

November 2010

SAS AWARDS AND REPORTS FROM FACSS 2010 IN RALEIGH

SAS Awards Presented at the Wine and Cheese Reception on Tuesday, October 19



Alex Scheeline of the University of Illinois received the Distinguished Service award for long-time service to the Society.



Martin Moskovitz (University of California, Santa Barbara) received the Lippincott Award for significant contributions to vibrational spectroscopy.



Nicoló Omenetto of the University of Florida received the Honorary Membership Award for exceptional contributions to spectroscopy.



The William F. Meggers Award was presented to Paul Gemberline (East Carolina University), David Haaland (Spectral Resolutions Consulting), and Patrick Cutler (University of New Mexico).

CONTENTS	Page
SAS Awards	1
SAS Student Poster Awards	3
President's Report	4
Executive Committee Meetings	5
Officer Reports	9-22
Committee Reports	23-26
Award Committee Reports	27-28

Frank Bright (State University of New York Buffalo), Joseph Caruso (University of Cincinnati), Timothy Keiderling (University of Illinois at Chicago), Curtis Marcott (Light Light Solutions), Yukihiro Ozaki (Kwansei Gakuin University), Steven Soper (Louisiana State University), and Isiah Warner (Louisiana State University) were named SAS Fellows for their outstanding service to the field of spectroscopy.



SAS President Fred LaPlant with SAS Fellows Steve Soper, Curtis Marcott, Yukihiro Ozaki, Frank Bright, Joseph Caruso, and Timothy Keiderling.



Karolin Kroening of the University of Cincinnati received the Barbara Stull Graduate Student Award for outstanding research in spectroscopy in honor of SAS longtime colleague Barbara L. Stull.



Olivier Bolduc (University of Montreal) was awarded the SAS Graduate Student Award for outstanding research in spectroscopy.

The New England and New York Sections were recognized as outstanding regional sections by the Poehlman award.

SAS Student Poster Awards presented on Sunday, October 17



SAS presented five awards to students for outstanding poster presentations on Sunday, October 17. Jessica Lopez of the University of Michigan received the undergraduate poster award for "Assessing Bone Fragility in Chemically-Aged Bone with Raman Spectroscopy." Dr. Michael Morris is her research director.

At left, SAS President Fred LaPlant and Jessica Lopez

Four awards were made to graduate students. **Michal Kliman** (Vanderbilt University) received an award for "Advances in Structural Characterization and High Spatial Resolution Imaging of Lipid Species with Ion Mobility Mass Spectrometry." John McLean serves as his research director. **James Calladine** of the University of Nottingham received his award for Elucidation of the Binding of Alkanes to Transition Metals Using Quantum Cascade Lasers and Time-resolved Infrared and NMR Spectroscopies." University of Wisconsin Milwaukee student **John Frost** made an outstanding presentation entitled "Photon Trapping Spectroscopy: Prototype Optimization and Application to Air Monitoring." Joseph Aldstadt is his research director. **Josemar Castillo** (Arizona State University) received her award for "Investigation of Capacitance Effects on Liposomes Containing pH Gradients."



SAS President Fred LaPlant with Michal Kliman



SAS President Fred LaPlant with James Calladine



SAS President Fred LaPlant with John Frost



SAS President Fred LaPlant with Josemar Castillo

President's Report - FACSS 2010

Fred LaPlant

The 2010 year has seen an unprecedented amount of activity in the Society. Over the past several years, a variety of discussions have taken place on how the Society can increase its benefits to members, and increase its visibility. The principal outlet for communication and access must be the website, and the focus for the year has been making sure that the direction and pace of development are on track to provide the Society a resource that can meet both our short- and long-term requirements. This appears to now be the case, and I direct you towards Ron Williams' report for the details on the progress that we've made this year. I believe that with the coming year, we will be prepared to implement a wide range of initiatives through the website that will directly benefit members, as well as grow and strengthen the Society.

Other web activities include the on-going development of the LinkedIn group, which continues to expand steadily and currently encompasses about 20% of the total membership. Through the efforts of Bonnie and the national office, the SAS Facebook site has also been launched, and will no doubt prove another valuable asset in allowing access and interconnectivity between members.

The continuing trend for increasing student involvement, especially in the founding of student sections, is extremely positive. Growing the Society from the ground up is the best way to maintain a vigorous membership, and David Heaps along with John-David McEldery has done a great job in welcoming students and making the Society an exciting organization for them to be a part of. Gloria Story and her committee have also continued do outstanding work in supporting the membership, especially in sponsoring the special event at FACSS. Both this event and the student mixer have fostered a great sense of community among the members and will no doubt help to both bring in new members and retain current ones.

The Journal continues to provide valuable content to the membership and academic community under the leadership of Peter Griffiths and Michael Blades. Competition from specialty and on-line journals, erosion of traditional techniques, and the growth of bio-photonics and other non-traditional disciplines have presented special challenges in maintaining the status of the Journal. Mike has taken on the task of

addressing these challenges and has assembled a task-force which will make recommendations on specific ways that the Journal can increase its impact to both the membership and the academic community.

As President, I represented the SAS at the Assembly of Society Officers sponsored by the American Institute of Physics in Washington, DC in late March. The meeting brings together the heads of 35 affiliate science societies from around the country to discuss important topical issues. At this meeting, these included the role that scientific societies can play in promoting and defending science at the local level, especially in light of the many non-scientific and non-rational agendas that are influencing educational curricula; the role of social media to bind scientists together and foster communication regionally and globally; and the opportunities for societies to provide guidance to government especially at the state and local level, where sound scientific input is often lacking and the voice of scientific societies can make a big impact. Probably of most long-term importance and direct impact to the SAS, the Scholarly Publishing Roundtable published its position paper on open access journals. The roundtable was formed under mandate by Congress and was made up of key stakeholders, including academia, librarians, and publishers. This presentation (as well as a summary of other events) can be found at (<http://www.aip.org/aip/assembly/march10/>). The briefest summary would be that while free flow of information is in the public interest, the current system offers important strengths in maintaining the integrity of scientific information, and every effort must be made to retain the most critical features of this system in the face of increasingly rapid progress toward open access.

As a side project, it was my intent (as suggested by my report from FACSS Louisville) to personally and individually poll every member of the Society on what they were looking for in the SAS and how we could be better serving their needs. This proved to be a large task, and as yet is uncompleted, but of the several hundred e-mails I sent out, the results are pretty clear. Apart from replies from people whom I already knew that thought this was a great idea, the response was essentially zero. This isn't wholly unexpected; part of the purpose of the exercise was to increase the visibility of the Society, so low response isn't by any means a failure. People are busy, and I can honestly say that I throw out similar e-mails every day. However, it also highlights that the Society is not high on people's consciousness. Although the Journal is an important benefit to the members, we are currently not central resource for members' spectroscopic needs. I believe that through the website we can begin to offer information, tools, and features that will make the SAS the first resource that people think of when they need any sort of professional guidance. It will be a pleasure to see this come to fruition over the coming years, and I look forward to working with the SAS to make this a growing and flourishing reality.

It has been a great pleasure serving as President of the Society over the past year. I especially thank Bonnie Saylor and the national office for their guidance and tireless efforts in support of the Society. I also offer my best wishes to the incoming president Curt Marcott and know that his leadership will help ensure the growth and prosperity of the Society.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING - SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2010
(SALON 10) ROSEN PLAZA, ORLANDO, FLORIDA**

President - Fred LaPlant - present
President-Elect - Curtis Marcott - present
Past President - Jon Carnahan - present
Secretary - Katherine Bakeev - present (part of meeting)
Treasurer - Paul Bourassa - present
Membership Coordinator - Gloria Story - present
Web Editor - Ron Williams - present

Local/Technical Section Affairs Coordinator - David Heaps - present
Parliamentarian - Diane Parry – not present
Journal Editor-In-Chief - Peter Griffiths - present
Journal Editor - Michael Blades – not present
Newsletter Editor - David Butcher - present
Student Representative - John-David McElderry - present
SAS Executive Director - Bonnie Saylor - present
Others: Allen Press - Ed MacMillan

A welcome to all was given by President Fred LaPlant.

A motion to approve the minutes of the October 17, 2009, Executive Committee Meeting was made by Jon Carnahan with second by Paul Bourassa. Motion passed unanimously.

A motion to accept the Executive Committee reports as presented was made by Jon Carnahan and seconded by Paul Bourassa. Motion passed unanimously.

A motion to accept the SAS Working Committee reports as presented was made by Jon Carnahan and seconded by Paul Bourassa. Motion passed unanimously.

