



A Publication for  
Seattle AWIS  
Winter 2014

# Women in Science



this issue:

Payline or Bust: The rise of Science Crowd-funding P. 3

Joan Greve : a comeback to the Ivory Tower P. 6

A note from the Scholarship committee P. 10

Dear Members,

We have just selected our new award winners for this year. We have been fortunate to receive excellent recommendations from the community. I am thrilled that we are making a difference by honoring the important contributions of women in our community towards the advancement of science. The 2014 Award for Scientific Advancement will go to Anna Wald, a University of Washington Professor of Allergy and Infectious Disease, for her outstanding research in herpes simplex virus infections. This year we are adding an additional award to honor the accomplishments of women in science education and outreach. There was an outstanding pool of candidates. The 2014 Award winner for Excellence in Science Education and Outreach will be Nancy Hutchinson, Director of Science Education Partnership at Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. We will honor these women at a banquet in June. I hope you can join us for this inspiring evening.

On a related note, Fran Solomon, Chair of Scholarship committee, is soliciting donations from our members for our Undergraduate Scholarship Fund. The scholarship fund has been active for over 25 years, touching the lives of many young women.

These scholarships prove to be invaluable to the young women that receive them. These awards will also be presented at the banquet. The banquet has added a new dimension in inspiring these promising young women with the accomplishments of other women in science. If your company has a matching donations program, please consider using it to support the next generation of scientists.

Our Programs committee has been hard at work organizing the Spring lineup. We love to host events that connect women with local biotech and research institutes. Our fall event at Infectious Disease Research institute was a huge success. There were 150 attendees, which was the capacity of the venue. We are still looking to line-up another event for the Spring. If your company would be interested in hosting an event, please contact the Programs committee to discuss an arrangement.

*-Continued on page 2.*



# A letter from the Seattle AWIS President

*-Continued*

The Girls in Engineering, Math, and Science program (GEMS) that engages 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade girls in hands-on science activities has opened a new South Seattle site this year. They are meeting at the South Seattle Community College. With this new site, the program was able to take all 60 girls that applied for the program this year. We are making an effort to recruit more girls from underrepresented groups. This has proved rather difficult and we are open to suggestions. Transportation for the girls has been identified as a potential barrier and we are considering options to overcome it. We are also interested in identify a location that would allow the girls to experience an actual biotech environment located on the South side, but for now the community college will work. We will keep looking.

I would like to wish a Happy New Year to all our members. I look forward to seeing you at one of our monthly events.

Sincerely,

Melissa Lerch

President, Seattle AWIS

# Payline or Bust: The Rise of Science Crowdfunding

By: Sarah Cullen

When Danny Colombara, a University of Washington Ph.D. student, needed \$5,000 to carry out the analysis to finish his doctoral thesis, he asked the same existential question asked by most researchers: Do I really have to go to all that effort of writing a grant if I need a small amount of money and quickly?

Luckily, Danny asked this question in the age of the internet. After investing only one afternoon, he solved his dilemma by taking his research project public on the science-centric crowdfunding site, Microryza. And with that, plus a series of personal appeals for donations on Facebook and Twitter, Danny became yet another researcher driven to crowdfunding.

For artists and inventors, crowdfunding has been a popular mode of raising capital for more than a decade. But in the realm of science - where peer review and dogma reign supreme - research dollars have historically come from behemoth federal agencies like the National Institutes of Health or the National Science Foundation. The sequester and incessant budget wrangling in Washington D.C. have changed all that, leaving scientists scrambling for funding alternatives.

For Danny, the idea to try crowdfunding came from a conversation with Cindy Wu, co-founder of Microryza. Wu, along with fellow University of Washington graduate Denny Luan, launched the site after they experienced the perils of obtaining research funds first-hand.

“We spoke with over 100 researchers and every single person said they have a new idea they've always wanted to try but it's too risky for them to ever apply for a grant--these ideas would never get funded in the traditional system,” Wu said. “We built Microryza as a project and never intended on building a company. It grew quickly, so we dropped out of grad school and started to work on it full time.”

Since debuting in April 2012, 67 projects have met their target amount and now that the site is hosting as many as 50 projects at one time, this number is bound to climb. Given its northwest roots, Microryza has championed its fair share of projects from our region, HiveBio Community Lab, for example, and along the way has even garnered acclaim from Seattle's own Bill Gates.

