full Members. Although I won’t identify each section’s numbers, the highest section had 36% of its membership in the Fellow status and 29% as full Members. Excluding the newest section, Digital & Multimedia Sciences, the lowest tally was 11% Fellows and 8% full Members. To be honest, I don’t know if this is a good or bad barometer of a healthy Academy. I do believe that each section should make an effort to encourage those individuals who have not presented scientific papers, or who have not participated as moderator or in some other way, to take a more active role in the AAFS Annual Meeting. Each of you does great work every day in your respective specialty. There is no better forum in which to present to a global audience than the AAFS Annual Meeting. I encourage you to take advantage of it. It will enhance your skills and will better the AAFS.

United Selected as the Official Airline for Chicago!

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) should 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.
FSF Acorn Grants Available

The FSF Acorn Grants (up to $500) are intended to help the investigator initiate original problem oriented research. These grants are open to members and affiliates (at any level) of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.

Acorn Grant Eligibility Requirements:
- Current curriculum vitae for each applicant
- Brief (approximately one page) description of the project
- Citations for current or previous FSF Research Grants awarded to any of the investigators/researchers
- Citations of appropriate references
- Budget for project, including amount requested from FSF
- Plan for dissemination of the results
- Timetable for project

Funding requests for bibliographic preparation, travel, equipment, routine agency operations, including salary of investigators/researchers or assistants, are not normally approved and are discouraged.

Issues related to the use of live humans or animals as research subjects must be dealt with explicitly in the proposal. Similarly, your plan for accommodating any issue related to privacy, appropriate permissions, and the harvesting, transport or disposal of human tissues or body fluids must be included.

All submissions must be received and completed by June 15. The deadline is firm with no extension. Please submit the aforementioned Acorn 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.

Acorn Grant recipients will be required to submit a progress report to the Forensic Sciences Foundation by December 1 of the following year.

Note: FSF Lucas and Acorn Grant proposals on the same subject, differing only in scope and budget, may not be submitted by the same investigators in the same year.

NIJ and FSF Announce Forensic Science Student Research Program

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has partnered with the Forensic Sciences Foundation (FSF) to launch the NIJ/FSF Forensic Science Student Research Program and begin a collaborative relationship of shaping the next generation of forensic scientists. The NIJ/FSF Forensic Science Student Research Program will require eligible applicants to be students enrolled in a Forensic Science Education Programs Accreditation Commission (FEPAC) accredited program. The mission of FEPAC is to maintain and enhance the quality of forensic science education through a formal evaluation and recognition of college and university academic programs. The primary function of FEPAC is to develop and maintain standards and to administer an accreditation program that recognizes and distinguishes high quality undergraduate and graduate forensic science programs.

The FSF will solicit competitive research applications from eligible undergraduate or graduate students enrolled in FEPAC programs. Applications will be peer-reviewed by a panel of forensic scientists and NIJ. Individual awards will be made by the FSF with concurrence by NIJ. Individual award amounts may vary, but will not exceed $7,000 per award. The award may be used to support research activities, excluding personnel costs, and travel, limited to $1000, for presenting research. The grant amount will also include money for indirect costs for the FSF and for contractors/consultants. This program will develop a federal link with FEPAC and will assist with the Department of Education in recognizing FEPAC as an authorized accrediting body.

The grant application is available online at www.forensicsciencesfoundation.org. The deadline for application submission is June 30, and award winners will be announced on October 1.

AAFS Topics of Interest and Continuing Education Needs Requested

What topics should be addressed at the Academy’s 63rd Annual Meeting? AAFS members are asked to send suggestions for topics of interest and continuing education needs for the 2011 AAFS Annual Meeting to the Academy headquarters. All responses received will be communicated to the program committee members when they commence their review of abstract submissions. Take this opportunity to have a voice on the program content in Chicago, IL; send your suggestions today. Please contact Sondra Doolittle (sdoolittle@aafs.org) at the AAFS office.
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.

The FSF Lucas Grants ($501-$5,000) are intended to help the investigator in original in-depth problem oriented research. These grants are open to members and affiliates (at any level) of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.

Lucas Grant Eligibility Requirements:
- Current curriculum vitae for each applicant
- Brief (up to 5 pages) description of the project
- Cites for current or previous FSF Research Grants awarded to any of the investigators/researchers
- Cites of appropriate references
- Budget for project, including amount requested from FSF
- Plan for dissemination of the results
- Timetable for project

Issues related to the use of live humans or animals as research subjects must be dealt with explicitly in the proposal. Similarly, your plan for accommodating any issue related to privacy, appropriate permissions, and the harvesting, transport or disposal of human tissues or body fluids must be included.

Funding requests for bibliographic preparation, travel, equipment, routine agency operation, including salary of investigators/researchers or assistants, are not normally approved and are discouraged.

All submissions must be received and completed by **June 15**. The deadline is firm with no extension. Please submit the aforementioned Lucas 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.

Lucas Grant recipients will be required to submit a progress report to the Forensic Sciences Foundation by December 1 of the following year.

*Note: FSF Lucas and Acorn Grant proposals on the same subject, differing only in scope and budget, may not be submitted by the same investigators in the same year.*

**Academy News**
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.

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.

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.

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.

Correction to the 2010 Financial Supporter List

Correction to the 2010 financial supporter list printed in the March/April 2010 Academy News Newsletter (Volume 4, Issue 2):

The Academy would like to thank the following financial supporter for the generous contribution to the 2010 62nd Annual Scientific Meeting:

2010 Corporate & Individual Supporter:
WetStone Technologies, Inc.
supported the Joint General and Digital & Multimedia Sciences Sections’ Reception
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 ______________________________
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 Forensic Scientist Award. Initial review and acceptance/rejection of the abstract will be done by the AAFS Program Committee which will focus specifically on the abstract’s treatment of reliability and validity issues. Multiple abstracts may be submitted for the Program Committee’s review; however, once the Program Committee approves abstracts for presentation, 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 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 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 statement sentence of the paper’s hypothesis or proposition.
4. A brief synopsis of the content, or statement of the methods, whichever is pertinent.
5. A summary of the results obtained, if pertinent.
6. A general statement of conclusion, if possible.
7. A minimum of one-half page single spaced (approximately 500 words) to a maximum of one full page (approximately 700 words) in length. Abstracts which do not meet the one-half page minimum will not be printed in the AAFS Proceedings.
8. Three key terms.
9. A brief statement of what impact the presentation or research findings will have on the forensic sciences and/or humanity.

Abstracts should NOT be written in the first person.

Format of Abstract

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

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 97212-3992

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.
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Reliable, Relevant and Valid Forensic Science:
Eleven Sections—One Academy
A View From the Bench

As a judge, the terms “relevant” and “reliable” are the hallmarks of my role as a gatekeeper in reviewing testimony and evidence offered by an attorney in court.

In 1975 the Congress codified the judge-made common law rules of evidence into the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE), which govern the federal courts. Most state courts mirror or have tailored the FRE into their state rules of evidence. Other states, which have not adopted the FRE, have their own rules of evidence. New York and Massachusetts do not have codes of evidence, but have a non-integrated system of evidentiary rules, which are found in procedural statutes and in judge-made common law. Nonetheless all jurisdictions recognize the general principles that evidence must be “relevant” and “reliable” in order to be admitted in court.

FRE §401 defines “relevant evidence” as “evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.” FRE §402 states: that relevant evidence is admissible and evidence which is not relevant is not admissible. Relevance implies that the opinion or evidence “fits the facts” of the case. Determining relevance is the easy part. But what makes evidence “reliable” is more problematic.

The federal courts and most of the state courts follow the Daubert standard of evaluating scientific reliability based upon an analysis of whether the expert’s opinion is based upon sufficient facts or data to form an opinion and whether the expert used reliable scientific, technical or specialized principles and methods and that those principles and methods were reliably applied to the facts of the case. Fed. R. Evid., R. 702 (2000). These factors were incorporated into the amended FRE §702, which were imposed upon the federal court system, but were not totally adopted by all of the states that model their evidence codes after the Federal Rules of Evidence.

Overlap the rules of evidence is case law which establishes standards of how judges are to admit evidence in court. Until the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc. in 1993, the leading case covering admissibility was the 1923 decision of Frye v. U.S., which was rarely cited until the 1970s.

Under what has become known as “the general acceptance” test, judges were to admit “expert testimony deduced from a well-recognized scientific principle or discovery which had gained general acceptance in the particular field in which it belonged.” The Frye test required that a judge ascertain whether the expert opinion was generally accepted in the field and that the expert was a spokesperson for the profession in giving testimony. However, science marches on at a faster pace, and does not wait until a theory or principle has been published and subjected to peer review to gain general acceptance within the scientific community. Consequently, a more liberal standard was needed to introduce new scientific theories into the courts before sufficient time had passed to gain general acceptance by publication and comments by their peers.

This was the environment that gave rise to the scientific reliability standards enumerated by the U.S. Supreme Court in Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals. Daubert made it clear that the burden of proof was upon the party offering the expert opinion, not by the challenger to establish whether an expert’s opinion was relevant and reliable in order to be admissible in court.

The Supreme Court in Daubert listed four “non-exclusive” factors that courts should consider in evaluating the validity of the basis for proffered expert opinions.

1. Is it testable or falsifiable and can it be replicated?
2. Is there a known error rate?
3. Has the theory or principle been subject to publication and peer review?
4. Has it already been generally accepted?

