

Just the Forensic Laboratory Workforce Part 2

Introduction [00:00:05] Now this is recording RTI International Center for Forensic Science Presents Justice Science.

Voiceover [00:00:20] Welcome to Just Science, a podcast for justice professionals and anyone interested in learning more about forensic science, innovative technology, current research, and actionable strategies to improve the criminal justice system. In part two of the final episode of our Strengthening the Forensic Workforce Season, Just Science continued the conversation with Dr. Peter Stout, Dr. Ray Wickenheiser and Matthew Gamette discussing the future of the forensic workforce. FEPAC accredited institutions provide high quality forensic science education for undergraduate and graduate students. However, coursework does not adequately emulate what working in a forensic laboratory and pursuing a career in forensic science will entail. Listen along as our guests discuss court readiness, training gaps and other valuable insights for anyone considering a career in forensics. This episode is funded by the National Institute of Justice's Forensic Technology Center of Excellence. Here is your host, Gabby DiEmma.

Introduction [00:01:11] Hello and welcome to Just Science. I'm your host, Gabby DiEmma with the Forensic Technology Center of Excellence, a program of the National Institute of Justice. Peter, Ray and Matt, we have a lot to cover, so I'd like to dive right into the conversation and continue where we left off last week. So you mentioned that part of the problem is that the students aren't ready to testify or maybe it's just the courts that are becoming more hostile to make it harder for everyone to testify. What do you think we can do as a collective we, the laboratories, the universities, the courts, just all education and training, how can we make this better? How can we get more seasoned and experienced students? How can we get them into the courtroom comfortable to testify accurately to to what they're doing? I know that's a multifaceted question, but I figured it was a good place to build off of.

Matthew Gamette [00:02:08] In my opinion, you're never going to get somebody that, like building off what Peter said, you're never going to get somebody that's standing there and is comfortable in their shoes in court. Not if you're doing it right because you don't know what the next question is going to be. You don't know where it's coming from. The avenues of attacks can be different on a number of fronts. So I always tell people, the analysts will always ask like, what can I do in college that is going to be the most meaningful thing? And what - I always say, well how'd you do in your English classes? And they're like, What? I'm like you're going to spend 75% of your time with me writing reports, you know, communicating with people in those avenues. How many times do we send our students into communications classes? How to have confrontations? How to have conversations? We're doing a huge emphasis in my laboratory on communication. Interpersonal communication, communicating with the other folks in your laboratory, with your supervisor. We're giving them a week, I would say, in most laboratories a week maybe of testimony, training, compilation with a mock court or a moot court exercise where they're being challenged on things. Maybe it's case work they worked, maybe it's something they read about. But we're not even scratching the surface of the communication that's going on, the unsaid communication that's going on in those courtrooms, all of the dynamics that they need to be aware of. We're not versing them well in the legal system, in my opinion, in how it works. Again, what's going on unsaid in the courtroom between the attorneys, the strategy of the attorneys being used, how they can engage or should engage with the attorneys. I know I'm talking a lot on this topic, it's one I'm passionate about because how is an analyst that's sitting there and not being allowed

to answer questions, you know, being cut off by the attorney, being cut off by the judge in some cases, how are they going to effectively communicate what they need to communicate and really, truly represent the science of what's going on when you have this intersection of the judicial system that maybe one party doesn't want that information to come out, the other party wants that information to be totally out on the table and we're somewhere in between just trying to communicate information. It's a really difficult position to put these analysts in.

Ray Wickenheiser [00:04:27] So I could probably chime in, in terms of what I feel would be a best response. I would agree that you should always have nervous butterflies before a testimony just to be on your toes and that really it's kind of the highest level of learning that not just memorization, not just explaining it, being able to explain it, to understandability for a layman, any question that could come at you. But practice makes perfect. No one is born a good and effective public speaker. So the idea that embedded in your classes, you're doing presentations to your classmates. You're getting used to verbalizing that presentations aren't just part of the class, that in every single class you should be able to take a project, a scientific paper, whatever you're doing, and present it back to your classmates and just getting comfortable with verbalizing concepts, discussions. To me, that's something that should be built into every program. I know they do it in business school, having taken some business classes. Even accounting you have to do a presentation. And I asked one of the professors, why are we doing that? Tell me a business situation where you're not going to be having to convince people. Speak aloud and public speaking is people's number one fear. And how do you get past that? You practice it. You get comfortable with it. You're never 100% because you need to be on your toes. But I would agree that that's one of the biggest areas of challenge to people and you absolutely have to be comfortable with that if you're going to be an effective forensic scientist.