As further proof that Microryza has uncovered a valuable niche, the site currently has a backlog of over 2,000 waiting to be launched. And while the clamor is certainly impressive, it is important to point out that the average award amount is only \$6,000.

*Continued on page 4.*

# Payline or Bust— *Continued*

The ceiling for Microryza funding hovers between \$25,000 and \$35,000. In contrast, generic crowdfunding sites like Kickstarter and Indiegogo have science projects which have been able to raise more than a million dollars. Funding of this magnitude would not be possible if it were not for the requirement that projects on these sites offer perks to its donors. With perks come donors, so not surprisingly Kickstarter and Indiegogo have legions of followers. For most projects, the incentive for pledging a certain amount is a copy of the project's invention. For example, the Glowing Plants project on Kickstarter offered a genetically modified plant which glows in the dark to any person pledging at least \$100.

Given that Kickstarter requires each of its projects to develop a tangible product, its model makes the union between science and crowdfunding a more harmonious one. But for scientists simply trying to conduct basic science research, the pressure to incentivize their project can seem unnatural.

Hoping to raise \$3,000 for an electron microscope, Tanya Parish, PhD of the Tuberculosis Drug Discovery program at Infectious Disease Research Institute (IDRI) took to the crowdfunding site, RocketHub. Since RocketHub has a reward-based system similar to Indiegogo and Kickstarter, Parish and her team were uniquely tasked with drumming up public interest for their new microscope.

“My research team and I sat down and brainstormed ideas of what we could offer – there were far more ideas than we could use, so we were pretty selective,” said Parish. “We wanted to offer things that were meaningful to the project. In general, we found that people were interested in contributing, but did not seem to mind so much about the rewards.”

By promising perks ranging from a thank-you note to a meet-and-greet with IDRI scientists, IDRI easily surpassed its goal of \$3,000 and in the end, collected \$4,045. The question is, when the novelty of science crowdfunding has worn off, will lab tours and coffee cups be enough to engage the public's interest?

With that in mind, Jim Olson MD, PhD is leading his group at Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center in taking an unprecedented approach to crowdfunding by giving donors a rare opportunity to participate in drug discovery. The crowdfunding campaign is called Project Violet - in remembrance of a pediatric cancer patient - and ambitiously seeks to raise \$20 million both from large and small donors.

Using this \$20 million, Olson wants to build upon the success of Tumor Paint technology and develop a second generation of “optimized peptides” or “optides” that can uniquely target cancer cells. With the manufacturing capacity to churn out 12,000 optides a month, Project Violet is raising money by challenging donors to add a drug to their extensive library of drug candidates.

In exchange for \$100, donors participate in the drug discovery process by designing key aspects of a drug candidate's molecular structure and then naming it. As the molecule undergoes testing, periodic updates are sent to the donor. If the drug candidate fails to show promise, donors can design a replacement thereby ensuring that they always have a “horse in the race”.

*Continued on page 5.*



# Payline or Bust— Continued

To create such an interactive user experience, Project Violet not only enlisted volunteers from Amazon but also harnessed the expertise of Seattle's gaming community. The concept of an interactive donor platform is truly unique - not to mention clever. If Project Violet is successful at cultivating a loyal following, that could make future crowdfunding efforts by Fred Hutchinson that much more successful .

As a testament to the popularity of this first go-around, Nicole Pratapas of Fred Hutchinson noted, "We now have raised enough funds that if everyone who is a current donor had a friend adopt one drug, we could pay for an additional scientist."

Fortuitously, donors may not be the only project's allies. Scientists of Project Violet have embraced its modus operandi and by doing so, discovered the benefits of science with a personal touch.

"When you talk to donors you understand that they are supporting your project for a reason," relayed Pratapas. "It helps us as scientists remember that we have been touched by numerous diseases and that we are pursuing our science not because of experiments, but for the potential impact it could have on patients."

It is too soon to tell if Project Violet is the ticket to the funding shortfall, but as Olson readily acknowledges, this massive undertaking is an experiment unto itself. But much like Colombara and Wu, Olson has no choice but to tread into the murky waters of crowdfunding because science is in a funding crisis.

When asked if she had observed a drop-off in the passion by the researchers contacting Microryza, Wu responded, "We've been amazed that the funding climate does not seem to be affecting the enthusiasm and passion of researchers. Researchers are going to extremes

to save their labs. Some that have lost all their funding are taking their savings and renting out a storage space to store their equipment until they can secure grants again."