Old Business

Discussion ensued regarding ways to promote membership. The following were suggested:

- Have spectroscopes available on our website for teachers to order.
- Recruit Authors as members.
- Have Ron Williams update the Wikipedia Page on spectroscopy.
- Have student chapters set up booths or posters at various meetings.
- Have a power point presentation available for download on the SAS website.
- Redesign our T-Shirts.
- Add more to student gatherings such as trivia night and prizes.

Discussion continued with regard to the SAS website.

Paul Bourassa moved that we define the web editor position as having complete responsibility for the website. Jon Carnahan seconded the motion. Discussion. Special thanks to Jim de Haseth for his diligent vision, work, and persona contribution for leading SAS to this point with the website; however, we are now able to transition and better define the role for responsibility for the website and with Jim's assistance move forward. Motion passed with one abstention.

New Business

Paul Bourassa moved that we keep 2011 membership dues at the same level as 2010 with no increase. Curt Marcott seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Paul Bourassa moved that we raise subscription rates for 2011 by no more than 3%. Fred Seconded. Discussion: Look at OSA rates to determine what percent within the 3% we raise the rates by. Motion passed unanimously.

Paul Bourassa moved to reappoint David Butcher as Newsletter Editor for a three-year term commencing on January 1, 2011. Fred LaPlant seconded the motion. Discussion that Dave Butcher look at what the latest things going on in spectroscopy are to be included in the newsletter. Also need a newsletter committee. Bonnie will draft bylaws change for the next meeting to create a committee. Motion passed unanimously.

Paul Bourassa moved to reappoint David Heaps as Regional and Technical Section Affairs Coordinator for a three-year term commencing on January 1, 2011. Fred LaPlant seconded the motion. Discussion that Dave is extremely energetic and does a great job. Motion passed unanimously.

Discussion on the Lippincott Award on whether or not to allow fundraising for the award to add money to the Lippincott Award Account. It was agreed to tell OSA that we will continue to support the award and will do fundraising if we can, but they are welcome to do any fundraising they would like. We are committed to maintaining the award in the future.

Dave Butcher requested permission to host a luncheon at FACSS in honor of SAS awardees. Funds will come from the Piedmont Section. All agreed this was a great idea and use of funds.

Fred suggested it would be great if we could have ribbons for the Executive Committee and Governing Board at meetings to put on badges. Bonnie will order.

Curt Marcott moved to accept Alex Scheeline as 2010 Distinguished Service Awardee. Jon Carnahan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Fred LaPlant moved to accept Nicolás Omenetto as 2010 Honorary Member. Curt Marcott seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Paul Bourassa moved to accept Ted Rains as 2010 Emeritus Member. Jon Carnahan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Curt Marcott moved to accept Mary Kate Donais and Greg Klunder as nominees for the office of President-elect. Paul Bourassa seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Fred LaPlant moved to accept Paul Bourassa and Geoffrey Coleman as nominees for the office of Treasurer. Curt Marcott seconded the motion. Motion passed with one abstention.

Fred LaPlant motioned for adjournment. Jon Carnahan seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING – Extended - Monday, March 1, 2010 (SALON 10) ROSEN PLAZA, ORLANDO, FLORIDA

President - Fred Laplant - present

President-Elect - Curtis Marcott - present

Past President - Jon Carnahan - present

Secretary - Katherine Bakeev - present

Treasurer - Paul Bourassa - present

Membership Coordinator - Gloria Story - present

Web Editor - Ron Williams - present

Local/Technical Section Affairs Coordinator - David Heaps - present

Parliamentarian - Diane Parry – not present

Journal Editor-In-Chief - Peter Griffiths - present

Journal Editor - Michael Blades – not present

Newsletter Editor - David Butcher - present

Student Representative - John-David McElderry - present

SAS Executive Director - Bonnie Saylor - present

Others: Allen Press - Ed MacMillan, Membership committee - Don Clark, Jim de Haseth - Web design

This extended meeting is held to discuss the SAS Website which has been undergoing a revision by Jim de Haseth.

Mtg called to order 8:03 by Gloria Story

FACSS Social Raleigh – go karting

New member event?

Ron Williams – Web editor

Review of report from Jim de Haseth

Journal pages added to website as feedback from FACSS 2009

Membership database format inconsistency made this a challenging task to include on website

Students page - John-David McElderry - info on how to contact people

Newsletter editor - Dave Butcher – needs clarification on news that will be on website and place to put the newsletter itself

Membership – Gloria – how to join, member benefits, etc; being able to have a map showing where members are; pictures of events; video of interviews with members (as on ACS undergraduate page); - this will help people justify membership to their mgmt

Web store needs to be set up so people can pay for membership online

Don Clark – info for members, and info that will help attract international members

Katherine – info for members – go to place for info; being able to find experts, etc.

Ed MacMillan – search engine; promote webinars

Peter – downloading regular contributed papers from journal which is currently done with Ingenta or OSA infobase. Lots of downloads, but not much revenue. Shall we make this a direct download, and how will this impact our revenue? Will be possible with web store

What in A pages is downloadable openly or to members only? Focal point articles also are in A pages. This is tied to ad revenues.

Do the Focal point articles need to be part of A pages? Publications committee needs to make decision on what is in A pages.

Bonnie - members need to be able to join and pay directly on website. Office needs to know how to make use of the online database, so will need training from Jim. May need to pay JP to update member database from Oct to now – as there have been updates made to their other database. Also need to be able to run financial reports from database

Jon Carnahan - everyone needs to get the training needed and access to page to make the changes and updates to the web pages relative to their responsibilities.

Fred Laplant – feels it is time we have a formalized training on update. Website must be for members so the content will attract them. Thanks to Jim for all his efforts

Paul – adds kudos to Jim for all his efforts. Maybe at sometime could put budget info on website – perhaps pdf with restrictions on access

Curt wants to see us all do our part to get the site populated. Let Jim's focus be on infrastructure, and we need to get all in there to be able to make it public now

Dave Heaps training – perhaps at SAS booth this week to get basics of inputting data; adding images; formatting of text; access to key pieces of database. Talk about a webinar run by Ron/Jim – I offer to coordinate

What can we put on website? Student chapters , local sections ?

Need to really make central what the benefits of membership are. This serves as the gate.

Need to set priorities for this:

Web store?

Member database updated

Search engines working?

Need to set hard deliverables and deadlines for the activities for this.

High priority

Finish pdf conversion

Webstore

Data base

This will take 60-70 hrs – cost ~ \$6000 and can be done in 3 weeks according to recent discussion of Jim with JP.

Fred motions we vote to approve \$6000 in funds; seconded by Jon

Discussion – Peter asks about the search engine. Any work being done on this? There is pending contract with Horiba for “powered by Horiba” so this needs to be taken care of now. Jim updates that the group with JP is doing some research on how best to do search. Jim confirms that according to JP this will be about 40 hrs to get something functional and useful; capabilities can be expanded at additional cost.

Unanimously approved.

Paul motions to spend up to \$5000 to develop search engine. Jon seconded; unanimously approved.

Fred motions that use stop gap measure of allowing members to e-mail in credit card info to pay membership even though this is an unsecure means of sending in info. Paul seconds. Discussion: Jon concerned that old system used for 5 years worked, and the current one is creating lots more work for office, and he therefore supports motion. Fred thinks this convenience to members is worth the risk. On form can add info that they can call in info to office to convey info. 3 in favor: Fred, Jon, Paul; 2 opposed Curt, Katherine. Motion carries with stipulation that form will have disclaimer that info not secure, and stated option to call office with credit card info.

Peter – member form for technical sessions is confusing with marks next to CNIRS and Coblenz, as these have \$20 fee, while other sections are \$10. Bonnie will take action to clarify info on form.

Fred moves to adjourn at 10:26. Paul seconds.

Executive Director’s Report - October 2010

Membership Information to Date

2010 to date: 1427 This time last year: 1619

Membership Breakdown: USA 1210; International 217

Academic Non-Student: 302; Student: 254; Non-Academic: 871

Total New Members for 2010: 133

Total Not Renewed for 2010: 471

Total enrolled in Regional Section: 970

Total enrolled in Technical Section: 596

Total paid for extra section: 241

Subscription Information to Date

2010 To Date: 878 Last Year This Time: 855

Subscriber Breakdown: USA 516; International 362

Total Not Renewed for 2010: 125

Total New Subscribers for 2010: 141

Total subscribers SAS: 373

Total subscribers OSA: 505

Membership

The recession has finally caught up with SAS membership. We are down almost 200 members this year which is a huge hit both membership wise and financially (about \$18,000). We did initial renewals via email, second notices via paper, and third notices were phone calls made by our office. Stephanie Iocco, SAS Office Manager, did our phone campaign and faced a daunting task as so many of our members have either moved with no forward, changed their numbers, or left the field. We did numerous promotions this year including promotions to the FACSS mailing list, PittCon mailing list, and the Winter Plasma mailing list. We also had a physical presence at FACSS, Pittcon, and Winter Plasma. We had an international Tour Speaker (thanks Rick Mendelsohn!) who promoted SAS during his travels. On a

positive note, our student membership is up just a bit – a reflection of our student promo at FACSS and our new student chapters. It is our hope that the new website will be a draw for new members and for retaining old members. We have also joined with OSA to offer joint membership in our organizations at a discount for our members.