Daubert, along with G.E. v. Joiner, which reconfirmed the scrutiny that the underlying testing of a theory must undergo were both civil toxic tort cases. In 1999, in Kumho Tire v. Carmichael the U.S. Supreme Court in another civil tort case established that all fields of science, technology and specialized knowledge are to be subjected to the rigors of the Daubert standards or some “set of reasonable reliability criteria.” This opened the door to challenge the validity and admissibility of traditionally accepted forensic science opinions. Initially this became the topic of several law journal articles by several prominent law professors. Subsequently, the criminal defense bar began making more and more Frye and Daubert motions to challenge the admissibility of previously “generally accepted” forensic specialized evidence and opinions. Their challenges range from claiming the experts are not qualified due to a lack of education, training, skill and experience, to a failure to maintain data, error rates and a lack of validation testing. Challenges are also made claiming that there is no scientific validity to the discipline that was created solely to use in the prosecution of criminal defendants.

Today, most courtroom challenges in Frye, Daubert or in other jurisdictions with their own evidentiary standards, involve the admissibility of testimony matching questioned items and known items of physical evidence. Most deal with hair samples, handwriting, tool marks, ballistics, bite marks and impression ridge identification evidence. While the various DNA
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procedures initially struggled with validity issues, the underlying science underwent growing pains of establishing valid testing procedures, known error rates and published findings that became recognized by various professional fields. While not all of the matching specialties can establish the widespread recognition of DNA testing, more research and writing should be generated to validate the underlying procedures. Certification of forensic specialists who have passed validation testing should be the norm, not the exception. Judges who must rule on whether a forensic expert has the proper education, training, skill, experience and knowledge also need a reliable basis to admit their opinions into court. While lawyers will retain only those experts who have the credentials to be acceptable in court, it is the opinions that the experts render that must be based upon valid principles or techniques performed in a reliable manner.

Appellate judges from some of the most populated states such as California, New York, Pennsylvania and Florida still claim to employ the Frye general acceptance test. But an analysis of the judicial reasoning of how some techniques became “generally accepted” usually includes testing, publication, peer review and comments about the existence or lack of existence of data and error rates. Some of the judicial decisions sound like the Daubert standards while at the same time proclaiming that the state has retained the Frye test. This anomaly compels experts, attorneys and trial judges to look to the underlying procedures and methodology to ensure reliability regardless of the type of jurisdiction. Interestingly, while the intent of the U.S. Supreme Court in Daubert court was to make admissibility standards more liberal, it has generally had the opposite effect in heightening the scrutiny courts place upon admissibility issues. Until particular theory or technique reaches or reacquires “general acceptance,” within the courts, challenges will continue to be made concerning its scientific or specialized basis.

Forensic specialists should not be confused by the overall burdens of proof required of the parties in a civil or criminal trial with their discipline’s validity standards. Plaintiffs in civil matters have the burden to prove by a mere a “preponderance of the evidence” that “more likely than not” the plaintiff’s claims outweigh the opposing claims. Plaintiffs’ attorneys frequently try to quantify this burden of proof by claiming that it is merely greater than 50%. However, prosecutors in criminal trials have a burden to prove each and every element of the offense charged “beyond a reasonable doubt” that is not to a mathematical certainty (i.e. not 100%). While it is noteworthy that DNA matches may be greater than 99% certain and other disciplines may utilize the 95% certainty or confidence level, not all disciplines have been reduced to a statistical confidence standard. Whether they should or could is a topic for another discussion.

Consequently, lawyers asking expert witnesses whether “more likely than not” or “beyond a reasonable doubt,” they are certain of their opinions are not standards used by scientists. These are evidentiary standards for the entire case not scientific validity standards. In order to be valid, an expert witness’s opinions should be much greater than a mere 50-50 coin toss. Lawyers, who have the burden of proof, have espoused that adding a mathematical certainty element to expert testimony precludes attacks on uncertainty and satisfies the criminal standard of proof “beyond a reasonable doubt.” However, in a time when judges and lawyers are hopefully becoming better trained and more sophisticated in the scientific method, very little, if anything is 100% certain. Forensic experts should resist being compelled to reduce their degree of certainty to a statistical number unless they have amassed a collection of data and error rates. Educating the legal community and ultimately jurors of how scientists reach their findings and conclusions is a challenge for the bench, bar and forensic community.

In the end, it is the forensic specialists who must convince the judges that they are professionals who utilized valid methods and procedures of science in a valid manner which renders their opinions reliable and thereby admissible in court.


The National Missing and Unidentified Persons System (NamUs)

With funding from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) through the National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC), there now exists a public accessible, on-line data system for reporting and comparing missing persons and unidentified deceased. The National Missing and Unidentified Persons System (NamUs) has one component for missing persons (NamUs MP) and another for unidentified deceased persons (NamUs UP). The system has evolved over the past seven years starting with an International Homicide Investigators Association (IHIA) working group which realized the need for such a site, and from a best practices working group organized by the National Center for Forensic Science (NCFS). Eventually by 2005, a pilot system was developed by Randy Hanzlick, MD (Chief Medical Examiner, Fulton County, GA) and Data Chairperson of the National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME), and Steven C. Clark, Ph.D. Director of Occupational Research and Assessment, Inc. (ORAINC), who has engaged in a number of death investigation projects in the past such as infant death investigation guidelines (SUIDI), performance standards for forensic autopsies, inspection and accreditation procedures, and national guidelines for death scene investigators. Subsequently, the NIJ has provided funds to NFSTC to further develop NamUs, administer it, and provide training to increase system usage.

continued on page 39
The Scientific Working Group for Forensic Anthropology (SWGANTH) is a prime example of the Physical Anthropology Section’s effort to meet these goals.

Academy President Joseph Bono has asked each section to include an article in the Academy News outlining what is being done to support the Academy’s current theme: “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” The development of the Scientific Working Group for Forensic Anthropology (SWGANTH) is a prime example of the Academic Section’s effort to meet these goals.

The SWGANTH intends to produce “best practice” documents and provide guidelines for the field of Forensic Anthropology, something that is currently lacking. The ultimate goal of the SWGANTH is to engage a majority of practicing forensic anthropologists to strengthen our discipline. On June 1-3, the SWGANTH will be meeting in Washington, DC, to discuss and finalize its numerous draft documents. Attendance is open to all and your participation in this important meeting is greatly encouraged. Contact Angi Christensen (angi.christensen@ic.fbi.gov) regarding logistics and to reserve a spot at the upcoming SWGANTH meeting.

This expanding scope occurs at the same time as the growing acknowledgment by forensic anthropologists of the need for standardization of the procedures and protocols currently in practice—both in the “traditional” framework of forensic anthropology, as well as in the expanding roles into which the discipline is radiating. Gone, or at least waning, are the halcyon days of individuals employing idiosyncratic techniques and methods that lead to findings by fiat. Increasingly, forensic anthropologists are employed in large governmental laboratories and medical examiners’ offices and are held to regulatory, statutory, and institutional guidelines which leave little room for deviation. Fortuitously, this plays to anthropology’s historical strength. Anthropologists have always been keenly interested in population statistics, error ranges, sample sizes, and probabilities. Indeed, it was Francis Galton’s interest in physical anthropology that gave the world the first systematic approach to fingerprint analysis, as well as the regression line and the standard deviation.

This paradigm shift of forensic anthropology from an “art” to a “science” should not be viewed negatively. It is a healthy evolution, and one that is long overdue. The challenge facing its practitioners is not (or at least should not be) how to arrest the change or to forestall it as long as possible, but rather to direct the field’s development into the most professional, efficient, and profitable pathway. Defining and expanding the boundaries of the discipline is the role of the SWGANTH.
Forensic Science Educational Conferences

Source: Nancy J. Jackson, Director of Development & Accreditation

The American Academy of Forensic Sciences is pleased to present the 2010 Forensic Science Education Conferences for middle- and high school teachers.

With today’s explosion of television programs and media coverage of the latest advancements in the forensic sciences, students have become fascinated with anything relating to the work of the forensic scientist. Wishing to foster a stronger interest in science learning among our nation’s young people, the American Academy of Forensic Sciences co-sponsors Forensic Science Education Conferences.

The goal of the conferences is to increase science teachers’ knowledge of the forensic sciences and to assist them as they enrich and/or develop challenging, innovative curricula.

Purdue University - West Lafayette, Indiana
June 7-9, 2010
A full schedule of exciting hands-on learning will be provided at the June 7-9, FSEC at the Purdue University campus in West Lafayette, Indiana. An array of forensic investigative science topics will be presented. Included will be an overview of basic crime scene procedures, laboratory exercises and instruction on fingerprint recovery, blood spatter analysis, digital imaging techniques, and cyber crime/computer forensics, along with current trends in profiling. A field exercise will also be included involving the collection and preservation of forensic entomological evidence and associated taphonomy at the death scene. In addition, attendees will be instructed on preparing and conducting forensic related laboratory experiments from the Crime Scene Processing and Laboratory Workbook published in 2009 by CRC Press and written by Patrick Jones and Ralph Williams, two of the workshop instructors. Attendees will take with them a wealth of information and hands-on training experience for use in their own classrooms and laboratories. Workshop breakouts will include:

- Crime Scene Procedures
- Cyber Crime/Computer Forensics
- Blood Spatter/Serology
- The Forensic Laboratory
- Fingerprint Recovery Techniques
- Forensic Entomology & Outdoor Scene Photography

Radford University - Radford, Virginia
July 29-31, 2010
The American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS), Radford University (RU), and the Radford University Forensic Science Institute (RUFSI) will present a Forensic Science Educational Conference (FSEC) on the campus of Radford University, July 29-31. This three-day conference will include state-of-the-art presentations from AAFS members from the AAFS disciplines, with hands-on workshop activities in forensic anthropology and archaeology, forensic chemistry and biology, digital forensics, and crime scene reconstruction and evidence handling and processing to be held in RUFSI laboratories. Donna Boyd (Physical Anthropology) serves as Conference Director. Topics to be discussed are:

- Current Issues in Forensic Science
- Wildlife Forensics Forensic Archaeology
- Forensic Anthropology, Osteology and Human Skeletal Analysis
- Digital Forensic Science
- Forensic Biology & Forensic DNA Analysis
- Medicolegal Death Investigations
- Crime Scene Investigation, Processing, and Courtroom Testimony

This conference will include a tour of the Virginia Division of Forensic Sciences and Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.