Crowdfunding may not be a panacea for science's ills, but mavericks like Olson and Wu are taking up the cause. And if nothing else, future generations will know that valiant efforts were made to keep science going - we'll have the rental unit receipts and internet pages to prove it!

**About the author:** Sarah Cullen is an immunology researcher who is currently looking for training opportunities in flow cytometry and cell sorting. If you would like to chat about your research experiences with flow cytometry, crowdfunding, or the goodness of marshmallows, please contact Sarah at [cullensa-rahjane@gmail.com](mailto:cullensa-rahjane@gmail.com).



# Joan Greve: a “come back” to the Ivory Tower

By Graciela Matrajt

While today most PhDs and post-docs are trying to break into the industry field, Joan Greve, a bioengineer who has dedicated the last fifteen years of her life to doing research in drug discovery, is making her come back to the Ivory Tower. Her reasons are tangled with her multiple and diverse experiences, from both her professional and private life.

Joan's first steps in science started during her undergraduate years at the University of Washington (UW), Seattle where she studied Engineering. Joan's main interest was to apply engineering tools to improve people's health. After discovering the unofficial undergraduate bioengineering program at the UW, she joined a lab to do research in leg amputation and to investigate a variety of prosthetics. Joan spent nearly three years in this lab and really enjoyed doing research; although highly self-motivated, she also received excellent mentorship regarding what she needed to be successful in her projects, including how to communicate her research advancements through three publications. That was already putting the bar quite high for a student who was barely breaking into the science world. Indeed, her passion and dedication for her research absorbed her so much that she neglected her grades. As a result, and despite her clearly advanced research experience, she failed to be accepted into Medical and Graduate schools.

Those were busy years for a young person who was also an athlete in college. So, after graduation, Joan was burnt out and decided to take a break for a couple of years to travel, experience different jobs and explore the world. But science always attracts bright minds and after two years Joan felt the need to return to the lab. By then she was married and had followed her husband to Northern California where he was attending grad school. She then looked for jobs in the California area and saw an advertisement in the newspaper for a job related to imaging at a company called Genentech. Lucky for her, the head of the imaging lab already had a sense of what a bioengineer could provide. She started her new career in Genentech as a Research Associate in the department of biomedical imaging in 1999 where she remained, in various positions, for 12 years.

*Continued on page 7.*

## Joan Greve– continued

Joan really enjoyed working at Genentech; she learned new analytical techniques, she performed small animal surgeries, imaging analyses, learned about new equipment, and once again received superb mentorship. She particularly enjoyed collaborating with people from multiple disciplines and being able to present her work in a variety of conferences. And as she blossomed in her scientific career, she realized that she could be leading her own team of scientists and could have more decision power to direct her own research. This, along with the desire to increase her knowledge and become an expert in her field, motivated her to go back to school to pursue a PhD.

Joan primarily applied to graduate programs in bioengineering. The one exception, however, was Stanford University which had not yet started their department. Still, Joan was convinced that Stanford University was the best place for her; so she decided to find a solution. And she did. She first contacted a few professors who were working in topics that were a good fit for Joan's interests. She made some presentations of the research she did in Genentech, and initiated a series of conversations to convince them to take a chance on her, and to allow her to do her research thesis within their group. Finally, Joan obtained financial support from one of these professors and engaged in thesis research work using Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) and small animal models at Stanford University. She is forever grateful for the investment her thesis advisor made in her.

Those were very productive years and Joan enjoyed being a student again, but she still had the firm idea to return to industry. So, after graduating, she rejoined Genentech where she became the Scientist of the NMR facility within the biomedical imaging group. Persistence and conviction drove Joan to her ultimate goal: she became an expert in her field, and obtained a position with leadership responsibilities in a world-recognized research firm.

But after a few years, Joan's ambitions started to grow again. She felt she was ready to move to an even more managerial role, where she could help facilitate a larger research program. In addition, Genentech had just been bought by another firm, Roche, and for someone who had been there for over a decade it appeared the culture of the company was changing too. Finally, Joan's private life was calling for more stability; her husband had moved to Seattle several years before and the couple had been living apart all that time. Joan felt that it was a good time for her to return to the Northwest and, when she found a position aligned with her new ambitions, she moved back to Seattle. She became a Scientific Program Manager in the Allen Institute for Brain Science.