Subscribers

Subscribers are up over this time last year. Our relationship with OSA continues to be a success and we have renewed our contract with them for another three years.

Corporate Sponsors

We currently have 17 corporate sponsors. This is up 2 over last year.

Finances

The budget has been prepared and will be presented by Paul Bourassa. We received the management comments and final numbers from the 2010 audit right after Pittcon. We came out of 2009 with a surplus.

Regional and Technical Sections

Regional and Technical Sections continue to struggle with getting volunteers to serve as officers and with getting people to attend meetings. The following is a breakdown of membership in Technical, Student, and Regional Sections:

Regional Section	Count	Technical Section	Count
International	39	Atomic	114
Arizona	12	Biotechnology	20
Arizona State U. Student Chapter	9	Chirality	17
Baltimore Washington	60	Fluorescence	35
BYU Student Chapter	14	Forensics	29
Chemometrics	57	Imaging	57
Chicago	114	Laser Sampling	6
Cincinnati	20	NIR/CNIR	40
Cleveland	29	NMR	8
Delaware Valley	53	Polymer Characterization	26
Detroit	15	Process	25
Houston	25	Vibrational/Coblentz	219
Indiana	22		
Intermountain	15		596
Mid-Michigan	19		
Minnesota	33		
New England	94		
New York	54		
Niagara Frontier	7		
Northern California	43		
Ohio Valley	19		
Pacific Northwest	14		
Penn-York	2		
Piedmont	46		
Pittsburgh	27		
Rio Grande	8		
Rocky Mountain	22		

Saint Louis	34
Snake River	7
Truman State Student Chapter	5
United Kingdom	43
University of Idaho Student Chapter	2
USA Other	1

970

Treasurer's Report - October 2010
Paul Bourassa

	2010 Final Budget	2010 as of Oct. 13	Percent Used	Total in/Exp Projected	2011 Proposed Budget
REVENUES					
Education Programs	\$0	\$0	0 %	\$0	\$0
Focal Point Book	\$50	\$24	48 %	\$44	\$50
Member Dues	\$122,000	\$83,563	68.5%	\$94,000	\$100,000
Journal Income	\$738,000	\$629,922	85.4%	\$706,340	\$725,000
Chapter Income	\$500	\$0	0 %	\$0	\$0
General contributions	\$4,500	\$11,508	255.7 %	\$13,500	\$13,000
Investment Revenue	\$5,000	\$708	\$14.1 %	\$1,700	\$2,000
Total Revenue	\$873,050	\$725,873	83.1%	\$815,884	\$840,550
EXPENSES					
Salaries	\$260,000	\$194,870	75 %	\$260,000	\$268,000
Payroll Taxes	\$17,000	\$17,041	100.2 %	\$20,000	\$25,000
Personnel Benefits	\$4,000	\$1,539	38.5 %	\$3,000	\$4,000
Executive Committee	\$38,000	\$16,663	43.8 %	\$32,000	\$35,000
Governing Board	\$1,300	\$0	0%	\$1,300	\$1,300
Membership Committee	\$1,000	\$1,244	124.4 %	\$2,200	\$2,500
Other Committees	\$1,000	\$1,665	166.6 %	\$2,500	\$2,000
Journal	\$355,200	\$243,546	68.6 %	\$334,230	\$341,500
Newsletter	\$1,000	\$500	50 %	\$1,000	\$1,000
Internet Services	\$10,000	\$9,622	96.2 %	\$10,000	\$10,000
Member Services	\$25,000	\$18,485	73.94 %	\$20,000	\$20,000
Member Education	\$0	\$0	0 %	\$0	\$0
Awards	\$25,000	\$982	3.9 %	\$18,000	\$15,000
Sections	\$10,000	\$4,769	47.7 %	\$10,000	\$10,000
Conferences	\$8,000	\$4,641	58.0 %	\$8,000	\$8,000
Member Acquisition/Ret	\$15,000	\$0	0 %	\$1,500	\$3,000
Society Office	\$90,500	\$64,462	71.2 %	\$83,633	\$84,200
Financing Expenses	\$5,000	\$3,761	75.2 %	\$5,000	\$5,000
Depreciation Expenses	\$5,000	\$2,512	50.2 %	\$5,000	\$5,000
Total Expenses	\$872,000	\$586,302	67.2 %	\$817,363	\$840,500
NET ORDINARY INCOME	\$1,050	\$139,571	13292 %	-\$1,479	\$50

Report to the SAS Executive Committee - August 31, 2010

Peter R. Griffiths and Michael W. Blades, Journal Editors

Applied Spectroscopy has run without major issues since the last Governing Board meeting in October, 2009, although one major and a number of relatively minor problems must be addressed, as discussed in this report.

In 2009, 4 accelerated papers, 165 regular articles, 11 spectroscopic technique papers, 11 Notes, and 3 Focal-Point articles were published. The total number of articles printed was 194 which is a decrease of 13 from the previous year. However, the total was not significantly different from the previous six years, for which the average number of articles published was 203, with a standard deviation of 11 (see table on page 2 of this report.) The number of manuscripts received for review was 352, which is about the same as the total for 2008 (356). The rejection rate for contributed papers and notes was 41.8% (compared with 43.5% in 2008), indicating the continuing vigilance of the editors and reviewers in requiring that papers be of excellent quality. This figure is consistent with top quality journals. Comparisons with previous years' statistics are included on the attached table.

This year, the number of papers submitted to the journal has increased. Between January 1 and August 5, 2010, 219 manuscripts were submitted, which prorates to an annual number of 368, which is higher than the previous five years. (We didn't check back further.) In the same period, 120 manuscripts were rejected. Please note that this does not mean that 120 of the 219 manuscripts that were submitted were rejected, as most of the manuscripts that were rejected were submitted in 2009. This year, for example, of the 195 standard papers that were submitted since January 1, 50 were accepted for publication and 56 were rejected, with 89 pending. Although this appears to mean that our rejection rate is greater than 50%, a good number of the papers that are still pending will be accepted, so our expectation is that the rejection rate will not change too much. The average number of days between the time a manuscript is submitted and the time that the first decision is sent to the authors is 48 days, which is longer than both the editors and authors would like. Potential reviewers are usually contacted within three days of the receipt of a manuscript. Some respond within a couple of days, while others take as much as 2 or 3 weeks. (If we haven't heard back from an individual, they are contacted again within 2 weeks.) Despite the fact that some people respond within a day, on the average, we learn whether someone has agreed or declined to review a paper in about a week. If someone declines, we have to go through the procedure again. For some topics, we sometimes contact as many as five different potential reviewers before we find someone willing to do the review. (Summer is a particularly bad season to find reviewers, especially from Europe where many people take four-week-long vacations!) However, the biggest problem with the reviewing process is getting our more recalcitrant reviewers to send in their reviews in a reasonable time. When the original request is sent, they are asked to submit their review within three weeks. If no review has been received in that time, a "gentle reminder" is sent. This is repeated every two weeks until the review has been received. The end result is that it takes an average of 47 days from receipt of a manuscript to the first decision. Although some papers are rejected and a few are accepted without change, most papers require major or minor revision. Minor revisions are usually made quickly but major revisions can take several months. As a result, the average time between receipt of a manuscript to the final decision is a little over two months. We would like to reduce this time by at least two weeks but have not yet come up with a good way to achieve this goal. Annual data for the past 6½ years are shown in Table 1; detailed data for 2010 are shown as Table 2. All data in Table 2 are as of August 8, as are the italicized rows marked with an asterisk in Table 1.