For additional information and registration, visit the AAFS website (www.aafs.org) and follow the link under the Resources tab, or contact Nancy Jackson (njackson@aafs.org) or Kimberly Wrasse (kwrasse@aafs.org) at the AAFS office (719) 636-1100.
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, 1250 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAFS 2010 France Outreach Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(As It Appears On Passport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Passport Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiration Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in more information on Tour of Normandy: Yes _____ No _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.
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 22 of this newsletter for cancellation policy details.

**Payment Schedule:**
Tour participants may remit payments per the following schedule: (1) one payment with application for the full amount, or (2) a deposit of 50% of total cost with application and the second 50% on or before June 20, 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: (Please check) Date:</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 June 20, 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)

Latest News and Information about the Journal of Forensic Sciences!

COMING SOON! Stay e-Alert!
Never miss another issue of the Journal of Forensic Sciences with this FREE service! By signing up to receive e-Alerts, the Table of Contents will be delivered straight to your inbox as soon as each new issue publishes online. This will ensure that you’re always among the first to read the latest research published in the Journal. For more information or questions regarding this service, please contact Membership Coordinator, Cheryl Hunter, at chunter@aafs.org.

Now Offering EarlyView!
Now you can read complete articles accepted by the Journal of Forensic Sciences before they publish in print! Every article is assigned with an online publication date and is fully citable.

EarlyView articles can be retrieved by logging into your AAFS People Web account and clicking the JFS Online link.

If you are not a member of the AAFS or do not currently have access to the Journal online, please contact the AAFS Membership Department at membership@aafs.org.
Section News

CRIMINALISTICS

Source: Ken Williams, MS, JD  
Section Program Chair

The 2010 Academy Annual Meeting is only a few short months behind us and organization of the 2011 annual meeting in Chicago is well underway. With the theme in mind for the upcoming meeting, we look to the past to help chart our course for the future. Fortunately, or unfortunately depending on your perspective, any discussion of the recent past involving Forensic Science includes the report issued by the National Academy of Sciences. We should look beyond the report to review the considerations given to the topics of relevance, reliability, and validity through the collaborative efforts of the legal and scientific communities.

The first historical stop is the Federal Rules of Evidence. FRE 402 aptly concludes relevant evidence is generally admissible. That is great news considering we are involved with evidence in one form or another and under varying circumstances. Now whether all evidence is considered relevant is a different matter altogether. Nevertheless, if deemed relevant by the courts, we fare a much better chance of getting relevant Forensic Science introduced, unless one of the many other avenues of exclusion is used.

Both reliability and validity were addressed in the landmark Supreme Court decision that gave us the Daubert Factors (Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, 509 U.S. 579). Each of the factors points to reliability and validity in a sense; two stand out in particular: 1) whether the theory or technique has been tested (RELIABLE); and, 2) whether the theory has been subjected to peer review and publication (VALID). The Court gave its “opinion” on the need for reliability and validity, and the legal community responded by amending FRE 702 in 2000 to include the major points made by the Court.

Where do we go from here? That question is not easily answered. One thing is certain: we need YOU to move forward as a section and as “One” Academy. A tremendous need exists for relevant research, reliable techniques, and valid practices in the field of Forensic Science. Those outside of the Forensic Science community have been made aware of these various needs through recent reports and publications. Program Co-Chair Jennifer Mihalovich and I would like to inform you that those same needs exist as they relate to the upcoming annual meeting. Presenters are needed to share their relevant and valid research as both oral presentations and posters. Relevant workshops can provide a more in-depth discussion of the work being done in the field. The deadline for abstract submissions for oral presentations, poster presentations, and workshops is August 1st. Please consider sharing your work with your peers and submitting an abstract by the deadline.

The best was intentionally saved for last - Reliability. Space and time constraints limit the number of abstracts which can be accepted for presentation. Consequently, the committee has the difficult task of rejecting abstracts each year. Moderators also serve an important role by maintaining the professional and timely flow of the meeting. If slated as a moderator, it is quite possible that someone else may have been denied the opportunity to do so. To that end, if you are given the opportunity to moderate a session or present your research, the section and the Academy as a whole rely on your intent and ability to attend the annual meeting. There has not been an overwhelming number of cancellations in the past, but enough to take notice.

These are only a few of the needs as we move towards the 2011 Annual Meeting in Chicago. Don’t miss out on an opportunity to impact the future through the sharing of your relevant and valid research/ discussions and reliable participation. Keep in mind it is through your involvement we are able to strengthen the section, the Academy, and the Forensic Sciences as a whole.

continued on page 24
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DIGITAL & MULTIMEDIA SCIENCES

Source: Jason P. Doyle, MFS, Section Program Chair

We had an outstanding showing at this year’s meeting in Seattle with full house presentations and another full workshop. A warm thanks to all presenters, volunteers, and attendees who made it happen. It’s not too early to start thinking about presentations for next year.

The August 1 deadline is fast approaching so don’t procrastinate. We are looking for representations from all the disciplines that comprise the Digital & Multimedia Sciences Section. Not only are we looking at scientific presentations, we are encouraging our members to consider new workshop ideas and poster submissions. Attendees have a strong interest in what you do; this was evident by the attendance at this year’s conference. The success of our section depends on the strong participation of our members.

The overarching theme of the 2011 Annual Scientific Meeting is “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” All relevant papers will be considered, and topics of interest include the following:

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

Papers can be specialized and highly technical since these are directed at your peers. Workshops, on the other hand, are aimed at the entire AAFS membership, and the AAFS Program Committee will only select one or two workshops from our section. The AAFS Program Committee generally looks for workshops that will benefit the most people, so workshop topics should offer broad appeal. Be sure to submit papers for the upcoming annual meeting, and encourage your colleagues to participate as well.

ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Source: Alexis N. Sommers, PhD, Section Program Co-Chair

As in past years, the annual meeting in Seattle saw a fascinating diversity in engineering-related presentations, ranging from unique issues in automotive failure to railroad incidents, asbestos removal negligence, tool mark identification, and environmental disasters. Sessions attracted critical masses of attendees who asked a lot of good questions and contributed to the learning process. On Wednesday, since the traditional on-site luncheon was not included in the official program, the section decided to meet informally for lunch at the nearby Tap House Grill, which proved to be a networking success. About forty members participated, choosing their own meals and favorite brews, enjoying good food and great conversation. This format saved a lot of money and made for a more informal get-together before the traditional business meeting. The sentiment is to find a way to repeat the event in Chicago. Something to think about!

During the business meeting, the serious issue of section membership elicited considerable discussion, given that most present were seeing the age of sixty coming up fast or were already beyond it. Attracting young professionals is an obvious goal, but one not readily attainable given that few colleges offer forensic engineering coursework. The path to forensic engineering tends to be unique to the individual, often starting later in a career when an engineer is exposed to litigation over product liability or a serious accident. How does one accelerate the process for more engineers? That is the challenge. Formal forensic engineering courses do attract enrollments, as the University of New Haven has demonstrated, but whether or not this leads to more students entering the field remains unclear. Do all practicing forensic engineers and scientists join the AAFS and the Engineering Sciences Section? The answer is clearly “no.” There are other engineering and sciences (fire) groups that attract them. Reaching out to all forensic engineers and convincing them to join the section seems to be an emerging goal. The sense of the meeting was to develop active strategies to boost section membership over the next twelve months. Additionally, the importance of a good program at the annual meeting was emphasized as a recruiting tool, and the two new Program Co-Chairs, John Nixon and Alexis Sommers, pledged to start work early to put together a first-class program for Chicago. Section Chair Helmut Brosz announced that the joint sessions as well as the reception with the Jurisprudence Section were very successful, and that the collaboration would continue into 2011.

GENERAL

Sources: Julie A. Howe, MBA, Section Secretary

Several initiatives have evolved in response to the NAS report. The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) established a subcommittee to assess and enrich the state of forensic sciences in the U.S. The National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) invited organizations that play a critical role in forensic science to nominate subject matter experts to participate in achieving the objectives of a new Subcommittee on Forensic Science (SoFS). SoFS is charged with developing recommendations for a nationwide effort to improve forensic science at the federal, state, and local levels. Its activity is organized through five interagency working groups (IWGs):
• Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluation
• Standards, Practices and Protocols
• Education and Ethics
• Accreditation and Certification
• Outreach and Communication

In March, a group of state, local and Federal forensic practitioners, researchers from academic institutions and subject matter experts met as participants in the General Forensics Research and Development Technology Working Group (TWG). The purpose of this TWG was to identify and prioritize the near and long term research needs of the forensic science practitioner community and to review current forensic science research projects funded by the NJI.

Also in March, a group of medicolegal death investigators and representatives from law enforcement met at the National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC) to update Death Investigation: A Guide for the Scene Investigator originally published in 1997.