Peter Stout [00:05:58] I've been scratching my head on what we do here because most laboratories, us included, there's testimony training, they do a moot court, they're signed off they testify, you know, most people maybe they'll testify once or twice a year kind of thing and so it's a lot of analysts. So how do we better ensure people have current training in this, are being currently challenged in it? And basically, you know, like cops requalify with their sidearm, basically making analysts requalify regularly for testimony and recurrent moot courts that they need to endure and I do think it is an exercise that should be one of endurance. Okay, Navy officer in me is coming out. Old Navy sayings, if you fight like you train, train like you fight. The more you sweat during peace, the less you bleed during war. Moot courts should be something that is a painful, arduous, memory searing exercise that they never forget. And that should happen regularly. Now, how do you get capacity to be able to do that? One of the things I'm scratching my head is how do you operationalize that? What can we do with universities that have programs in forensics, law schools, and basically utilize some of the capacity within universities so you start building in those students into moot courts regularly, making people be both defense and prosecution and judge so they have to learn what those roles are doing and some of the rules that those roles have to function with and doing that routinely. I don't know - I'm scratching my head at it if I can find retired lawyers or lawyers that are more on the civil side and less on the criminal side so we don't end up with conflicts, but lawyers that might be willing to come volunteer time with us to come beat the crap out of analysts. I mean, I joke about it, but it is vastly easier, I think, for an analyst to work through that gut wrenching sense of, oh crap, I'm out on a limb and I don't know what's going on here in a moot court, in a practice situation then have that happen to them on the stand for real. I mean, that is - this - testimony, I think is one of the most dangerous things that analysts do, even though it's a

tiny component. I mean, that is where licenses get lost. That's where careers get destroyed, probably faster than most any place else.

Matthew Gamette [00:08:22] You're talking to three people here, I have a master's degree, Peter and Ray have Ph.Ds., you're talking to people that have been through educational experiences where they've had to defend their work. So me with master's thesis, I think the other two gentlemen with Ph.D. or maybe even master's defenses that they've had to do. Those are not easy. Those are not friendly rooms where you're going in to defend those papers and defend your work. And that's the kind of thing that we're throwing these analysts into in court. But there is a move within the community, I think, I'm not in tune to everything that's going on, but there is a move to move away from defense programs, away from defending a thesis, defending a Ph.D. and I think that in some ways is good, right? But in some ways it's not. You're not putting the students in a position to have to defend their work and to be in a confrontation situation where they really have to think and think on their feet and give answers without having time to research. So I think there's value in them producing a paper and a project and an outcome and having to defend that, whether it's a poster presentation at a professional meeting or whether it's some of these things that the universities are doing well, but I think there's something to defending your work in that kind of an environment. But I'll also add one of the things that we do in our programs is we ask our junior analysts and all of our analysts really, to go out to elementary schools, to go out to junior highs, high schools, colleges. We have a program here where teachers, educators can request analysts to visit their classroom virtually. We have them do the tours in the laboratory. We have a lot of opportunities for these scientists to be able to dialog with the jury people that they're going to be seeing, right? We teach them to teach in a courtroom to an eighth, ninth grade education level, so they have to understand what that looks like. What does an eighth or ninth grader look like? How do we educate them and sending them in to that junior high environment or that high school environment and asking them to ok teach them and see, do they understand what you're talking about or are they looking at you like deer in the headlights? It's a very valuable exercise.

Gabby DiEmma [00:10:38] I agree with that. I mean, most of these programs, they do require a lot of public speaking practice, but you're usually presenting to your peers. So at some level, they all understand what you're talking about. So speaking to other scientists is so much different than speaking to people who don't have that basic understanding, those laypersons that you're going to be speaking to in court. That is such an important part that I feel isn't always emphasized enough and I'm glad that you guys brought that up and are bringing that to the forefront, because it definitely is an issue. In terms of hiring, when you have openings that don't require any experience you guys mentioned that you tend to get a lot of applicants, but when you require experience, you're not getting that same participation. Do you think that the students entering the workforce generally have enough practical hands-on laboratory training to help facilitate that transition from academia to practitioner? Or are they really coming in completely inexperienced and you're having to train them from the ground up?