Table 1

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 (published or accepted through Oct. issue)	2010 (est)
Focal Point	4	1	4	2	6	3	1	4
Accelerated Papers	2	2	2	2	1	4	4	5
Submitted Papers	190	178	183	175	174	165	147	176
Spec Techs	6	7	14	11	14	11	5	6
Notes	15	11	4	6	12	11	5	6
Correspondence	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Feature Article	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Rejected after review*</i>	35	50	63	50	65	67	57	96
<i>Rejected without review*</i>	41	30	54	75	90	80	19	32
Total articles printed or accepted thru October	220	201	210	197	207	194	163	195
Total rejected	76	80	117	125	155	147	76	128
% rejection	25.7	28.4	35.8	38.8	42.8	43.1	31.8	31.8
<i>Papers rcvd for review*</i>	296	292	321	352	356	352	219	368
Actual journal pages								
<i>Total A-pages*</i>	362	308	344	292	362	354	228	392
<i>Total manuscript pages*</i>	1536	1590	1526	1442	1430	1442	966	1663

Table 2

Manuscript Types	Total # of Submitted Manuscripts	Acceptance Rate (%)	Total # Accepted Manuscripts	Total # Rejected- Manuscripts	Total # Pending- Manuscripts	Days from receipt to first decision	Days from receipt to final decision
Submitted Paper	195	47	50	56	89	48.1	65.3
Spectroscopic Technique	12	25	2	6	4	32.5	34.4
Note	9	43	3	4	2	42.1	56.3
Focal Point article	2	100	2	0	1	44.5	34.5
Accelerated Paper	1	100	1	0	0	43.0	43.0
Total	219	47	58	66	95	46.97	62.3

From Table 2 above, it can be seen that the average time from receipt of a manuscript to the time that both reviews have been received and a decision (*i.e.*, accept as is, minor revision, major revision, reject) has been made is 47 days. Clearly many reviewers take an excessively long time to respond once they have agreed to undertake the review. At the Editorial Board meeting held in Louisville last October, it was decided to reduce the time that we ask that a review be submitted from four weeks to three weeks. Reminders are sent out at that time and at intervals of two weeks thereafter. If one reviewer is late but the other has sent in his/her review, we will usually accept the recommendation of the one reviewer, but only after the second reviewer has failed to send in a review after the second chaser. However, this is still an exorbitantly long time for an author to wait for the decision and only having one review reduces the quality of the journal. (This happens with fewer than 10% of the submitted manuscripts.) The good news is that the number of days between receipt of a regular submitted manuscript and the final decision decreased from 74.7 last year to 65.3 this year. The number and percentage of papers from countries that have submitted the most manuscripts which resulted in published papers are shown below.

	2007/8	(Total = 415)		2009/2010*	(Total = 301)
	Total papers	Percentage		Total papers	Percentage
USA	177	42.7	USA	119	39.5
Japan	39	9.4	PROC	34	11.3
England	38	9.2	Japan	25	8.3
France	24	5.8	England	21	7.0
PROC	21	5.1	Germany	21	7.0
Canada	20	4.8	Spain	18	6.0
Germany	18	4.3	France	15	5.0
Spain	15	3.6	Canada	11	3.7
Italy	10	2.4	Austria	6	2.0
South Korea	9	2.2	Denmark	6	2.0
Denmark	7	1.7	Switzerland	6	2.0

* Through the July issue

We are now receiving about 44% of the published papers from North America, 30% from Europe, and 22% from Asia, with the contributions from USA and Canada dropping and those from Asia (in fact from the PROC) increasing, while the number from Europe remains approximately constant. The percentage of papers submitted from PROC is now about 25%.

As noted in our previous report, all authors are asked to name up to four potential reviewers. However, if we know the names of appropriate people other than the ones who are named by the authors, we make it a practice to ask them. Some authors, especially in the developing nations, name reviewers who are from the same geographic region (and hence may be perceived by the authors to give a favorable review to a mediocre paper).

This is particularly relevant for authors from mainland China since over 20% of our manuscripts are now submitted from the PROC. The papers are usually written in marginal English and often would be very difficult for the average reader of *Applied Spectroscopy* to follow. However, if sent to another Chinese reviewer, the papers rarely receive a rating any worse than "publish with minor revision". Hence we always ensure that at least one reviewer is from North America or Europe. However, this puts an unfair burden both on these reviewers and on Rebecca Airmet, part of whose responsibility includes converting these manuscripts into acceptable English. At the meeting on Monday, October 18, the Editorial Advisory Board will be asked to discuss whether manuscripts should be rejected without review when the English is unacceptably poor. Another area of some concern is the number of Focal Point (FP) articles published this year. Only one FP article was published through the August issue but we expect three more by the end of the year. The number of review articles has a significant effect on the Impact Factor of the journal and it is our goal that at least six Focal Point articles should be published each year. With the help of the FP Editors, Rina Dukor, Ben Smith and John Chalmers, we hope to increase the number of FP articles next year to at least 6. Attached as Appendix A to this report are the prognostications of Rina, Ben and John, from which it can be seen that we should meet or exceed this goal.

By far the worst news in this report is the dramatic drop in the Impact Factor of the journal for 2009. The statistics for 2008 and 2009 for Applied Spectroscopy and several other journals are shown below.

Journal	2008	2009	Change	% Change
<i>Analytical Chemistry</i>	5.712	5.214	(0.50)	-8.7
JAAS	4.028	3.435	(0.59)	-14.3
<i>Analyst</i>	3.761	3.272	(0.49)	-13.0
J. Raman Spectrosc.	3.526	3.147	(0.38)	-10.8
<i>Anal. Bioanal. Chem.</i>	3.328	3.480	0.15	+4.5

Spectrochim. Acta B	2.853	2.719	(0.13)	-4.6
Applied Spectroscopy	2.062	1.564	(0.50)	-24.2
J. Near IR Spectrosc.	1.822	0.991	(0.83)	-45.5
Vibrational Spectrosc.	1.810	1.931	0.12	+6.6
J. Mol. Spectrosc.	1.636	1.542	(0.09)	-5.5
Spectrochim. Acta A	1.51	1.566	0.06	+4.0

Journals covering more than spectroscopy are shown in italics.

What conclusions can be drawn from these data? As can be seen from the above table, several journals suffered a setback in their Impact Factor, but the percentage change for *Applied Spectroscopy* was the second greatest of any journal. We throw out a few thoughts on the reason for this change.

Publications like the *Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectroscopy* and the *Journal of Raman Spectroscopy* have relatively high impact factors, presumably because they cover more specialized topics. *Applied Spectroscopy*, on the other hand, covers the electromagnetic spectrum from x-rays to microwaves (not to mention NMR, EPR and a little mass spectrometry). Should we consider becoming more focused on certain spectral regions?

The lack of a viable website is hurting the overall impression of the Society and, by extension, the *journal* as viewed by the members and the outside world. It seems that no progress has been made on the new website since March. Certainly, almost any time that we try to use some function, it doesn't work. From the viewpoint of the editorial staff, we were significantly better off last February than we are now.

Large publishing houses, such as Elsevier, Springer, Wiley and the American Chemical Society, are able to supply libraries with a "package deal" for all the journals that they publish, whereas this is not the case for Allen Press. Authors find it much easier to access articles from journals to which their libraries have a subscription than going through sources like Ingenta, where they have to pay for a reprint.

There is one other possible cause for the drop in the Impact Factor. We were surprised to see that the IF of *Vibrational Spectroscopy* increased, even though most spectroscopists would think that the quality of the papers in *Applied Spectroscopy* is significantly higher. However, the use of color in this journal is free whereas color costs authors \$600 per page in *Applied Spectroscopy*. Is it possible that authors choose to publish their more important articles in a particular journal because it doesn't charge for the use of color? In light of the reduced Impact factor, it is surprising that the combined number of downloads from Ingenta and Optics InfoBase is *not* showing a concomitant decrease, see Appendix B.

To increase the accessibility of FP papers to electronic search systems, all FP articles now contain an abstract and key words (as do the Notes) and we plan to include the word "Review" in the header and the abstract (which is vital if FP articles are to be recognized as review articles by abstracting services). This is vital if *Applied Spectroscopy* articles are to be more readily accessible for literature searching.

At the Publications committee meeting in March 2010, Mike Blades proposed that there may be value in striking a "Task Force" to study and offer some suggestions on the strategy for moving forward with the journal. The purpose of the Task Force would be to gather data and opinion and to make a recommendation on a strategy for addressing the issues that face the journal. This Task Force has now been set up and consists of the following people: Mike Blades (Chair), Peter Griffiths, Hide Sato, Bruce Chase, Zhong-Qun Tian, Heinz Siesler, Pavel Matousek, Frank Bright, Isao Noda, Rebecca Airmet. There has already been some productive correspondence. The Task Force will meet for the first time at the FACSS meeting in Raleigh and will have a report in time for the Executive Committee meeting at Pittcon next March. Among the issues that will be covered by the Task Force are the following:

1. *How to improve the Impact Factor (see above).*

2. How should *Applied Spectroscopy* respond to the appearance of new journals such as the *Journal of Biophotonics* that will potentially sap its author base?
3. Should the topics covered by the journal be more restricted? At the moment the question of appropriate content for the journal is determined by the Editors. Bearing in mind the emergence of China and the increasing manuscript flow from China and other developing countries, is it time to consider what is appropriate content for the journal? This is particularly relevant in light of the powerful influence of un-cited papers on the Impact Factor of the journal.
4. Open Access: Although most commercial academic publishers (including Allen Press) require that the authors of the works they publish sign all copyrights over to the journal, Congress recently mandated that all researchers funded by the National Institutes of Health retain the right to freely distribute their works one year after publication (several foundations have similar requirements). Since then, some publishers started fighting the trend, and a few members of Congress are reconsidering the mandate. Now, in a move that will undoubtedly redraw the battle lines, the faculty of MIT have unanimously voted to make any publications they produce open access. Coming up with the funds to support open access publication will be difficult. (There is no way that institutional support will become available at the University of Idaho, for example!) Nonetheless, within North America the number of institutions with open-access funds has grown from two to 15, including Calgary, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Memorial Sloan-Kettering, MIT, Ottawa, Oregon, Simon Fraser, Tennessee, UC Berkeley, North Carolina, Wake Forest, and Wisconsin, within a two-year period.