In June, the NJI, in partnership with the National Center for Forensic Science (NCFS), is sponsoring an invitation-only Forensic Death Investigation Symposium. The purpose of the symposium is to bring together a multidisciplinary group of criminal justice practitioners, such as medical examiners, coroners, death investigators, and others from across the nation who can augment the development and implementation of new and better research, training, and best practices and protocols within the death investigation community.

We will face new challenges and great opportunities in furthering forensic science overall, but it’s an exciting time for each of us to participate!

JURISPRUDENCE

Source: Joseph J. Maltese, JD, Section Chair

A Call for Joint Programs

The theme for the 2011 American Academy of Forensic Sciences Annual Scientific Meeting in Chicago is “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Twelve Sections—One Academy.” As the title implies, the Academy sections should interact with one another.

All forensic specialists have connections with attorneys and courts. Accordingly, the Jurisprudence Section members are eager to partner with forensic specialists from other Academy sections to present joint programs and workshops dealing with relevant, reliable and valid forensic science. Our section is comprised of attorneys who are federal and state prosecutors, criminal and civil defense lawyers, plaintiff’s lawyers and judges, as well as practitioners with notable expertise in particular forensic disciplines. Jurisprudence Section members have professional experience and knowledge that can enhance a program or workshop dealing with any specialized forensic discipline.

If you are interested in creating, or participating in, a joint program or workshop with the Jurisprudence Section for the 2011 AAFS conference, please contact our Program Chairs:

Christine Funk, JD, of the Minnesota Public Defender’s Office
(Christine.Funk@state.mn.us)

Judge Stephanie Domitrovich, PhD, JD, of the 6th Judicial District of Pennsylvania (sdomitrovich@eriecountygov.org)

Cutting Edge Issues in Investigative Technologies Conference

The American Bar Association’s Criminal Justice Section and the American Academy of Forensic Sciences are co-sponsoring a program that will cover investigative technologies, the NAS study, DNA applications, and Forensic Accounting. The conference will be held June 4 at Fordham Law School in New York City. For a conference brochure visit: http://new.abanet.org/sections/criminaljustice/PublicDocuments/forensicsbrochure.pdf.

Impression and Pattern Evidence Symposium

The National Institute of Justice, the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the FBI Laboratory are co-sponsoring a symposium on Impression and Pattern Evidence, which will discuss reporting, bias, error rates and admissibility, as well as current research and case studies. The four-day symposium, August 2-5, will be held at the Sheraton Sand Key in Clearwater Beach, Florida, a fabulous beach resort.

For more information visit: http://projects.nfstc.org/ipes.

ODONTOLOGY

Source: Iain A. Pretty, DDS, PhD, Section Program Chair

While Seattle becomes an ever distant but fond memory, we are now looking forward to Chicago in 2011. As usual, this seems so far away - but for those of you wishing to present your work at the next Academy annual meeting, it’s really worth planning ahead. This year’s program was an excellent example of the work undertaken within the Odontology Section from those within academia, private practice, and those in education. The cross disciplinary nature of many of the presentations also provided evidence of how, as a section, we are seeking to constantly improve and develop our speciality through research. This theme is especially relevant to the annual meeting next year - “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Twelve Sections—One Academy.” This theme offers our presenters a range of opportunities to present works that demonstrate how we are striving to provide the metrics to support our discipline, especially that relating to bite mark evidence. Please start thinking now of research, case work or collaborations that demonstrate this ongoing commitment to improvement and the close working relationship that we have with our peers, colleagues, and friends in other sections. While February 2011 might seem an age away, the August 1st deadline is firm so please give it some thought. If you would like to consider some reading to help formulate ideas, the Cardozo Law Review may help. You can read a major article entitled, “Reality Bites: The Illusion of Science in Bite-Mark
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Evidence - simply visit the website (www.cardozoalawreview.com) and select volume 30 number 4. While you are online, please visit www.aafs.org to check for updates on next year’s meeting and other Academy news.

PATHOLOGY/BIOLOGY

Source: Jeffery K. Tomberlin, PhD, Section Secretary

Randy Hanzlick from the Pathology/Biology Section is among the five nominations from the Academy for participation on the Interagency Working Group of the White House Subcommittee on Forensic Sciences. These working groups include: 1) Research, Development, Test, and Evaluations; 2) Standards, Practices, and Protocols; 3) Education and Ethics; 4) Certification, Accreditation and Licensing; and, 5) Outreach. These groups will help develop the executive branch of the U.S. federal government response to the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report. In an attempt to get fair representation from the organization, each section was given the opportunity to offer three names for consideration by the Executive Committee and ultimately voted on by the entire Board of Directors. Dr. Hanzlick, if selected by the White House, is sure to represent the Academy well.

Kim Collins, Section Chair, would like to announce that AAFS International Liaisons are Thomas Noguchi and Virginia Lynch. The Pathology/Biology Research Committee will consist of Keith Pinckard (Chair), Scott Denton, Joseph Prahlow, Amy Gruszeciki, Jeffery Tomberlin, and Brian Hunter. Sandra Conradi and Jason Byrd comprise the AAFS Pathology/Biology Annual Meeting Minutes Review Committee. Victor Weeda was elected by the Board of Directors to serve on the Executive Committee as member-at-large. It has been several years since the section was so represented.

Wendy Lavezzii would like to announce to all Pathology Residents and Forensic Pathology Fellows in accredited training programs: submit your original research, theory or technique as a manuscript for the AAFS Best Resident Paper Award at the 2011 AAFS Annual Meeting in Chicago. The prize is a $500 cash award, a memorial certificate, and AAFS member dues for one year. More details to follow in future AAFS newsletters.

In other news, as previously mentioned the last newsletter, we need to begin preparations for the next American Academy of Forensic Sciences Annual Meeting which will be held in Chicago, IL, February 21-26, 2011. The theme is “Relevant, Reliable and Valid Forensic Science: Eleven Sections—One Academy.” Continue to talk with one another about potential workshops, breakfasts, and symposia that would highlight the impacts that Pathology/Biology is having on multi-disciplinary approaches to the forensic sciences.

Pierre Provost, Fellow of the Pathology/Biology Section since 1980, passed away June 2, 2009. He was very proud of his membership in the Academy and enjoyed the meetings and lectures.

PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

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

Craig Cunningham from the Centre for Anatomy and Human Identification at the University of Dundee, Scotland, would like to announce two week-long courses. The first course, Cranial Juvenile Osteology, will be offered from August 1 - 6, and the second course, Postcranial Juvenile Osteology, from August 9 - 13. Each course is set up as a week long residential module. Please contact Dr. Cunningham at c.a.cunningham@dundee.ac.uk or +44 (0) 1382 388351 for further information.

QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS

Source: Martha A. Blake, MCrin, Section Secretary

It’s not too soon to plan on attending and presenting at the AAFS Meeting in Chicago. August 1 only seems far away so mind the deadline. The meeting theme encourages presentations that serve to support QD methodologies through research, particularly those that represent handwriting examinations. The program and workshop planning are in the very capable hands of Larry Olson and Robin Hunton, both from the IRS lab in Chicago. Please contact them with workshop suggestions or other ideas for the meeting.

The Annual General Meeting of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners is a joint meeting with the Southwestern Association of Forensic Document Examiners and will be held in Victoria, British Columbia, August 28 - September 2, 2010. See www.asqde.org for details.

As always, encourage a colleague to apply for membership in the Academy. If they are already a member, encourage them to participate, both in the annual meeting and in the development of standards by joining ASTM.

TOXICOLOGY

Source: Kenneth E. Ferslew, PhD, Section Chair

The Toxicology Section continues to be active in representing toxicologists’ interests in the forensic sciences. There was an open session in Seattle to inform our membership of the formation and mission of the Scientific Working Group in Toxicology (SWGTOX). Since some may have missed the session, SWGTOX’s mission is to promote a consensus in the standards for forensic toxicology. The Forensic Toxicology Council has appointed Robert Middleberg, Daniel Isenschmid, and Bruce Goldberger to co-chair the three committees covering forensic toxicology activities: practice, education, and research. Numerous members of the section have been appointed to be members, consultants and advisors to these committees. It is an
Now is the time to focus on the 2011 Annual Meeting in Chicago. The section has a great team working on our program and workshops. The section has elected Ruth Winecker as Program Chair (winecker@ocme.unc.edu, 919-445-4428) and Loralie Langman as Workshop Chair (langman.loralie@mayo.edu, 507-284-8408). They are eager to fill our program with interesting presentations and workshops so if you have an idea for a presentation or a workshop proposal, please get in touch with them as they can help you with your submission. Plus, if anyone wishes to volunteer to participate in the meeting, please contact these folks, or our section officers (Kenneth Ferslew).

President’s Message cont.

more interesting was the fact that the forensic science testimony in many of these cases was much less significant in the outcome of the case than eye witness testimony, or ineffective counsel. And yet, even with these reports in hand, charges of “faulty forensic science” remained the purported counterpoise on which the conviction was allegedly attributed. To continue pointing to examples from 15-25 years ago and attributing these alleged norms as the state of forensic science in 2010 is disingenuous at best. Forensic science is but one of the many factors which contribute to the outcome of a trial. Forensic science does not convict or acquit; that is the responsibility for judges and juries.