Once more, Joan had obtained all that she wanted. Well, almost. As she moved back to Seattle and her new career started to flourish again, with new scientific goals, new instrumentation approaches, new colleagues and new successes, her private life declined and, ultimately, ended in divorce.

*Continued on page 8.*



# Joan Greve– *continued*

Although the Allen Institute exposed Joan to many new opportunities for learning , it was not the right fit for her, and once she was single she had more flexibility to think of what might come next. So, one more time, Joan felt the need to follow her ambitions and start a new adventure: she decided to try and come back to academia. Indeed, her priorities had changed; she wanted to mentor people, teach them in a lab setting, and guide someone into research . Furthermore, she had underestimated her desire to answer basic scientific questions left unanswered from various parts of her previous work. She didn't want to solely pursue applied research focused on drug development. Rather , she wanted to continue her efforts to do good, high quality basic science while teaching other people what she has learned throughout all these years of experience in industry.

Transmitting knowledge to the generations that follow is the major purpose of higher education institutions. What could be a better fit for Joan's new priorities than returning to the Ivory Tower? It was not easy for Joan to translate her atypical path when applying to tenure-track faculty positions. But, with much discussion, the right fit was found: Joan is elated to have obtained a tenure track position as an assistant professor in the University of Michigan starting next January. She will be part of the Medical school and College of Engineering and will teach Biomedical Engineering. In addition, she is establishing a lab where she will teach state-of-the-art imaging laboratory techniques. Her ultimate goal is to guide students into research using preclinical Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and models .

Next winter, when Joan teaches her first course, a handful of students will have the good fortune of receiving instruction from a brave, intelligent and ambitious woman who has more than fifteen years of experience in industry. Professors with such a profile are rare and much needed to reconcile industry with the Ivory Tower.

Welcome back to academia Joan!



# October Event: The Supreme Court's Myriad Decision: Redefining What is Patentable

by Melanie Mayer, PhD

On June 2013, the Supreme Court officially ruled that Myriad Genetics could not patent the BRCA1 and 2 genes, a decision which has nullified those patents, and suggests that genes are not generally patentable material. This decision has major ramifications for genetic research and the biotech industry. On October 16, AWIS hosted a discussion about the Supreme Court's decision on ASSOCIATION FOR MOLECULAR PATHOLOGY ET AL. v. MYRIAD GENETICS, INC., ET AL.

Melanie Mayer, PhD, an Associate at Fenwick & West LLP gave an introduction to the case, starting with the definition of what is patentable, that is to be patentable, an idea must be "new and useful." This distinction plays a key role in the Supreme Court finding. She also described what conditions bring a patent case to court; in this case, there were people who felt they were harmed by the patent. These people included researchers, patients and professional societies that were unable to perform research and get diagnosis based on these patents. The central aspect of the decision was based on the fact that these genes occur in nature, and therefore not "new." Although Myriad Genetics did add value by being able to distinguish which alleles are correlated to cancer diagnosis, this does not make that material patentable. This decision means that anyone can now sequence this stretch of DNA without paying a licensing fee to Myriad. Interestingly, the Supreme Court found the cDNAs, which are constructed in the lab, remain patentable. Ultimately, this Supreme Court decision has a

huge impact on Myriad Genetics. While in the years they held patents on this gene, Myriad amassed a private library of information about the specific risks of cancer caused by various mutations to this gene, a number of suits against Myriad have yet to be litigated, which may affect the company's ability to stay profitable, and their business model. IN addition, the Supreme Court decision ruled very narrowly that human genes cannot be patented, but as DNA based technologies continue to advance and the intellectual property surrounding this technology attracts more investment and development, we can expect to see biotech return to the Supreme Court for future rulings.

--

*Sandlin Seguin, PhD, is the editor of the AWIS newsletter. She is also a Curriculum Development specialist and Bellevue College, and the Executive Director of Education Programs at HiveBio, a community lab.*

# Scholarship Committee

By Fran Solomon

Fundraising is underway for AWIS scholarships that will be awarded in June of this year to 5-8 undergraduate women who are majoring in science fields at colleges and universities in Washington and demonstrate academic excellence, financial need, high motivation to pursue a science career, and a record of giving back to their communities. See the fall 2013 newsletter for biographical profiles of last year's outstanding scholarship winners.