We would like to raise one additional issue at this point. We think that it would be useful at this time to clarify the relationship between the *journal*, the Society, and its members. *Applied Spectroscopy* is published by the Society for Applied Spectroscopy, presumably on behalf of the members. However, most of the people who publish in the *journal* are not members of the SAS and it is questionable whether the content of many of the papers is actually of interest to the majority of members. This goes back to the broad range of spectroscopies that are covered in the journal in contrast to the relatively narrow fields in which most SAS members work. We would like to recommend that the Executive Committee discuss what they believe the relationship between the Society and the journal should be.

Finally, some kudos to the staff who make the journal work. We are incredibly fortunate to have LeNelle McInturff, Rebecca Airmet and Jonell Clardy as the members of the production team. They allow us to put out a high quality issue on time and on budget every month and maintain a wonderfully high standard of professionalism in their dealings with the authors.

Appendix A: Status of Focal Point Articles as of October 2010

Author	Topic	Expected Date	Editor
D. Hahn N. Omenetto	Laser Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy (two articles)	Sept. '10	BWS
G. Hieftje	Sources, spectrometers and systems in atomic spectrometry in progress	Confirmed	BWS
D. Guenther	Laser Ablation ICP MS	Reconfirmed	BWS
D. Pappas	Fluorescence Correlation Spectroscopy: Biochem., Microfluidic, and Cellular Applications	Spring '11	BWS
B. Denton	Current state of the art in imaging detectors	Possibly '11	BWS
W. Kiefer	Nonlinear (ps/fs) Raman spectroscopy	Dec. '10	JMC
S. Parker	Inelastic neutron scattering	Fall '11	JMC

D. Proefrock	Quantitative analysis in environmental and life sciences with ICP-MS detection	Spring '11	JMC
T. Parker S. Umapathy	Time-resolved Raman spectroscopy	Dec. '10	JMC
T. Parker M. Towrie	Time-resolved infrared spectroscopy	Summer '11	JMC
E. Smith D. Graham	Surface-enhanced resonance Raman spectroscopy	Summer '11	JMC
K. Chou	Nanoscale Far-field Microscopy	April '11	MWB
V. Deckert	Tip-enhanced Raman spectroscopy	2011	RKD
L. Nafie Y. He, R. Dukor	Update on VCD	Jan. 2011	RKD
F. France	Hyperspectral imaging in art conservation	Fall 2010	PRG

Subjects for which invitations have been issued in August 2010

I. Levin	Spectroscopy: from bench-top to bedside		PRG
B. Lendl	Quantum cascade lasers		PRG
S. Xie	Stimulated Raman scattering microscopy		RKD
I. Lednev	Deep UV resonance Raman spectroscopy		RKD
D. Griffith R. Yokelson	Spectroscopy in the study of fire		PRG
D. Pivonka	Optical activity spectroscopy in the pharmaceutical industry		RKD

Leads that have "gone stale" but might be reactivated

B. Lendl	Quantum Cascade Lasers		PRG
J. Harris	Optical-Trapping Confocal Raman Spectroscopy of Particles		PRG
F. Van Haecke	Direct solids analysis by ETV-ICP-MS		
Robin Garrell	Microfluidics		RKD
C. Hassell	Spectroscopy in security and defense		RKD
K. Kalsinsky	Hair analysis		RKD
J. Olesik	Ion-molecule reactions in ICP-MS		BWS

Topics that could lead to a good Focal Point article but don't have an author

The Pulsed Glow Discharge: Status and Prospects
Spectroscopic Characterization of Nanoparticles

Appendix B: Download Statistics

The download statistics for Ingenta and OSA InfoBase usage for the calendar years 2005-2010 are as follows:

		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 to date	On pace 2010
Ingenta	Content pages viewed					78,849	62,713	107,508
	Abstracts viewed					402,777	226,057	387,526
	Full-text downloads	47,672	58,843	51,673	48,370	40,167	19,252	33,003
OSA	Full-text downloads			68,248	63,148	66,502	49,201	70,287
Total full-text downloads		47,672	58,843	119,921	106,518	106,669	68,453	117,348

In terms of full-text downloads, the countries with the largest number of downloads are:

	2009	2010 (to date)	On-pace for 2010
USA	22,790	10,787	18,492
Canada	2,631	2,494	4,275
United Kingdom	2,437	977	1,675
Germany	1,823	764	1,310
Italy	851	525	900
Spain	753	415	711
Japan	1,044	388	665
Taiwan	774	325	557
Sweden	947	280	480
Austria	336	246	422

As the table shows, the number of full-text downloads from Ingenta is showing a continued downward trend. In 2007, 51,427 full-text article downloads were provided through Ingenta. This number dropped to 48,370 in 2008 and, as can be seen from the data above, dropped again (to 40,167) in 2009. This drop has been offset by an increase in the numbers from the Optical Society of America InfoBase system. In 2008 there were 63,148 downloads of Applied Spectroscopy articles through Optics InfoBase, which increased to 66,502 in 2009 and is on-pace for 117,348 for 2010. OSA has told us that most of the downloading are accessing InfoBase through an institutional subscription.

Downloads through personal subscriptions or through download benefits (50 complimentary downloads) are generally much lower. It is likely that institutions have access to either OSA or Ingenta so this may be just a matter of how the institutions use search methodology to point to the journal source.

For comparison the following is a table of statistics for OSA's other journals.

PDF Journal Downloads through Optics InfoBase: Jan 1 – July 31, 2010

Journal	PDF Downloads
Advances in Optics and Photonics	5,318
Applied Optics	545,618
Applied Spectroscopy	49,201
Biomedical Optics Express	677
Chinese Optics Letters	15,407
JOSA	70,439
JOSA A	150,175
JOSA B	147,852
Journal of Display Technology	5,519
Journal of Lightwave Technology	51,174
Journal of Optical Communications and Networking	4,233
Journal of Optical Networking	5,168
Journal of Optical Technology	7,730
Journal of the Optical Society of Korea	4,885
Optics and Photonics News	9,484
Optics Express	717,260
Optics Letters	530,426
Optics News	942

Newsletter Editor's Report - August 25, 2010

David Butcher

Seven issues of the newsletter have been published since our last report, as detailed in the table below. The most significant issue has been the migration to the new website. For two months, until we were able to use the new site, we sent the Newsletter to the membership via email. However, thanks to excellent work by Jim, Ron, and Bonnie, we were able to add the newsletters to the website.

Ron also assisted us by creating a Newsletter Archive, which contains earlier issues of the newsletter, as well as issues of Arcs and Sparks magazine digitized by Marvin Margoshes.

At this point, I believe the Newsletter has completed a successful transition to the new website.

Ed McMillan sold an advertisement for the Newsletter for the April issue.

As mentioned in my previous report, Peter Griffiths has graciously asked his Editorial Assistant, LeNelle McInturff, to format the Newsletter. She has done a truly excellent job of formatting the documents, and I deeply appreciate her assistance.

Issue	Topic
February 2010	FACSS and SAS Student Awards
March 2010	SAS loses two Excellent Scientists and Friends
April 2010	SAS News from Pittcon 2010
May 2010	SAS Day at the Races; 2010 FACSS Program; SAS Awards
June 2010	SAS Awards to be Presented at FACSS 2010
July 2010	Upcoming Meetings
August 2010	FACSS 2010, October 17-21, Raleigh Convention Center, Raleigh, NC

Web Editor's Report - October 2010

Ron Williams

Website Development

The new SAS website was launched in January 2010 due to the hard work and vision of Jim De Haseth. Jim did extensive development, with the collaboration of web developer Juan Pablo Claude at Big Nerd Ranch, especially developing the web infrastructure and the interface for the Journal on the SAS homepage. At the March 2010 SAS meeting the Executive Committee directed that the highest priority for the next phase of development would be to generate an on-line membership and renewal system as well as a functioning site search function. As these items proceeded Jim decided he did not wish to participate in the further development of the site. His efforts and dedication will be sorely missed.