Ray Wickenheiser [00:11:44] So part of the challenge is you've got a four-year program or even with the masters, you're going to tack on maybe another two or three. There's only so much a person can do to prepare. So certainly as a prospective forensic scientist, the more that student can put into themselves in terms of not only taking the rigorous class work, getting an excellent program and working hard at it, but then also getting summer jobs that are related to the lab work and volunteering and trying to become an intern, everything they can do to prepare themselves. A lot absolutely is going to fall on crime

labs. We've had, I think, good success in modularized our training where we've broken it down into pieces so that we can get the people over a shorter training period to get going and doing a part of a job where they can be ready to testify and then build upon that with additional analysis they can do. So it does extend their training somewhat, but it does allow them time to build the skills, the public speaking skills, and to work with their colleagues and get the Q&A and that kind of thing. But certainly to get that first job is the tough one. We do have absolutely a very large number of candidates and the way I posed to students in terms of a question exercise for themselves, what can you do with yourself that would beat the self that would not do that thing? So the you with the internship beats the person, the you, without that. The person with the advanced degree or this additional experience and we absolutely want to see people that are able to roll up their sleeves, volunteer, get in there, you know, put themselves out there in terms of going to meetings, willing to speak with people that are comfortable in those kinds of positions and one thing does lead to another, and one door kind of opens and other building relationships. But certainly the more they can do to enhance themselves just means they're going to show up better for the interview, do a better job.

Matthew Gamette [00:13:40] And not only beat yourself, but don't beat yourself. Meaning don't do stupid things when you're in college that are going to prevent you from getting a job. I mean, Peter may have a different situation, but most of us work in law enforcement culture. We're going to do a thorough background check. We're going to do a polygraph examination. I think most agencies still require a polygraph, although that's kind of waxing and waning in the community. So we're going to look at your drug use. We're going to look at your party history. We're going to look at your financial history to see if you've got defaults, if you've got credit card debt. And so we're not going to hire somebody that's got drug history to come in and have access to thousands of drug cases. It's just not going to happen. So that becomes a critical component and I don't think students understand how serious we are about that. You are not going to beat the system. You can try, but we're going to find out. And if we don't discover it in the background poly process, we're probably going to figure it out within your first few months of employment because you're going to go through a six-month probationary period or a year probationary period with us in the lab where we're going to find out other things. And you would be amazed how honest your roommates are and your family members are about really? I can't believe they're applying for a position at the state police because we wouldn't think that of them because they do this and this and this. And this is from your mom and your dad and your brother and your sister. So don't beat yourself. You know what's going to be required to get that job. And it's a waste of your time and the college to put somebody through a program where at the end, your degree is going to be worthless to you because you can't get a job.

Peter Stout [00:15:14] Yeah, nothing on the Internet ever goes away. Everything Ray and Matthew said there, I'm maybe I've got a little bit of latitude. We don't do polygraphs, but pretty much even for us, it's the same thing. We're going to find if you've got that kind of issue and no, we can't tolerate. In what we do, this is work that you will be scrutinized on. Full stop. We try to do a lot of work in the interview process at multiple layers, trying to make sure, we have not found the magic sauce on this yet, but make sure that particularly new students understand the work that they are signing up to do. This work of forensic laboratories is hard, enormously gratifying of enormous social impact, very few things have that level of social impact, but that comes with an enormous responsibility, and that is hard. It is also work that is hard on you. Twenty-six-year-old kid in CSU's been with us, I think three years, he has processed more than 240 homicides in three years. This work takes a toll and it is kind of a screening aspect in there. And I don't think there's really any way that a student can prepare themselves for the 24/7 full tilt, no filters nightmares that

crime labs are. Where we come in is where somebody left off and it wasn't in a good way. Nothing about what we do is kind or gentle. It is all brutal, violent and nightmarish. And getting them to understand that is what you will do is a little tricky. Helping them also see that they need to come into this with basically an escape plan. I talk with a lot of undergrads about, go get yourself just a general science degree, not a forensic science degree right off. Because if you come into a lab, spend a couple of years in the lab and realize this is more than you can handle, that gives you more latitude of someplace you can go than a forensic science degree is going to give you right off. Master's in forensic science? Terrific. There are very few things that are as gratifying and rewarding. What I'm trying to filter for is somebody who's really coming into it for the service aspect that is a service minded individual. That they understand this is something vastly bigger than themselves. And people that are wired up for that, they get that it does well, but people that don't quite get that yet, it can be really, I think, frankly, dangerous for them to get into it.