Every year, contributions from Seattle AWIS members comprise at least 1/3 of the total scholarship fund. The Scholarship Committee encourages all AWIS members to contribute to the scholarship fund this year. Your contribution is 100% tax-deductible and 100% of it will be used for scholarships for aspiring future scientists.

The following thank you letter from a past scholarship winner illustrates that the scholarships are greatly appreciated by our recipients, not only for the financial assistance, but also as a gesture of support from the scientific community. "I would like to express my gratitude for the wonderful scholarship you awarded me. Of course, the \$1250 will be extremely helpful, but even more meaningful is the recognition from an organization whose values I admire so much. I am so thankful to all the fabulous women who have come before me - whose courage and determination have made my journey less difficult and more inspired. Thank you!"

For your convenience, [you can contribute to the scholarship fund online via PayPal](#). Thank you in advance from this year's scholarship winners.

# AWIS 2014 Award winners

## **Dr. Anna Wald and Dr. Nancy Hutchinson named for Seattle AWIS Awards**

The annual Seattle AWIS Award honors established women in our local scientific community and recognizes the accomplishments of women in science. For the 2014 AWIS awards, we have chosen to honor women in two categories:

### **Award for Scientific Advancement.**

To recognize a woman with innovative contributions to a field of science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) whose work (in academia, industry or public sector) has made significant scientific advances that have opened new avenues in a research field.

### **Award for Excellence in Science Education/Outreach.**

To recognize a woman who has demonstrated innovative and sustained contribution to education in the field of science, technology, engineering or math (STEM). This may also include contributions to outreach activities or programs that promote STEM or encourage women in science or whose work has led to establishment of new policy.

We are delighted to announce the winners of these two awards, chosen from a pool of many qualified candidates by the Awards Selection Committee. We will be honoring **Dr. Anna Wald** and **Dr. Nancy Hutchinson** with the Award for Scientific Advancement and the Award for Excellence in Science Education/Outreach respectively at our fundraiser/banquet to be held in June 2014.

Anna Wald MD, MPH is a professor in the Division of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the University of Washington and a member of the Vaccine and Infectious Disease Division at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. Her research focuses on the epidemiology, natural history and the immunobiology of Herpes Simplex Virus infection. According to Dr. Lawrence Corey who nominated her, Dr. Wald's research has led to "to paradigm-shifting clinical and translational research into the natural history and prevention of genital herpes." Besides her scientific contributions, Dr. Wald is also known for being a wonderful mentor to people both in and outside of her research group. Dr. Joshua Schiffer, one of her mentees states that "Anna in fact has taken on an informal role within our division as a career advisor".

*-continued on page 12.*

# AWIS 2014 Award winners

Nancy Hutchison, PhD is the Program Director for the Science Education Partnership (SEP) at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center (FHCRC), Seattle, WA. She founded this unique and award-winning program in 1991, which is now in its 23<sup>rd</sup> year of operation. The SEP enables teachers to work directly with scientists in the lab both at FHCRC and other research institutions such as Seattle Biomed, UW, and the Institute for Systems Biology. Teachers get first-hand experience in working in labs, which helps them develop relevant and research based curriculum for their students. We received three separate nominations for Dr. Hutchison. “She is a passionate, dedicated and thoughtful individual who makes a difference in the lives of science teachers and students in Washington everyday”, says Janis Wignall, a longtime colleague who nominated her for the Award for Excellence in Science Education/Outreach.

Congratulations to all of the nominees. We hope you will join us in celebrating the accomplishments of these two outstanding women in June. If you are interested in sponsoring this event, please contact [award@seattleawis.org](mailto:award@seattleawis.org)

--

Dr. Prerana Ranjitkar is currently working at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and serves as the Chair of the Awards Committee for the Seattle Chapter of AWIS.



# AWIS November event: Intellectual Property

In November AWIS hosted a panel on Scientific Careers in Intellectual Property. Panelists included Jill Scott, M.P.H, J.D., Associate General Counsel at Seattle Biomedical Research Institute, Beth Etscheid, Ph.D., Director of Licensing at Washington Research Foundation, Jessica Meyers, J.D., Patent Portfolio Manager at the UW Center for Commercialization, Melissa Nowak, M.S., J.D., Associate at Christensen O'Connor Johnson Kindness PLLC, Loria Yeadon, M.S., J.D., Executive Vice President & General Manager at Intellectual Ventures, and Hai Han, Ph.D., J.D., Of Counsel, Seed Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC. Each of these women have a background in laboratory science or engineering and discovered rewarding careers in patenting or licensing work surrounding scientific discoveries and innovations.