In April, Bonnie Saylor was designated as the "super user" for the website and I assumed the role of liaison with the web developer. The website has been designed as both the web presence for SAS and the repository for all of SAS's data on members, local sections, the journal, etc., using the Django programming language, which utilizes a core database as the engine for the entire website, rather than having data reside on individual pages. There are several ramifications of this design that became evident during phase II development. The basic and laudable goal was to create a website that required minimal maintenance by the members. The consequence of this design, however, is that while the content of the fields in the database is easy to change, the presentation of the data on the pages is much more rigid, and the webpages are not directly editable by the users. More importantly, the Office needs to have intimate access with the database for a wide variety of reasons, not the least of which is to provide the necessary and current information required for maintaining its 503C status. This problem would be particularly severe over any period of migration for the database. Although the BNR web developer was planning to design the new database by taking the old one and updating its design for web applications, the Office and EC were not confident that sufficient input from the office had taken place to ensure the new database would meet their needs. It was also felt that a sufficient functional testing plan had not been considered, since the data in the database were critical for the functioning of the Society.

Faced with an uncertain future of data access despite the on-going need for current data, in a May conference call the EC refocused the web developer on the highest priority of getting the on-line renewal and application process up and running. Because of the complexity in transferring the database to BNR and then transferring it back while new members were added at the office, it was decided that in the near term a stand-alone application for on-line membership (equivalent to the legacy system from the old site) should be in place.

After weeks of slow implementation of this plan, and difficulties in communicating with BNR, it was decided that it would be in the best interest of the Society if a new web designer was hired who was closer geographically to facilitate one-on-one interactions. In June we severed our relationship with Big Nerd Ranch and initiated a new contract with Flow Theory Networks, a DC-based web developer whose development philosophy is based on using as much pre-existing programming as possible, rather than developing each module from the ground up.

FTN has worked quickly to deal with the priority issues of the website. An online form is now available for automating the process of joining the Society as well as renewing membership. The search function of the website is operating and provides results from the website, membership directory, and the Journal. Rotating banner ads now populate the search results page, as well as other second level pages.

Content Updates

Despite the difficulties in the development of the website several content areas were expanded. The Newsletter section was set up by Dave Butcher and has been continually updated over this time period. The Spectroscopist's Calendar kept by Mary Carrabba has been updated regularly. The Home Page was made editable and announcements can now appear as needed. A new section focusing on open source programs that researchers may find useful was created. An early history of SAS created by Marvin Margoshes was added in July and the Compendium of Focus articles updated in August.

Future content updates are planned to tie a monthly home page update to each new issue of the Journal.

Membership Coordinator's Report - September 2010

Gloria Story

The membership committee meeting during PittCon 2010 was an extended Executive Committee meeting held on Monday, March 1st (8:00 to 10:00 AM, Rosen Plaza – Salon 10); those in attendance were: Katherine Bakeev, Paul Bourassa, David Butcher, Jon Carnahan, Don Clark, Jim de Haseth, Peter Griffiths, David Heaps, Fred LaPlant, Ed MacMillan, Curt Marcott, John-David McElderry, Bonnie Saylor, Gloria Story, and Ron Williams. The agenda for this meeting was focused on our new website design. The new website is the main connection resource for our members with easy access to the electronic version of the Journal, but it is also a "landing page" for non-spectroscopy folks looking for information. In this age of social media connections, having a dynamic website is crucial for member interaction and promotion of society events and benefits. It's a conduit for attracting new members and an educational resource.

First, all those present acknowledged the tremendous amount of effort that Jim de Haseth had invested in the updated version of the site. Thanks to Jim, we have a fantastic start. It is now time to prioritize the next phase of development and fund the work needed. At the meeting, top priority issues were identified: updating the SAS database with a new column for the newsletters, populating the pages with new content, getting the web store open for business, and enabling the search engine powered by Horiba.

The Executive Committee voted for a budget of \$6000 to add the newsletters to the database and to open the web store. Until our members can pay their membership fees on-line, a stop gap measure was instituted by adding a line on the membership application form for credit card information, along with a disclaimer clause, and the option to call the office to relay card information. Another budget of \$5000 was approved for the search engine work.

<http://www.s-a-s.org> should be more than a download location for the Journal and newsletters. It is up to all of us with access to populate the pages with up-to-the-minute news and information; to make it the one-stop destination for all things applied spectroscopy. What is needed is a bit of training on how to add content. Curt suggested that Ron learn first and teach the rest of us. Katherine offered to host a webinar for us after PittCon.

As of this writing, the newsletters back to 1996 can be accessed from the "News" page! Our 2nd Annual SAS Day event, Sunday October 17th of FACSS 2010, is planned and ready for us to enjoy. We'll have free transportation from the Marriott Raleigh City Center Hotel and be treated to an afternoon of championship go kart racing at Rush Hour Carting. Between races, a delicious North Carolina barbeque lunch with an open bar will be served. Billiards, darts, and arcade games are also available. Not to worry, the bus will take us back in plenty of time to attend the FACSS opening mixer and SAS Poster Session.

I would like to welcome my **new committee members**, Don Clark and Heather Brooke, and thank Tina Battaglia and Mary Kate Donais for their service. Don will be a voice from our budding UK section and Heather will represent our key member constituent: our graduate students now hanging up their shiny new PhD diplomas!

Report to the SAS Executive Committee - September 1, 2010

John-David McElderry, Student Representative

The students of SAS are enthusiastic to be a part of the society. The student event at PITTCON 2010 was a success with 75 in attendance, which was triple what I was told to expect. Several students were new to the society, and many were participating due to good experiences at past events. In the PITTCON 2010 report I proposed injecting activities or entertainment into every student event to increase retention of attendees into the later hours. At the dueling piano bar the section was packed until after 11 pm. Furthermore, I got an outpouring of positive feedback about the event in the weeks following. Thank you EC for your support and participation.

Student membership is important to the strength of SAS. Not only do students comprise 18% of the total membership, but they contribute a significant portion of the new members of the society. No one on the EC would disagree that acquiring new members, particularly students, is a top priority. Here are two ideas that I plan to pursue:

- 1) I plan to make SAS student chapter material available at the student event. My goal is to successfully encourage at least one student to start a new student chapter on Monday night and perhaps renew the energy of current student chapter leaders while doing so. I also challenge the EC to make student chapters a part of their conversation while at the student event.
- 2) I hope to establish a new program of sending "SAS Student Ambassadors" to conferences beyond FACSS and PITTCON where SAS might have a valued presence. Please see the attached page for a more detailed description of the proposed program.

Realizing these ideas will undoubtedly have a positive impact on student enthusiasm on the chapter level and on the whole, and we may see increases in student memberships.

Dear SAS Executive Committee:

The SAS Student Representative would like to propose the creation of a new student program called "SAS Student Ambassador". The purpose for creating the program is to boost the student membership accrual rate. A description of the program is as follows:

The SAS Student Ambassador (SA) program is an opportunity for student members of SAS to act as a spokesperson for SAS at spectroscopy conferences beyond FACSS and PITTCON. The SA position will be a temporary assignment where a graduate student in good standing with SAS will prepare and maintain a decorated table containing pamphlets, pins and poster boards which advertise the mission of SAS and the benefits it provides to its members. The SA will not be expected to stand by the table; however, during poster sessions he/she will be encouraged to direct interested students to the table for more information about SAS. The SA will feel free to participate in any other part of the conference or attend to other responsibilities. The SA would be encouraged to wear a SAS provided name tag through the duration of the conference and acknowledge SAS in any presentations given while at the conference. All responsibilities after the conference is completed will be dissolved.

In support of the SA, the SAS will provide table decorations, pamphlets, pins and hand-outs and mail them to the SA before the trip. SAS will gain approval for the decorated table from the conference coordinators. In return for their generous service SAS will subsidize the student's conference registration

fee up to a limit (TBD). The budget necessary for the function of this program is based on the cost of the table contents, the registration fee limit, and the number of students chosen to serve as SA per year.

Choosing the SA will be based on three criteria: enthusiasm to represent SAS, activity in student chapters, and a statement of purpose. Student chapter officers would be ideal candidates for this position. The position will be advertised via email to students and mentors of SAS along with inclusion on the website. Student volunteers at FACSS should also be encouraged to participate.

Conference selection will be determined with the program purpose in mind: to boost student membership. Conferences that attract spectroscopy students will of course be the first criterion. It will be most efficient to target small conferences which provide intimate and prolonged networking opportunities.