Matthew Gamette [00:17:40] Gabby, I think perhaps for your listeners, it might be interesting to hear how we hire. You know, for a student coming in, we open a job, gets posted on state website, on the city website, whatever it gets posted, you apply. You send us your transcripts, you send us your resumes. That's the first step. Like, if you don't provide that stuff, if you think, oh, I'm better, I don't need to provide me with the transcript. It's an auto fail. You're done. So provide everything we ask for. Do it in the way we ask for it. We're serious. It goes through our H.R. department. Second thing is, if we like you, you're on a roster of 200, 300, 400 people sometimes for one position. So you've got to make yourself stand out like Ray was talking about, because now we're selecting maybe 10, 20 to interview for that position, if you're lucky. So now you got to beat 10, 20 people out. I don't know of many programs that are doing an interview process with these students, but I can tell you it would be hugely beneficial to them because they're going to answer technical questions, they're going to answer personality questions, they're going to answer ethical questions, situational based questions. We craft these questions for months. We look at these with H.R. professionals, with others, you know, with our technical staff to make sure that they are geared towards the students that show best on an interview. So we're going to look at everything they've done in their background and polygraphs after we hire them. But if you can't even get into that process because you can't answer questions before an interview panel and we're not putting our slackers on the interview panels. We're putting our directors, we're putting our technical people, we're putting our best H.R. people on there to determine, do these people have the teeth to cut it? And then we offer to one, maybe two if you have fears that they may not get through a background process or something. So if you get to that point, you've been through that gauntlet of things, but we are purposefully throwing you into exercises, and if your answer to tell me what a GCMS is and how it functions and you just like, I have no idea, that's a problem, right? And if you are not prepared, both technically, ethically and otherwise, to answer those questions with examples, and in my situation, I - each question has a score. So question number one through ten, each question is weighted on a ten point scale. So you can blow your entire interview by not knowing what a what a GCMS is or you can blow your whole interview by not having good examples of an ethical dilemma that you've faced in college or in your life. Got to be prepared when you get to us and through that whole process.

Ray Wickenheiser [00:20:15] What I would want candidates to know is, consider us doing due diligence on the crime lab side. We're going to make a six-figure investment just in the training of you as a successful individual. We have a massive pool of candidates and what are we going to do to make sure we're going to select somebody that is worth that

investment? So you have to know the background check is going to be thorough. You have to know we're going to be looking for a lot of certain things. And then, unfortunately, I mean, that's just the way interviews go. You've got a snapshot of time of which you're going to have to verbally present yourself. And we're there taking those notes. We probably have a rubric of the certain things we're looking to see, and there's going to be a point score and there may be a razor margin between you and the other large number of candidates we're looking at so what can you do to prepare yourself? And it always amazes me how unprepared some candidates are when you consider how much of investment they have made in their schooling, how much of investment, as Matthew had said, blow it on a background of partying or some dumb decisions and it's heartbreaking that we have folks that otherwise would be great candidates and don't make it through a background check. Expect what kind of rigor that we're going to have to look for to make that kind of investment and over that person's career. Every one of our employees is a multi-million-dollar investment. You know, you don't get to work on these crime lab cases. You have to earn that. You've got to earn it by passing your training, by representing yourself as that individual that is unimpeachable in court. New York is a full discovery state. Everything is on the line in every single case or we can't move ahead with it. So there's a very high bar and we're going to do our due diligence and make sure the people coming in are up to the challenge. So for the students, recognize that this is arguably the best career that you can get. You're going to make a difference in people's lives. People that you will know you touch and many, many more that you do, you don't. Using science to help solve crimes and prevent crime. This is an incredibly rewarding - but hence, why do a lot of people want to do it? It's a great job but it's absolutely rigorous and that is our adversarial court system and that is science. You got the data there, but it's got to be unimpeachable. You have to be unimpeachable. Please prepare yourself and be ready for it. We don't want you to waste your time, but we certainly don't want you to waste our time either. So we want to absolutely hire the best candidates with the best chance for success, but really enhance your own chances by investing in yourself and not making those kind of rookie mistakes by limiting your own opportunities.

Gabby DiEmma [00:23:01] So this has all been a great discussion and I did want to circle back. So you gave some advice for students, but also what advice do you have for the professors and advisors that are working in these FEPAC accredited programs? How can they help make their students better for when they get to you?