One of our responsibilities as leaders in the forensic science profession is to question any scientist responsible for formulating conclusions. We do so with facts, not innuendoes; with expertise, not exaggeration; and with reality, not rhetoric. There is a difference between the science being faulty and the analyst being incompetent or embellishing the truth. When the latter happens, there are mechanisms in place to remove those who are incompetent or unethical. Criminal charges related to possible perjury are also an option. However, painting with the broad brush of “INVALID” (without specificity as to what constitutes “invalid!”) methods which do indeed have an empirical basis for generating valid data defies logic.

I will be the first to require that the friction ridge pattern association science should be strengthened with quantifiable standards. I also believe that the use of smudged or overlapping patterns requires careful scrutiny and a critical evaluation of the images. Here is a scenario for those who use this broad brush approach of claiming that two forensic science disciplines employ invalid/unvalidated methods: To quote Lewis Carroll’s Alice, “Let’s pretend” that a close friend is found murdered; and at the crime scene are found two full friction ridge patterns (fingerprints) which are later associated with a person of interest (POI). The POI’s home is searched, and a .38 caliber revolver is found, test fired in the laboratory, and with current methodology, determined to be associated with the same weapon used to fire the projectile taken from the body of the friend. Will those claims of “invalid/unvalidated” methods still be extolled as fact by those who today challenge friction ridge pattern associations and firearms examinations when that close friend (as opposed to someone else’s friend) is involved?

To be clear, in an adversarial system, I would be the first to challenge the conclusions of the forensic scientist by evaluating the collection and examination methods, and data or images; however, that challenge is different from arguing that the testimony should not be admitted because the methods are unvalidated. In the use of “pattern evidence,” there may not be standardized quantitative thresholds for a conclusion, and perhaps, there should be. For example, how much of the friction ridge pattern is required for an association of a fingerprint? One fact is clear: there are no known examples in AFIS of replicative patterns of full “rolled prints.” This statement is based on the empirical data, not on a philosophical argument. How much distinguishable detail is required to establish an association between a fingerprint from a crime scene and a known fingerprint from a suspect? This is what I mean by establishing a threshold. This is an example where research must be conducted to strengthen forensic science. To claim that the methodology in friction ridge pattern association remains unvalidated and therefore should not be admitted in trial, is open for discussion.

All forensic science disciplines must be strengthened. There are some issues which must be addressed regarding the quality and quantity of data/images required for conclusions to be proffered in court as expert witness testimony. Again, what is the threshold which must be met to ensure a scientifically valid conclusion? There are also valid questions related to the wording of the conclusion.

Except in the rarest cases where shouts of “invalid” or “not validated” fill the media, the eleven sections in our Academy do
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practice forensic science which is relevant, reliable and valid. Beginning with the March issue, this and future editions of the Academy News will include descriptions from the eleven sections synopsizing how the science in the respective disciplines addresses the theme for 2010-11.

UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES
Shortly after we departed Seattle, I travelled to Washington, DC, where, together with President-Elect Doug Ubelaker, we met with Senator Patrick Leahy’s staff. Senator Leahy is the Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and his staff will be pivotal in crafting the legislation which will define the responses of congress to “The Report.” We also met with a staff member from Senator Richard Shelby’s staff. Senator Shelby is the ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Our goal was to notify these staff members that the American Academy of Forensic Sciences stands ready to offer the opinions of experts in the various forensic science disciplines as the draft legislation comes together over time. I also made clear that the cross-sectional representation of the eleven sections of the Academy would ensure that we will bring “many scientists into the room” in discussing suggestions for ways to strengthen the draft legislation.

The 2011 AAFS Annual Meeting in Chicago will return to the format which had been so successful in years past. We are planning to invite a Plenary Session speaker who will discuss the importance of forensic science. The Tuesday evening Welcoming Reception will be reserved for “welcoming” those who are attending the meeting. The meeting will officially open on Wednesday morning, February 23, with the Plenary Session, followed by a return to section luncheons and section business meetings.

Legislative Corner cont.

directly to the adequacy of counsel’s treatment. See, e.g. Sturgeon v. Quartermen, 615 F. Supp. 2d 546, 572-573 (S.D. Tex. 2009) (defense counsel’s failure to prepare a witness to testify about the unreliability of eyewitness identifications prevented defendant from presenting testimony that would have called into question the only direct evidence against him and was ineffective assistance of counsel warranting habeas relief); Richter v. Hickman, 578 F.3d 944, 946-947 (9th Cir. Cal. 2009) (en banc) (defense counsel’s failure to conduct an adequate forensic investigation with respect to blood spatter, serology, and pathology comprised ineffective assistance of counsel warranting habeas relief). See also United States v. Pena, 586 F. 3d 105 (1st Cir. 2009 affirmed) (the court’s decision not to hold a Daubert hearing on fingerprint testimony where counsel offered no expert or evidence affirmed.

In the past, the admissibility of this kind of evidence was effectively presumed, largely because of its pedigree — the fact that it had been admitted for decades. As such, counsel rarely challenged it, and if it were challenged, it was rarely excluded or limited. But see United States v. Hines, 55 F. Supp. 2d 62 (D. Mass. 1999) and United States v. Green, 405 F. Supp. 2d 104 (D. Mass. 2005).

The NAS Report suggests a different calculus — that admissibility of such evidence ought not to be presumed; that it has to be carefully examined in each case, and tested in the light of the NAS concerns, the concerns of Daubert/Kumho case law, and Rule 702 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. This order is entered to accomplish that end.”

The order signals to defense attorneys that if they want to make a Daubert challenge, it will require real and serious preparation and work. It also indicates Judge Gertner’s receptivity to such challenges. Only time will tell if this type of order will begin to take hold in other jurisdictions.

During the month of March, the Board of Directors voted to put forth five Academy nominees from a list of members from each section to serve on the White House Subcommittee on Forensic Science. The five nominees in random order of selection were: Marina Stajic, Robert Barale, Randy Hanzlick, James Tarver, and Jose Almirall. The five AAFS nominees’ names with their resumes were then submitted for consideration to the subcommittee.

The Executive Committee (EC) is comprised of the AAFS President, the President-Elect, the Secretary, the Treasurer, and two members-at-large. The EC is empowered to act for and on behalf of the Board on matters which require urgent action between meetings of the Board and to accomplish other specifically assigned tasks. In February, the Board voted for John Gerns (General) and Victor Weeden (Path/Bio) to fill the two at-large positions of the EC. Congratulations to both Victor and John on their elections to the EC.

Program Chair Susan Ballou and Program Co-Chair John Gerns will be reminding everyone in this and in the July issue that the August 1 abstract deadline will be upon us very shortly. Therefore, I am requesting that if you are planning to present at the annual meeting, please get ahead of the curve and submit your abstracts early.

Please send your comments to me at bonojp@gmail.com.
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 3/31/10.

The Fund’s balance through 3/31/10 was $553,488.19. Additionally, the Endowment has provided $132,422 in awards and grants since its inception in 1990.

FSF Endowment Fund Contributors
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There is no requisite “stop, drop, and roll” in the writing of a judicial opinion; certainly, nothing so illustrative and informative as in an elementary school’s fire drill. Consequently, it comes as no surprise to find the meaning of “instantaneous death” as used in judicial opinions to be lacking in crystalline clarity and manifest cause for confusion and second guessing. This essay is tendered in order to shed some enlightenment on the subject (fiat lux).

Having seen frequent references in different contexts to the subject (the fact?) of instantaneous death as presented through the testimony of pathologists as reflected in judicial opinions, it became the goal of this author to learn more on the matter, going beyond unconnected and sporadic references in judicial opinions. Through the research labors of Matthew Mantel, Esq at The George Washington University Law Library a list of some eighty cases from all the states with no limitation on the date of issuance was developed, as of March 19, 2010, in which the words “instantaneous death” and “pathologist” appeared and were relevant to the decision of the court. The same search of “instantaneous death” without the key word “pathologist” and without any time limitation garnered some 659 hits, a size unmanageable for present purposes. Thus the focus of attention was on the eighty cases.

These eighty cases originated in twenty-nine different states. The earliest was an opinion from the New York Court of Appeals in 1905 (People v. Patrick, 74 N.E. 843 (N.Y. 1905) and the latest were a goodly number decided in 2009. These judicial opinions revealed that the concept of an instantaneous death appeared mainly on appeals in criminal prosecutions (direct appeals from trials as well as appeals from post-conviction motions), with a smattering of civil cases involving automobile accidents and workmen’s compensation claims supplementing the criminal cases.

The twenty-nine states from which these opinions were rendered included Alabama (8), Arkansas (1), California (7), Florida (9), Georgia (1), Illinois (5), Indiana (1), Kansas (1), Louisiana (3), Michigan (2), Minnesota (2), Missouri (5), Montana (2), Nebraska (3), New Jersey (3), New York (2), North Carolina (1), North Dakota (1), Ohio (1), Oklahoma (2), Oregon (1), Pennsylvania (2), South Carolina (2), South Dakota (1), Tennessee (10), Texas (1), Utah (1), Virginia (1), Wisconsin (1).

The wide disparity of the numbers of opinions in which instantaneous death and the testimony of a pathologist appeared, particularly in the ten occasions in Tennessee appellate court opinions in contrast to none from the state of Washington, may be the basis for a statistician’s analysis but, for the nonce, that disparity will be left unexamined.

Furthermore the search which was conducted by Mr. Mantel found references only in reported opinions of appellate courts from these twenty-nine states and then only when the issue of an instantaneous death was germane to the reviewing court’s opinion. Thus there may be many other, uncounted, occasions when the question of an

Fiat Lux: Instantaneous Death – Part One

James E. Starrs, LL.M.
Professor of Law Emeritus & Forensic Science
The George Washington University
instantaneous death involving the testimony of a pathologist was raised at the trial level but did not find its way into the opinion of a court on appeal. But those instances are not readily searchable in today’s electronic legal world, given the limitations of that coverage’s searchability.