The goal for initiating this program is to send out the first emails by January 1, 2011 for the upcoming year of conferences.

Should the EC decide to move forward with this proposal it would be imperative to establish a budget and approve a conference list. It is recommended that student selection for the SA position be left up to the elected Student Representative.

Constitution and Bylaws Committee - Fall 2010 Report

Proposed Bylaws Change: (additions are bolded, italicized, and underlined)

ARTICLE XIV - COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. STANDING COMMITTEES. The standing committees of the Society are: Awards, Constitution and Bylaws, Regional and Technical Section Affairs, Long Range Planning, Membership, ***Newsletter***, Nomination, Publications, Publicity, Tellers, Tour Speakers, *Applied Spectroscopy* William F. Meggers Award, Lester W. Strock Award, and Lippincott Award. Details of the Meggers Award Committee, the Lester Strock Committee, and the Lippincott Award Committee are in Article XVI, Sections 3, 4, and 8 respectively, of the Bylaws.

SECTION 17. NEWSLETTER COMMITTEE.

This committee shall consist of a total of two (2) or more members. The Chair of the committee shall be the Newsletter Editor of the Society. Each member is appointed for a one (1) year term. This committee shall support the newsletter editor with duties as assigned by the newsletter editor and/or SAS Executive Committee or Governing Board.

SAS Regional and Technical Affairs Committee Report 2010 - Raleigh, NC

International Regions

Below is a letter to Bonnie showing some of the concerns facing the international regions:

Bonnie,

As you know, we have spent a great deal of time researching various approaches and issues relative to international sections. Information was gathered from ASAE, from other non-profits that have international sections (International Erosion Control Association, International Society for Performance Improvement, Optical Society of America), and from our auditors. Generally, SAS has two options for its sections: either they can be "internal" (operating as part of our corporation) or "external" (their own corporate entities, not under SAS control or financial responsibility). In our documents, we refer to the sections that are under the SAS corporation as chapters and those that are separate entities as affiliates. (Please note that this terminology is not universal. Other nonprofits may call all of their related sections "chapters" even though some or all of them are completely separate entities.) For consistency in this memo, I will use the terms as SAS has defined them. Following please find a summary of our options and recommendations concerning international sections. The bottom line, for the reasons described below, is that it probably makes most sense for all the international sections to be affiliates, not chapters. If a section is a chapter, it would have more burdens or requirements in terms of its relationship with SAS. The auditors confirmed that everything that I outlined previously (an SAS officer as

signatory on the bank account, detailed financial reports so that we could include their income and expenses in our corporate statements, etc.) would have to be implemented. Essentially the chapter's money is "our" money, so all of the same requirements for the way we treat bank accounts and document income/expenses in the US would apply to our money being handled by the international chapters.

Having a chapter outside the US would also require additional work by the SAS office. "We" would now be operating in a foreign country and would have to follow that country's requirements for registration and reporting. Since those requirements vary drastically by country, it could be a monumental task to try to research and comply with the regulations in multiple countries. *Every nonprofit that I spoke to had no international chapters, only affiliates.* The primary reason that each organization cited for that policy was the complexity that would be involved in trying to deal with various international regs.

If a section is an affiliate, the requirements for dealing with SAS are much less of a problem. In order to give them money, we have to have some documentation on file indicating that their purposes and mission are in line with those of SAS. (That is probably already taken care of by SAS's policy for establishing sections.) Each year the affiliate would also have to send us some report indicating how they spent whatever money we gave them. No receipts would be required. If they spend the money across multiple years, they just show the portion of the money that they spent in that year, and continue reporting annually until our grant is used up. We don't need to see any reports on money that they raise themselves.

From the section's perspective, the down side of being an affiliate is that whatever registration or reporting requirements there may be in that country would be the responsibility of the officers of that section. I asked each of the non-profits referenced above if they assisted their international sections at all in figuring out what those requirements are, and they all said no due to manpower and time constraints. *Their international sections are on their own in terms of how they get set-up and maintain themselves relative to legal and financial reporting requirements.* This was true even for OSA which seemed to have the largest staff and provide the most money to its sections.

I know that our immediate concern is the section in the United Kingdom. However, to give you a broader picture for purposes of establishing policies, I want to pass on some comments shared by the other organizations relative to differences that they have seen in various countries. The level of difficulty encountered by affiliates in establishing and maintaining an organization seems to vary widely by country. Generally, western European countries were better in terms of allowing the creation of volunteer organizations and having established procedures and understandable regulations governing such organizations. Some eastern European or Middle Eastern countries were much more difficult in terms of figuring out what the requirements were or the level of bureaucracy or regulations the affiliate had to deal with. In a few countries, the obstacles are so high, the local volunteers have had to resort to different strategies in order to meet their purpose. For example, the ISPI members who wanted to set up an affiliate in China worked on it for over a year but could not get past that country's complicated regulations. They ultimately decided to set themselves up as a project under one of the founder's company rather than start an organization. OSA has had a few cases where its affiliate could not establish a bank account in the name of an organization due to the country's banking regs. So, for those cases, they had to develop a form letter that all the affiliate officers sign saying that if money is given to one officer that it will be used for the purposes of the affiliate. OSA then makes the check or wire payable to the individual officer.

One final point is that the other organizations that I contacted were relatively cooperative in sharing information. In the future, perhaps that could help the founders of our potential affiliates if they are in a country where another group already has an affiliate. For example, if John has any questions about what government regs he may need to deal with in the UK, and if OSA already has a section there, perhaps he could get some insights from the OSA UK affiliate officers about how they have done it.

In summary, I believe having all the international sections be affiliates is the most feasible option for both SAS and the affiliate. That will force the volunteer officers of that affiliate to do the research on whatever regs there are in that country, but given our time and manpower limitations, that burden would probably have to be at the local level in either a chapter or an affiliate scenario. I hope this information is of some help to you. If anyone has any questions, please let me know.

Best regards,

Mary Anne

Mary Anne Ohlhoff
Financial Management & Computer Services, LLC
1321 Peachtree Ct.
Frederick, MD 21703-6031
(301) 695-5299 - Voice
(301) 695-0817 - Fax
fmcs5@comcast.net

Questions like these are going to need to be resolved before we can move to other regions.

Publications Committee Meeting Minutes - March 19, 2010 - Orlando, Florida

Attendees: Curt Marcott, Bruce Chase, Peter Griffiths, Larry Nafie, Ron Williams, Geoff Coleman, Mike Blades, Fred LaPlant, Dave Butcher, Jon Carnahan, Jim de Haseth, Ed MacMillan, Bonnie Saylor

Absent: John Olesik, John Conboy

Minutes from Louisville Meeting were reviewed and passed with a motion by Larry Nafie and a second by Bruce Chase.

Reports

Editors Report - Peter Griffiths: We are averaging 3-4 Focal Point articles per year. The goal is to make it up to 6. Mike Blades suggested we target pre-tenure folks. Peter indicated his frustration with the length of time it takes to get reviews returned. Reviewers do not like to get bad papers. Peter questioned whether we should triage bad papers out before sending them for review.

Newsletter editor report - Dave Butcher: Published 5 issues since our last meeting. Thanks to those who have contributed to the newsletter, especially for the Bill Fateley tribute. Discussion ensued regarding what should be covered in the Applied Spectroscopy news area vs the newsletter now that Dave has taken over the news in Applied Spectroscopy. Fred suggested we form a newsletter committee.

Web editor report - Ron Williams: The Executive Committee approved additional funds for the new website for database merging, search engine operation, and a complete web store. \$11,000 was approved.

Website development update - Jim de Haseth: We are moving forward on the phases we set out as priorities.

Advertising Report - Ed MacMillan: The recession is definitely affecting us. In 2009 Allen Press was cautiously optimistic, but they are worried about 2010 because the mood has changed. Ed is looking for guidelines and where and when advertising is acceptable on the website and do we want banner ads, pillow ads, or skyscrapers.

New Business

Mike Blades began a discussion on impact factors. What can we do to increase our impact factor numbers? 30% of Applied Spectroscopy papers never get cited. This drags us down. Also new journals are getting manuscripts that we no longer get. Open access also poses a problem. It was decided that a small group of former editors might be able to address this issue. Suggested Paul Farnsworth, Joel Harris, Jim Holcombe, and Bruce Chase.

SAS Publicity Committee Report - Date: 09/27/2010

Members: Mark Henson (chair), Chad Leverette, Greg Webster, Heather Gulley-Stahl, Drew Manica

Summary: The committee met in late spring 2010 in a teleconference hosted by SAS President Fred LaPlant to discuss several ways to publicize the SAS. Items discussed were potential give-away items, T-shirt design concepts, and re-design of the society logo. At the time, it was suggested that the logo design should be opened up to the entire society as a contest, which was subsequently done. Fred identified potential give-away items and followed up by sending links to some potential items to the committee members, as well as some t-shirt ideas.