Jill Scott, M.P.H., J.D. is tasked with assisting the 17-odd principal investigators at Seattle Biomed with decisions surrounding patent development to further the goals of their non-profit organization. Seattle Biomed is dedicated to studying global infectious diseases such as HIV and malaria. Jill has a degree in Public Health and interned with the World Health Organization in Geneva studying cross-border disease threats.

Beth Etscheid, Ph.D. is the Director of Licensing at Washington Research Foundation, an organization that is tasked with commercializing technology from research institutions in Washington state. Her focus has shifted from tech transfer work to managing a \$100 million venture capital fund, and providing funding to startup companies coming out of research institutions in Washington.

Jessica Meyers, J.D. began her career as a Computer Science major at the University of Puget Sound in Tacoma and is now employed as a Patent Attorney at the University of Washington's Center for Commercialization. While Intellectual Property agreements require professors and graduate students at UW to relinquish exclusive rights to the technology they have developed, UW will foot the bill of upwards of tens of thousands of dollars to file relevant patents, thus allowing for commercialization of these technologies.

Melissa Nowak, M.S., J.D. began her science career with a Biology degree from the University of Georgia, and developed laboratory and research skills as a lab tech in Neuroscience at the University of New Mexico. After struggling through graduate school in Biology, she discovered a more suitable career path through law school. She currently works with the COJK law firm in Seattle on patent prosecution and trademark work.

*Continued on page 14.*

# AWIS November event-continued

Loria Yeadon, M.S., J.D. emerged from a high school in rural Virginia to excel at the top of her class in an Engineering program at the University of Virginia, and continued for a Masters in Electrical Engineering. A very selective patent training program offered through her employer in the telecommunications industry allowed her to transition to a career in patent law, trademarks, and litigation. She worked for Honeywell for a number of years and started in 2009 with Intellectual Ventures.

Hai Han, Ph.D., J.D. comes from a family of scientists and has a background in Chemistry. Amidst issues with incorrectly filed immigration paperwork she found her place in the world of science as an Intellectual Property lawyer. She enjoys the breadth of science that she experiences as a lawyer, and as someone who prefers non-adversarial legal work, has a rewarding career writing patents for the Seed Intellectual Property Group.

When asked about work life and lifestyle, the panelists commented on the flexibility of work schedules. “The firm doesn’t care how and when you bill hours,” Hai Han explains, which allows for the opportunity to care for children or work around family members’ schedules and commitments. The only drawback is that you are “always on” and need to be available and responsive to clients’ needs. Jessica added that while it is necessary to pay one’s dues when beginning a job, Loria affirms that if you are straightforward with your employer about your schedule and your needs, it is possible to “have it all,” including a family, career advancement and free time.

When it comes to job security and the job market in Intellectual Property, the general consensus is that the field, while certainly in demand, is more competitive now than it was ten years ago. Even through the economic downturn of 2008, most IP jobs were retained, even if new jobs were not created. Jessica commented that a Ph.D. may be necessary for specialists in Life Sciences, but not necessarily so for Engineering fields.

There are also several career opportunities for those unable to invest the time and money in law school. Technical Advisors, who have experience in various fields of science and engineering, are employed by the law firm to assist patent attorneys in more of a consultant role. A Patent Agent, who does similar work, is required to take a patent bar exam, but will not have as high a salary as a patent lawyer.

The panelists were asked about the transition and adjustment from bench work to legal work. Most of the panelists commented that they had no problems leaving the benchwork behind because they are still working with cutting edge science and technology. Hai Han, who had no coursework other than science classes, had to focus on taking writing classes and other coursework pertinent to law school. While Melissa misses the casual attire of a lab atmosphere, Loria’s skirts and high heels didn’t exactly compliment the lab coat and she knew her career would eventually move in a different direction.

*Continued on page 15.*

# AWIS November event-continued

The main difference our panelists noted between the dynamics of experimental research and legal work, is the fact that questions in the legal arena are more open-ended, as opposed to the “yes or no” answers in scientific coursework. “There are no real answers [in law school], only possibilities,” Loria explains.

On that note, AWIS would like to thank the panelists and attendees at this event, for broadening our knowledge of careers in intellectual property, and opening women scientists up to a world of legal career possibilities.