Matthew Gamette [00:23:21] I want to take that first because this is what I'm passionate about and I know Ray is too, and he's going to jump in too. We have advocated so long for FEPAC accredited programs or other programs to network with us. These students have to be in the laboratory. We have to make ourselves available with internships and all kinds of programs to get these students with us. They have to do projects. They can't be washing dishes. They need to be working in the lab with our folks. You know, learning the disciplines, producing papers, going to these scientific conferences. They have to be integrated. And if we have universities that are developing programs to just essentially toss students over the fence at us, that's not going to work. We have to integrate with these programs. We have to be sending our folks to train these students in the university environment. They have to be sending them to us to be working on our instrumentation. It has to be a partnership, and I think there are those of us who want that to happen. Whether we do national training programs through the colleges or whatever we do, they have to be integrated.

Ray Wickenheiser [00:24:25] I hate that Matthew jumped ahead of me and grabbed those fantastic points, but I would absolutely not only endorse those, but add that I think it's

really absolutely incumbent on any university program to be relevant. And how can you be relevant? You have to be engaged with and connected with not just even one crime lab, but multiple crime labs. And as hard as it is to get internships, if folks can get those, that's great. But in the very least, your program has to have an involvement, engagement with forensic scientists to stay relevant. The research projects should absolutely be connected to and advised by forensic scientists so they can be relevant. And when you think of it from a student learning experience, if you're working on a relevant forensic science project that has been vetted and engaged with forensic scientists in the crime lab, and you're doing some kind of a validation of research that is using the same instrumentation and something that the lab is currently doing, or maybe even better yet, wants to get into, how marketable are you going to be that you've got some experience in validating the technology that this crime lab wants to do? So if you're a professor and I'm going to put in a plug here for the American Society of Crime Lab Directors Forensic Research Committee, you absolutely should be part of that network and making sure that you're delivering an education FEPAC ideally, but certainly absolutely connected to forensic labs, that these students are going to have the best chance of getting a job and becoming the better person that's going to beat the program that doesn't have the same connection. I'd love that we do more internships. It pains me that we can't but when we're busy work on backlogs, we can only take so many. But in the very least that your classes are relevant. But those research projects are a tremendous opportunity and then in turn presenting those so you get that public speaking opportunity and at the same time your networking that you're out there, scientists are there watching you and that you're connecting with those scientists and putting yourself out there and making those network connections at those meetings as well. That's a tremendous opportunity and to me, a responsibility of the program to make sure that their students are also having those same opportunities.

Matthew Gamette [00:26:36] To illustrate Ray's point, if Ray's scientist reaches out to one of my scientists and says, this student is worth taking. That speaks volumes for that student. Yeah, they're still going to go through the same process, but I guarantee you we're going to take them a lot more seriously when we see the experience and integration that they've already had through a university-lab partnership.

Ray Wickenheiser [00:26:55] And I would add that even though this is a big community, it's really not a big community. We all know each other and will know if there's a student coming out of a certain program and we'll reach out and nothing is more valuable than the recommendation of another scientist because we're putting our name on that person and the fact that they've got that experience is absolutely going to give them a leg up and hence would be highly recommended.

Peter Stout [00:27:22] Both what Ray and Matt are saying, very much agree with that, very much agree that it is a whole different thing. FEPAC programs that we work with that we hire a lot of people out of are ones that we've got a relationship with. So from the faculty standpoint, I've got a lot more confidence in some programs because I know the faculty, I know how they think and when they talk about a student, it means a whole different thing than the forensic science and screen doors program. I think what I might add is, you know, faculty are scrabbling around for tenure. They've got pressures from the university. It's not like they are pressure free and all the pressures in the crime labs, that is certainly not the case. They have their own suite of pressures that make it difficult to take that time. But that time is essential, I think, in trying to help these students understand what it is that they're gearing themselves to be in. Those faculty have years with these kids. I've got 5 minutes to try and convince them. Are you really sure you know what you're getting yourself into? No, it is hard to make those calls with a student that just really isn't

geared for this, but it's obvious through that program, please help coach that student go someplace else. You're not doing your program any help, any favors. You're not doing that student any favors. You certainly aren't doing any lab any favors that's going to end up with that student coming in and not being successful with that multimillion-dollar investment that we're going to make in them. And that's for any number of things from it's just somebody that isn't terribly meticulous or really gives a crap about detail. Warning. Somebody that for whatever reason, their personality just isn't one that's going to line up with the fact that they are going to deal with awful stuff for a career. Somebody who's maybe thinking about this that I'm in it for the money or in it for the attention. Help them understand there are probably better places for them.