Additional suggestions for publicizing the society which were generated by this committee follow below:

- 1) Prior to starting new publicity efforts, a study should be made of past efforts in an attempt to identify efforts which had the greatest positive impact on membership, and to avoid efforts which previously did not show a benefit. Past reports did not indicate which suggestions were acted upon.
- 2) Perhaps design a higher-quality polo/golf shirt that could be sold to committee members rather than a lower-quality t-shirt that would be given away. This might encourage the shirt to be worn more

frequently in professional settings or at other conferences. Obviously, this might limit the extent to which an “edgy” design (to use Fred’s terminology) could be used. Having members wear these shirts at Pittcon (perhaps organize a “wear your SAS shirt day”?) would give us visibility as a society.

3) An additional idea for a “freebie” to give away might be a simple USB flash drive, or one perhaps customized somehow to be appropriate for our society. (Mark comment: I attended a fertility conference last year where a company gave away USB drives shaped like sperm. The tail popped off of it to reveal the USB plug. Not sure what the equivalent would be for us. Would we get sued if we had one shaped like a lightsaber?)

4) How about a couple special issues in Applied Spectroscopy dedicated to targeted industries such as Pharma, Environmental... and market them to Pittcon and AAPS?

5) Why not run a SAS session at AAPS (for Pharma), AAPS (for Ag/food) and wherever is relevant to environmental like you do at Pittcon?

Tour Speakers Committee Report: Society for Applied Spectroscopy Governing Board FACSS 2010, Raleigh, NC - October 19, 2010

Linda Kidder

Ten individuals have graciously agreed to contribute their time and energy to the 2011 SAS Speakers Tour. Subject areas include Raman, LIBS, XRF, IR, and Sum Frequency Generation. Applications draw from a wide swath including art and archaeology, remote sensing, protein folding, biological assay, and chemical sensor development.

Largely drawn from academia (both large research institutes and smaller academic colleges), there are a few participants from government labs and some speakers that have commercial affiliation/interests in addition to their primary academic affiliation.

The speakers and their proposed titles are detailed below.

Name	Title/subject
Frank Bright	Spectrochemical Analysis for Chemical Sensor Development
Nathan Bower	XRF and Lead isotopic analysis of corroded first century Biblical coins
Luisa Profeta	Applications of Infrared Methods to Simple & Complex Systems
Richard Hark	Spectroscopic investigation of pigments on fake and authentic medieval manuscripts
Gary Small	Environmental Remote Sensing by Passive Infrared Spectroscopy
Elsa Yan	Protein Folding at Interfaces Probed by Sum Frequency Generation Spectroscopy
Kirk Rector	Targeted SERS Nanosensors for Time-Lapse Chemical Microscopy of Live Cell
Rosemarie Chinni	Applications of Laser-Induced Breakdown Spectroscopy (LIBS) for Uranium Detection and Field Portable Instrumentation
Tim Keiderling	Peptide conformation and dynamics of folding. Site-specific insights with vibrational spectroscopy and related techniques
Joseph Chaiken	“Hunting the Deceitful Turkey”: Recent progress in noninvasive in vivo blood and tissue analysis by Raman spectroscopy

The next phase will be the distribution of the candidate speaker list to the local sections and the subsequent “dance” of matching up preferences, schedules, and logistics. We appear to be on target and look forward to the ongoing process.

International SAS Tour Report

Rich Mendelsohn

Mendelsohn sabbatical activities supported by SAS

Background: Rich Mendelsohn is on sabbatical for the calendar year 2010. As part of his sabbatical activities, a trip to Europe to present lectures to colleagues concerning activities in the Mendelsohn lab was outlined and presented to SAS. Prof. Mendelsohn has indeed accomplished his goal. He presented a lecture entitled :

“Vibrational Spectroscopy and Microspectroscopic Imaging: Introduction and Applications to Skin Pharmacology and Wound Healing”

Lectures were presented at 4 Universities and 2 Industrial locations as follows (chronological order) :

- 1) Fac. Biologia, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain. Host : *Professor Jesus Perez-Gil*
- 2) Unidad de Biofísica (CSIC-UPV/EHU), Sarriena s/n, Leioa, Spain. Host : *Professor Felix Goni*
- 3) Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne, Institut des sciences et ingénierie chimiques Lausanne, Switzerland. Host : *Professor Horst Vogel*
- 4) Firmenich, Geneva. Host : *Dr. Mila Boncheva*
- 5) Johnson and Johnson, Paris. Host : *Dr. Georgios Stamatias*
- 6) Division of Drug Delivery Technology, Leiden University, Gorlaeus Laboratories, Leiden, Holland. Host: *Professor Joke Bouwstra*

The audiences for the lectures ranged from 10-50. SAS functions and support of my visit was announced and elaborated at the beginning of each lecture. It will be interesting to note whether an influx of European members into SAS will ensue.

Finally, I would like to thank SAS for support of this venture. Travel is expensive, and the funds indeed were most welcome.

Awards Committee Reports - Fall 2010

2010 SAS Student Award

Karen Esmonde-White

The committee has selected Oliver Bolduc and Karolin Kroening to receive a 2010 SAS student award. We were impressed with the quality of research from all of the nominees, and the committee faced a difficult decision in nominating two students.

Each committee member reviewed the nomination packet of all students. We especially looked at the scope, difficulty, and the potential of the research to open a new field of spectroscopy. The ability of a student to provide insight and leadership to a research project was also considered. We used the nominating letters, publication record and presentation history as indications of the student's ability to perform top-level research and maintain a strong connection to the scientific community. We considered patents and intellectual property as another indication of the novelty of research. It is especially exciting to see nominees as inventors or co-inventors! We wanted to acknowledge that cultivating intellectual property is a relatively new aspect in the development of graduate students, but is important because students are opening new avenues of applications, or developing new instrumentation, to solve difficult problems. Leadership skills, community service and membership to SAS were other factors we considered. However, these factors were not as heavily weighted as publication/presentation record and nomination letters.

Meggers Award Committee Report

Pavel Matousek, Chair of Meggers Award Selection Committee

This Committee has identified as the winning publication for the 2010 Meggers Award the following two papers merged into one entry:

Methods for Kinetic Modeling of Temporally Resolved Hyperspectral Confocal Fluorescence Images

Authors: Cutler, Patrick J.; Haaland, David M.; Andries, Erik; Gemperline, Paul J.

Volume 63, Issue 2, (February 2009), pp. 153-163

and

Systematic Method for the Kinetic Modeling of Temporally Resolved Hyperspectral Microscope Images of Fluorescently Labeled Cells

Authors: Cutler, Patrick J.; Haaland, David M.; Gemperline, Paul J.

Volume 63, Issue 3, (March 2009), pp. 261-270

The papers were merged into a single entry as discussing a very similar topic. The committee is confident that this work conforms to the high standard set by previous Meggers Award winners.

Lester Strock Award Committee Report - Fall 2010

Heinz W. Siesler, Committee Chair

Based on his research contributions in the field of laser-induced breakdown spectroscopy (LIBS) for nanoparticle analysis I propose:

Professor Dr. David W. Hahn

Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611-6300, USA

for the Lester Strock Award 2011.

The award will be presented at the FACSS 2011 conference (Grand Sierra Resort, Reno, NV, October 2 – 6, 2011).

2010 Lippincott Award Winner

Martin Moskovits, University of California Santa Barbara, is the recipient of the Lippincott Award for “fundamental and continuing contributions to the field of Surface-Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy, and proposing its fundamental enhancing mechanism based on the excitation of localized surface plasmons”.

Tellers’ Committee Report

Glenn Boutilier, Chair

Mary Kate Donais was elected President-Elect. Paul Bourassa was elected treasurer. Steve Barnett, Karla McCain, Robert Lascola, John Wasyluk, and Mike Morris were elected to the SAS Governing Board.

Poehlman Award Report - Fall 2010

David Heaps, Francis Esmonde-White & Mark Druy

Regional/Technical Section Affairs Committee

This year’s Poehlman award winners are New York and New England. They both have excellent activity with their members and solid leadership. They have educational outreach that exemplify the SAS mission to advance and disseminate knowledge and information concerning spectroscopy. The reason for co-winners this year is that the New York and New England sections have gone well beyond other sections in disseminating knowledge and information concerning spectroscopy. Both section have introduced web based section meetings and have invited other sections to join these webinars. For these and other reasons the Regional/Technical Section Affairs committee has chosen both sections to be co-winners of the Poehlman award.

Comments to david.butcher@Analytchem.org