The Enigma of Capital Punishment from the perspective of the perpetrator

As might be expected the prospect of an instantaneous death has been featured prominently in a number of the cases challenging capital punishment as violative of the Eighth Amendment’s cruel and unusual punishment clause. In Provenzano v. Moore, 604 So. 2d 413 (Fla 1999), a dissenting judge, in this post-conviction habeas corpus proceeding, was not convinced that Florida’s method of execution by electrocution (or lethal injection as an option) was constitutionally acceptable just because it concededly resulted in instantaneous death.

The prosecutor in Provenzano had admitted at oral argument that in today’s constitutional world the guillotine would not pass “constitutional muster” even though it would bring about a pain-free instantaneous death. The fact of an instantaneous death was, in the view of this dissenting judge, not the alpha and the omega of “the judicial inquiry into whether the punishment is cruel and unusual.”

And in State v. Mata, (745 N.W. 2d 229 (Neb. 2008) the prosecutor once again argued that the method electrocution in implementing the death penalty ukase in that State did not involve an Eighth Amendment violation since “it is undisputed that electrocution can and does cause the instantaneous death of a condemned prisoner.” Yet the testimony of a number of medical specialist in Mata proclaimed their disagreement with the prosecutor’s categorical stance on this question. And the court itself “concluded that the state’s theory of instantaneous death assumed a substantial amount of current going to the brain, which it was impossible to know.”

Yet there is much in the sphere of capital punishment, by whatever means it is effected, which is subject to surmise and speculation. Those who have died pursuant to the successful infliction of capital punishment do not and have not returned from the grave to present first hand knowledge of the presence or absence of pain or, indeed even its magnitude, in their legalized from the grave to present first hand knowledge of the presence or absence of pain or, indeed even its magnitude, in their legalized.

Not even the unique situation of Louisiana’s Willie Francis who was twice electrocuted, once unsuccessfully in 1946 and again successfully in 1947, for a murder committed by him at the age of 16 in 1945 is entirely apposite to the instantaneous death equation in relation to capital punishment. Francis did not die in 1946 when the current did not suffice to put him to death, presenting the conundrum of whether the state should be given a second chance to end it all for him. The United States Supreme Court in a 5 to 4 opinion (Francis v. Resweber, 329 U.S. 459 (1947)), with Justice Frankfurter casting the deciding vote’ rejected all the many claims of constitutional imperatives standing athwart the state’s having a second go at electrocuting Willie Francis in Gruesome Gertie, the portable electric chair that had malfunctioned the first time around. (See King, Gilbert, The Execution of Willie Francis, Basic Civitas Books 2008)

Yet even the more modern and said-to be humane infliction of capital punishment by the protocol of lethal injection can be and has been botched or, as Justice Frankfurter is said to have remarked about Willie Francis’ flubbed execution, can create an occasion for an “innocent misadventure.” Maryland’s Bert Leroy Hunter who suffered observable “violent convulsions” during his lethal injection execution might not so cavalierly discount the fear and trembling that can accompany even such a supposed instantaneous death execution. The constitutional question of the legitimacy of capital punishment cannot be so blithely bypassed by saying that an instantaneous death has ensued. There is a much larger and different societal issue at stake in the infliction of capital punishment, even supposing the meaning of an instantaneous death could be agreeably and scientifically ascertained.

The enigmas of language defining instantaneous deaths

William Swatek, the driver of a westbound pickup truck that struck and killed a pedestrian, Jody McClaren, who was walking at 10:40 at night on a Wisconsin highway’s westbound lane was convicted of leaving the scene of an accident without rendering reasonable assistance to Ms. McClaren. He appealed to the Wisconsin Court of Appeals, arguing that he had no statutory duty to aid Ms. McClaren since his truck’s striking her had caused her instantaneous death.

The appellate court rejected Swatek’s claim stating “that whether McClaren’s death was instantaneous begs the question.” The question, according to this reviewing court, was not whether Ms. McClaren suffered death instantly but whether Swatek rendered reasonable assistance to her via a reasonable person’s investigation into her post-accident condition.

The reviewing court did hypothetically agree with Swatek’s contention if and only if the applicable statute were to be construed to mandate aid to the injured pedestrian solely when the injured person survives the accident. But the court rejected that statutory construction, construing the statute more broadly to require what a jury would say would be the reasonable conduct of a motor vehicle driver after striking a pedestrian, whether thereafter determined to be alive or dead.

That Ms. McClaren had been fatally injured by the accident seemed to be a given. First Swatek came to that conclusion himself after stopping his pickup and walking back to within sixty to ninety feet of the victim’s “mutilated” body where he decided that his assistance would be futile since from that vantage point Ms. McClaren was already dead.

Second, Dr. Billy Bauman, Ms. McClaren’s autopist, stated that her death was “virtually instantaneous with the degree of injuries she had.” Those injuries included “blunt force injuries which crushed her face, lacerated her brain, fractured her neck, crushed her chest and ruptured her abdominal organs,” which even to a
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non-medical person would seem to justify calling her death instantaneous rather than the less certain "virtually instantaneous" as described by pathologist Bauman’s report and presented in court.

Watchers at the forensic sciences pond have regularly taken note that the linguistic phraseology in the opinions of forensic scientists is often mired in terminological murkiness. So it is not unexpected to find the courts’ referring to the opinions of pathologists as replete with conclusions that could fairly be described as linguistic legerdemain at its worst. To say a death was virtually instantaneous is not to commit oneself but to hedge the bet, a practice quite endemic among forensic scientists, be they forensic pathologists or representing other scientific disciplines. To this author’s personal knowledge a chest x-ray report was said to be “essentially negative” which is as informative as is a court’s calling an expert a “medical pathologist.” (Way v. State, 760 So. 2d 903 (Fla. 2000) referring to defense expert Dr. Feegel).

Thus Dr. Billy Bauman’s calling Ms. McClaren’s death “virtually instantaneous” in State v. Swatek, 502 N.W. 2d 909 (Wisc. App. 1993) is on a par with Missouri’s State v. Anderson, also decided in 1993, 862 S.W. 2d 425 (Mo. App.) where the homicide victim, a Mr. Frederick, was shot in the head and face multiple times with at least one of these shots transecting “the brain stem and midbrain, causing Mr. Frederick’s virtually instantaneous death.”

To add to the murkiness in the courts’ devining the meaning of instantaneous deaths in eonomini are those numerous decisions adjectivally denominating instantaneous deaths as occurring either “almost” (Knight v. State, 338 So. 2d 201 (Fla. 1976) and State v. Gross, 390 P. 2d 612 (Ore. 1964) or “nearly” (People v. Gleckler, 411 N.E. 2d 849 (Ill. 1980) and (Langford v. Schumpert Med.Ctr., 759 So. 2d 1037 (La. App. 2000) or “probably” (People v. McGrath, 133 Cal. Rptr. 27 (Cal. App. 1976) or “sudden and instantaneous death” (State v. Kirk, 2003 Tenn Crim. App. Lexis 1068 (Tenn App. 2005)

So in People v. Stanworth, 114 Cal. Rptr. 250 (1974) the pathologist who performed the autopsy on the homicide victim “concluded that the death of the victim was ‘almost instantaneous’ after being shot.” That finding encouraged the defendant in his claim that he could not be guilty of raping a dead person since rape, by definition, requires a lack of consent which only a living person is capable of giving or refusing.

However the court was of the view that the rape and murder of the victim were one seamless and continuous act regardless of whether the rape came after the homicide or before.

End of Part One: Part Two will address the definitions offered by pathologists and the courts to elucidate the meaning of an instantaneous death. One such is that of Dr. Gould in Cavalier v. State, 994 So. 2d 635 (La. App. 2008) where he testified “he generally indicates the time between the injury and death is four minutes, meaning ‘instantaneous’ death.”

---
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**Criminalistics**

**Associate Member**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agbo, Benedict, MSc</td>
<td>Lagos, Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colen, Alan H., PhD</td>
<td>Kansas City, KS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbin, Kerre, BS</td>
<td>Springfield, VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fogelberg, Christopher W., BA</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fratticeto, Stephen W., MSc</td>
<td>Thunder Bay, ON Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier, Nicole R., MS</td>
<td>Fayetteville, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fu, Jun, PhD</td>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goltz, Krisztina L., MFS</td>
<td>Fullerton, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves, Joseph W., BS</td>
<td>Pensacola, FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hokanson, Stephen P., BS</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurston, Heather H., BS, MS</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez, Malena, BS</td>
<td>Jefferson City, MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merth, Michael G., BS</td>
<td>Crystal, MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundo, Jose A., III, BS</td>
<td>Buford, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, Lola J., MS</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Dirk A., BS</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia, Michael L., MS</td>
<td>Albany, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southall-Malone, Amy L., BA</td>
<td>Jackson, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven, Colin R., MS</td>
<td>Ellicott City, MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidwell, Mark A., BS</td>
<td>Las Cruces, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine, Jennifer A., MS</td>
<td>Fort Worth, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verma, Ritu, MS</td>
<td>New Delhi, India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner, Adrienne L., MS</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trainee Affiliate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burleson, Garrett L., BS, MS</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bybleezer, Michael R., MFS</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call, Michelle M., MS</td>
<td>Westminster, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Southlake, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Hannah M., BS</td>
<td>London, OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Joliet, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Jennifer K., MS</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krieger, Caroline E., BS</td>
<td>Des Plaines, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert, Lindsay M., MS</td>
<td>Maryland Heights, MO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarecki, Lisa M., BS</td>
<td>Milford, CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen, Diana M., MS</td>
<td>Runnemede, NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Chadds Ford, PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renson, Christine M., MS</td>
<td>Troup, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt, Carrie L., BS</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed, Lindsay M., BS</td>
<td>Meridian, MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss, Rachel L., BA, MS</td>
<td>Hamden, CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vensel, Denise L., BS</td>
<td>Grand Junction, CO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Charlene R., MS</td>
<td>Stone Mountain, GA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaldana, Italo, BS</td>
<td>Brookville, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Affiliate**