Matthew Gamette [00:29:19] A couple of things I've been thinking about as these guys have been talking is Ray brought up that we're going to take on students where they have a professor behind the scenes helping them. We don't have time, my scientists don't have time to do research. So I think that's pretty universal across the community. Some people have research programs in their labs. Most of us don't. So we need help. A student has to come in with a relative project, meaning something that they need and Ray did a great job explaining that. But then the professor has to do the work with the student behind the scenes, helping them through their problems. Yeah, we're going to help provide some technical expertise, but that professor behind the scenes guiding directing, getting them to present at the scientific meeting. I mean, the Young Forensic Science Forum at the American Academy meeting. Fantastic. Because they evaluate how relative was their project, how related was it to a problem that the community is facing. That is so critical. But professors, pass them the applications. One of our newer employees I was talking to this morning and I said, how did you hear about us? You're from Pennsylvania. You came out to Idaho. How did you hear about us? And he said, you know, your H.R. staff reaches out to my professors and my professors pass us that information. That's the critical thing. The professors are willing to give them the information to be successful. But then the other key point here for the professors in the schools and I know FEPAC schools know this, but anybody who else who's listening to this, you've got to make sure you meet the minimum qualifications. If there is not a molecular biology class in their curriculum and they're applying for a biology opening, it's not going to work. Again, it's an automatic auto fail. They have to have genetics, molecular biology, statistics. Look at that course outline that we have to abide by per FBI, per federal law. We can't get around it. If you don't have enough chemistry hours, if you don't have enough, whatever it is to meet our minimum qualifications and they're different and they'll probably get better as we get more standardized through education and training, through OSAC programs and things. But right now, there is an all a carte menu of you have to have these things to even put in an application with us. And if the school is not meeting that by the curriculum that they develop, they have to modify that program. You have to modify that degree to meet our minimum qualifications.

Ray Wickenheiser [00:31:34] What I really think is good advice, not only for the program but for the student, start looking at job requirements, looking at the ads for jobs before you even go into forensic science. So you'll look what the ads are. You look what those very requirements are. You look where the jobs are. And you look at what you're going to be doing. You look at what the expectations are. And frankly, you also look at what the pay and benefits are. And this is not the most high paying job out there. I don't know of anybody who went into forensic science for the money. You go into it because you love this job and those are the kinds of people that we're looking for. We're looking for the people who really, really want to be forensic scientists, because as Peter had said really quite aptly, this is a very, very challenging career. But I would say it's it's arguably the most

or one of the most enjoyable careers if you're cut from the cloth, that's going to make this kind of career. So absolutely, you measuring up and having a look at what it's going to take early, the fact that you're preparing yourself to take those right classes, to do all those things that set yourself up for success and knowing where to go for those jobs. The other thing I would throw in is that when you consider I think we've got somewhere in the neighborhood of 208 or so DNA labs, maybe 400 or so crime labs, if you look at sort of the multi discipline labs, that's not a lot of labs right across the US. The chances of you finding that job right close to your hometown is really limiting your opportunities and sometimes you have to go a distance. Don't limit yourself by location.

Peter Stout [00:33:13] When we bid for faculty, program chairs, deans, please have something in your curriculum that is obviously statistics and clearly labeled as statistics. Don't make us guess at what's in that class. And I emphasize, I mean Matt mentioned statistics almost in passing there. Again, where we are seeing everything head in forensics is towards more probabilistic reporting. In Texas, part of the licensure requirements is a class in statistics. It is going to be something that you have to have - are going to have to have in order to qualify. But we've noticed in a lot of different programs, it can be a little challenging to try and figure out what actually was statistics. So for those that are in charge of what the label is on the class, please call it statistics.

Gabby DiEmma [00:34:05] That's great. Everything you guys have said has been so important, and I'm glad we got to as much as we did. I really wish we had more time but I think you guys have covered so much in in the time that we did have and I want to thank you all for coming on the podcast, taking the time to have these important conversations.

Matthew Gamette [00:34:24] Well, we appreciate it. I appreciate it.

Ray Wickenheiser [00:34:26] Appreciate y'all.

Gabby DiEmma [00:34:27] If you enjoyed today's episode, be sure to like and follow Just Science on your platform of choice. For more information on today's topic and resources in the forensics field, visit ForensicCOE.org. I'm Gabby DiEmma, and this has been another episode of Just Science.

Voiceover [00:34:44] This concludes our 2022 Strengthening the Forensic Workforce Season. Tune in for the next season of Just Science, which will cover conviction integrity through forensics. Opinions or points of views expressed in this podcast represent a consensus of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of its funding.