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hight, Kelley R.</td>
<td>Kokomo, IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez, Adrienne Marie</td>
<td>Oklahoma City, OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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Stoffel, Michelle C., BS
East Lansing, MI
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Baird, Stephen D., MS
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Cohen, Peter A., PhD
Honolulu, HI
Delporte, Steve, BA
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Deming, Alexandra, BA
New Hope, PA
Earle, James H., PhD
Colorado Springs, CO
Harvell, Karen D., BA
Pensacola, FL
Holt, Michelle Y., BS
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Hooper Marosek, Stephanie E., PhD
Fayetteville, NC
Jackson, Bruce A., PhD
Wayland, MA
Jensen, Eric E., MS
Quantico, VA
Jones, Patrick L., PhD
West Lafayette, IN
Kinsey, Amy, MS
Newberry, FL
Lancaster, Elizabeth F., BA
Fort Pierce, FL
LeFebvre, Aaron K., PhD
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Ludvico, Lisa, PhD
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Lynch, Michael J., BS
Alea, HI
Malagon Bolanos, Felipe, MS
Bogota, Colombia
Marchesini, Lorenzo M.R.
Bondono, 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
Tomlinson, Chet L., BA
Saint Johns, FL
Womack, Kimberly A., DHSc
Gulf Breeze, FL
Yap, Roland W., BS
Honolulu, HI

**Trainee Affiliate**
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
Tomick, Ryan S., BS
Arlington, VA

**Student Affiliate**
Al 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
Hogie, Anastasia M.
Grand Forks, ND
Keith, Sarah A.
San Jose, CA
Li, Jiazi, BS
New Haven, CT
Matias, Maria R.
Carrollton, TX
Myers, Linda
Los Angeles, CA
Richardson, Sandra, BS
East Haven, CT
Sevilla, Samantha
Seattle, WA
Smith, Sarah C.
Glenwood, IN

**Jurisprudence**

**Associate Member**
Erfe, 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
Swegle, Ann E., JD
Wichita, KS
Vigil, Jani L., JD
Westminster, CO
Warren, Morris B., LLB
Calgary, AB Canada

**Student Affiliate**
Forrester, Scott M.
Spokane, WA

**Odontology**

**Associate Member**
Beehler, Richard R., DDS
Victoria, BC Canada
Ethier, Joanne E., DMD
Montreal, PQ Canada
Kovalski, Paul, Jr., DMD
Englewood, NJ
Lee, Leland H., DDS
SACRAMENTO, CA
Pittenger, Gina R., DDS
Thomson Station, TN
Risos, Deanna, DDS
Chula Vista, CA
Located at www.NamUs.gov, members of the public can report missing persons with such reports being reviewed by NamUs regional managers and additional vetting through law enforcement to verify case validity before a missing person report goes live on the system. Medical Examiner and Coroner offices (or their designate) can report details of unidentified decedents. The NamUs system generates lists of potential matches between missing persons and unidentified decedents, and members of the public, law enforcement, and missing person clearinghouses can also conduct specific searches and comparisons. Progress is underway to facilitate data exchanges between NamUs and other systems such as NCIC and missing persons clearinghouses such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC).

A team of forensic anthropologists, forensic odontologists, and fingerprint examiners has also been assembled to review information in the NamUs system and to assist in review of anthropologic information, fingerprint comparisons, coding of dental information, and dental comparisons in order to improve case information quality and facilitate the case comparison and identification process. As new cases are entered or edited, case managers review entries and if questions or other needs arise, case owners can be contacted for follow up. An Advisory Panel also exists and meets periodically to review system progress and make recommendations for additions or changes to the system.

A major advantage of the NamUs system is that it does not require special software or terminals, and portions of the data relevant to public interest are available to the public who may conduct searches or do missing and unidentified decedent comparisons. Very positive feedback has been received from family members of missing persons who are trying to locate a missing person and/or come to a definitive resolution of the case. Thus far, NamUs has facilitated the identification of about 6% of persons who were unidentified, entered into NamUs, and subsequently identified.

All AAFS members should be aware of the NamUs system and especially those who work with or for a medical examiner, coroner, missing person agency or organization, or law enforcement agency which manages missing persons cases.

The National Missing and Unidentified Persons System (NamUs) cont.
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A Letter from the YFSF President

The 2011 YFSF Committee has already begun planning for the AAFS 63rd Annual Scientific Meeting to be held February 21–26, 2011, in Chicago, IL. The 2011 Special Session promises to be more exciting and even better than the 2010 Special Session. YFSF is continually growing, striving for excellence, and always looking for ways to reach out to young forensic scientists. If you are new or if you know of anyone who is new to the field of forensics, then the Young Forensic Scientist Forum is the place to be! Make sure to register early for the Special Session and present during Bring Your Own Slides, Bring Your Own Posters, or both. I’d like to take a moment and thank those who participated in the 2010 Special Session and Breakfast Session and made it incredibly successful, and also to those who have already volunteered to be a part of the 2011 Special Session and Breakfast Session. If anyone is still interested in participating with the Young Forensic Scientist Forum, please contact me at tanisha.henson@yahoo.com.

Tanisha Henson, BS
YFSF President

The 2011 YFSF Committee members would like to introduce themselves. We are beyond excited to have these amazing committee members on board. If you have any interest in working with YFSF, please do not hesitate to contact any officer for more information.

President:
Tanisha V. Henson, BS
tanisha.henson@yahoo.com

Special Session Chair:
Jenna L. Oakes-Smith, MFS
jloakes-smith@slmpd.org

Special Session Co-Chair:
Amanda G. Kittoe, BA
akittoe@gmail.com

Breakfast Session Chair:
Melissa DeBerry, BA
mdeberry@ncl.state.ms.us

Financial Liaison:
Jacquelyn M. Jenkins, PhD
j.jenkins71@gmail.com

Secretary:
Lauren R. Pharr, MA
lpharr1@tigers.lsu.edu

Secretary Co-Chair:
Kelly L. Knight, MS
kellyknight09@gmail.com

BYOS Chair:
Martin K. Overly, MSFS
martin.overly@mail.wvu.edu

BYOP Chair:
Stephanie M. Crider, BA
scride1@tigers.lsu.edu

A Note from the YFSF Secretary

Greetings everyone! Writing to you from Baton Rouge, LA, this is Lauren Pharr, the 2010-2011 YFSF Secretary. Let me begin by saying that I am honored to have been appointed Secretary and will strive to be as excellent a secretary as Jennifer Mercer, who skillfully held this office the past five years; Jennifer will be greatly missed. I would also like to express my gratitude to both the YFSF and AAFS program committees for the outstanding conference in Seattle this past February.

For those of you who were unable to attend this year’s YFSF special sessions and presentations in Seattle, I encourage you to attend the YFSF events offered at the 2011 meeting in Chicago. The multidisciplinary backgrounds of the YFSF officers and participants offer an exciting array of forensic science information. Not only does the YFSF expose conference attendees to many topics of forensic interest, the YFSF presents these topics in a welcoming, non-intimidating manner. Because we are members of AAFS with five years or less experience in our respective forensic careers, each YFSF officer understands the anxiety and uncertainty associated with the first few years of attending the AAFS annual meeting. Because of this understanding, one goal of the YFSF is to provide an easy transition into becoming active within the AAFS community.

Last but not least, I would like to introduce myself. I was born and raised in Memphis, TN, and I received my BA in Anthropology from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Immediately
following graduation, I moved to Baton Rouge, LA, to begin the master’s program in Anthropology at Louisiana State University (LSU). Under the guidance of Mary Manhein, Fellow of the Physical Anthropology Section, I completed my master’s thesis which documented my investigation of decomposition rates and taphonomic processes associated with child-sized remains within both airtight and unsealed 55-gallon drums; postmortem interval estimations were then made using these results. Currently, I am a Geography PhD student with an Anthropology concentration at LSU. My current research interests include crime mapping, geographic profiling, and applying GIS and Remote Sensing techniques to forensic anthropology contexts. If you have any questions, concerns, or comments, please feel free to contact me at lpharr1@tigers.lsu.edu. I look forward to seeing you in Chicago, and as always, Geaux Tigers!!

Lauren Pharr
YFSF Secretary

Financial Liaison
My name is Jackie Jenkins, and I will be serving as YFSF Financial Liaison for the coming year. Currently, I am completing my MSFS at the University of Alabama at Birmingham and working as an intern at the Alabama Department of Forensic Sciences. I attended my first AAFS Annual Meeting and YFSF Special Session this past February in Seattle, and enjoyed the variety of speakers and presentations the meeting had to offer. I am looking forward to becoming more involved in YFSF and planning for a great year! For more information on how you can support or contribute to the YFSF, please contact me at j.jenkins71@gmail.com.

Jackie Jenkins
YFSF Financial Liaison

YFSF Breakfast Session
We all had a great time in Seattle at the 2010 AAFS Conference. For those of you who were not able to attend the meeting, I want to introduce myself. My name is Melissa DeBerry, and I work at the Mississippi Crime Laboratory in the Technical Assistance Section. I handle all the incoming and outgoing evidence for our laboratory. I was first introduced to the YFSF at the 2009 AAFS Annual Meeting in Denver and was then recruited as the Breakfast Session Co-Chair for the 2010 meeting. I honestly had no idea what I was in for, but with the help of the Program Chair and the current President, everything was able to come together for a great YFSF Breakfast Session in Seattle. I am looking forward to the annual meeting in Chicago and can’t wait to meet new people coming into YFSF.

Melissa DeBerry
YFSF Breakfast Session Chair

Special Session Co-Chairs
It is the beginning of another year here at the Young Forensic Scientist Forum (YFSF) and exciting things are in the works. I am Jenna Oakes-Smith, Chair of this year’s YFSF Special Session. I first became involved in the YFSF a few years ago when I attended a special session in Washington, DC. Since then I have acted as the Breakfast Session Co-Chair and the Breakfast Session Chair. I am very excited about the opportunity to serve the forum one last time as the Special Session Chair this year. This is my last year of service in the YFSF as I have worked for the last four years as a Criminalist in the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department Crime Lab in the DNA section. At the end of this year, I will have worked in a forensic setting for five years and will become ineligible to participate in the YFSF. I hope to go out on a bang though, and make this year one of the best.

Joining me this year as the Special Session Co-Chair is Amanda Kittoe. Amanda is working on her master’s of anthropology at Louisiana State University, specializing in forensic anthropology. Amanda just experienced her first YFSF Special Session this last February and became a member of AAFS shortly thereafter. She chose to become a member of the YFSF planning committee in order to better acclimate herself with the forensic community and to help new members situate themselves within their forensic careers.

In the upcoming months, this newsletter will outline the topics and speakers for next year’s special session in Chicago, IL. We are busy planning the event already, but we would love to hear any suggestions or comments that you want to share. Feel free to email me at jloakes-smith@slmpd.org with ideas that will make the special session great. I look forward to creating a great program for you in Chicago next year.

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

YFSF Bring Your Own Slides
My name is Martin Overly, and I am the Bring Your Own Slides Chair for the YFSF this year. I work as a Forensic Technician with Forensic Science Initiative at West Virginia University. I had the opportunity to attend my first AAFS and YFSF meetings this year in Seattle, WA. I must say that I am excited to get involved and network with such an exciting and motivated group of people. I also look forward to recruiting speakers to present their material and research at this upcoming meeting in Chicago. If you are interested in presenting, please contact me at martin.overly@mail.wvu.edu for more information.

Martin Overly
YFSF Bring Your Own Slides Chair

YFSF Poster Session
My name is Stephanie Crider and I am the 2011 YFSF Poster Session Chair. I first attended YFSF in 2006 at Seattle. Since then I have continued to be involved with YFSF as an attendee, and last year I was the Co-Chair for the Poster Session. Currently, I am finishing my MA in Anthropology at Louisiana State University; my research focuses on ancestry and the cranial base. I am very excited for the meeting in Chicago (my first time there!) in February and hope that you are as well! If you are interested in presenting your research as a poster, please feel free to contact me scride1@tigers.lsu.edu for more information.

Stephanie Crider
YFSF Poster Session Chair
Meetings and Conferences

**MAY 2010**

14
Forensic Investigation of Sexual Assault Cases—Hosted by The Cyril H. Wecht Institute of Forensic Science and Law—To be held at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, PA.
CONTACT: (412) 396-1330
wechtinstitute@duq.edu

16-19
31st IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy—To be held in Oakland, CA.
CONTACT: http://oakland31.cs.virginia.edu/

16-21
AusCERT Asia Pacific Information Security Conference—To be held in Kenmore Hills, Queensland, Australia.

17-21
Advanced Bloodstain Pattern Analysis and Expert Witness Workshop—Presented by the Metropolitan Police Institute of the Miami-Dade Police Department—To be held in Doral, Florida.
CONTACT: Toby L. Wolson, MS, F-ABC
(305) 471-3041
Fax: (305) 471-2052
Twilson@mdpd.com

17-21
Detection and Recovery of Human Remains—To be held at Chaminade University of Honolulu in Honolulu, HI.
CONTACT: M. Lee Goff, Director
(808) 440-4209
lgoff@chaminade.edu
www.chaminade.edu/grad

17-21
Mid-Atlantic Association of Forensic Scientists 2010 Annual Meeting—To be held at State College, PA.
CONTACT: www.maafs.org/annualmtg.htm

17 - Aug. 8
2010 Crime Scene Investigation Summer Institute—To be held at The George Washington University.
CONTACT: Office of Summer Sessions
(202) 994-6360
gwsummer@gwu.edu

19
Forensic Aspects of Ancient Egypt Study Day—To be held at the University of London.
CONTACT: Rikk Barritt
ikki_promo@yahoo.co.uk

19-21
Conference on Digital Forensics, Security and Law 2010—To be held in St. Paul, MN.
CONTACT: www.digitalforensics-conference.org/index.htm

20-23
54th Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis and Dynamic Psychiatry—To be held in New Orleans, LA.
CONTACT: Executive Director
(888) 691-8281
Fax: (860) 286-0787
info@aapdp.org
www.aapdp.org

25-26
Lifeguard Systems Homicidal Drowning Investigations Program—Hosted by the Berlin Police Department. To be held in Berlin, Ct.
CONTACT: Karen Thomas-Malloy
Lifeguard Systems
(843) 637-5544
Lgs@TeamLgs.com

29
TUTANKHAMUN Study Day—To be held at the University of London.
CONTACT: Rikk Barritt
ikki_promo@yahoo.co.uk

National and International meetings of interest to forensic scientists are included as space permits. For a complete list, go to the AAFS website (www.aafs.org) and click on the “Meetings” link.
JUNE 2010

2-4
Field Methods in Forensic Anthropology—To be held at the Forensic Anthropology Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
CONTACT: Rebecca J. Wilson fac@utk.edu

4
Behavioral Science Evidence in Divorce and Custody Cases—Hosted by The Cyril H. Wecht Institute of Forensic Science and Law—To be held at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, PA.
CONTACT: (412) 396-1330 wechtinstitute@duq.edu

7-11
Basic Bloodstain Pattern Analysis—Instruction by Paul Erwin Kish—To be held at Elmira College in Elmira, New York.
CONTACT: Paul Erwin Kish
(607) 962-8092 paul@paulkish.com www.paulkish.com

7-11
Forensic Anthropology Course—To be held at the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) Training Center in Ashburn, VA.
CONTACT: Oscar Molina, TSgt, USAF
(202) 782-2637 Fax: (202) 782-5020 came@afp.osd.mil www.askafip.org

7-11
Outdoor Recovery Course—To be held at the Forensic Anthropology Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
CONTACT: Rebecca J. Wilson fac@utk.edu

14-18
Chemical Searching and Enhancement Techniques for Latent Bloodstains—Instruction by Paul Erwin Kish & Martin Eversdijk—To be held at Elmira College in Elmira, New York.
CONTACT: Paul Erwin Kish
(607) 962-8092 paul@paulkish.com www.paulkish.com

16-18
14th Wrocław Symposium of Questioned Document Examination—Hosted by the Department of Forensic Sciences, Faculty of Law, Administration and Economics—To be held at the University of Wrocław, Poland.
CONTACT: katkrym@prawo.uni.wroc.pl www.kryminalistyka.uni.wroc.pl

17-19
39th International AES Conference—To be held in Hillerød, Denmark.
CONTACT: www.aes.org/events/39/

17-20
Syracuse University Dialogues In Forensic Science: Looking to the Future of Forensic Anthropology—To be held at the Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY and the SU Minnowbrook Conference Center in Blue Mountain Lake, NY.
CONTACT: http://forensics.syr.edu

25-27
2010 IEEE International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Information Security (WCNIS2010)—To be held in Beijing, China.
CONTACT: www.ieee-wcnis.org/index.asp

26-27
National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Dental Coding Workshop—Sponsored by The FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division—To be held at the Intercontinental Harbor Court in Baltimore, MD.
CONTACT: Stacey Davis
(304) 625-5090

29- Jul 2
7th International Symposium on Risk Management and Cyber-Informatics—To be held in Orlando, FL.
CONTACT: www.2010iiisconferences.org/RMCI

JULY 2010

5-9
Introduction to Human Identification—To be held at the Forensic Anthropology Center, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
CONTACT: Rebecca J. Wilson fac@utk.edu

8-9
Seventh Conference on Detection of Intrusions and Malware & Vulnerability Assessment—To be held in Bonn, Germany.
CONTACT: http://dimva2010.fkie.fraunhofer.de/

11-17
International Association for Identification’s (IAI) annual International Educational Conference—To be held in Spokane, WA.

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
www.mcri.org/home/section/101-523/inter-micro-2010

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

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

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

28-30
37th Annual Florida Association of Medical Examiners Educational Conference—Jointly Sponsored by the District 9 Medical Examiners Office and the University of Florida College of Medicine—To be held at the Ritz Carlton Orlando, Grande Lakes, FL.
CONTACT: http://maples-center.ufl.edu www.fameonline.org
Do you know someone who may be interested in AAFS membership?

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

Name: _______________________________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________________________
City: _______________________________________________________________________
State: ____________________________________________ Zip: _______________________

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

Your name: ___________________________________________________________________