**Mini Review**
Volume 14:03, 2023

Journal of Forensic Research

ISSN: 2157-7145 Open Access

# Senior Practitioners Preferences for Employment and Progression in the Field of Forensic Science were polled

**Barry Logan***

*Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece*

## Abstract

In the present climate in the field of scientific science where nonstop progressions in innovation and logical methodologies are the standard, the requirement for criminological professionals with more particular and subject-explicit information is basic. An up-to-date survey regarding the preferred educational requirements for entry-level applicants by senior practitioners, directors of crime laboratories, and managers was carried out. In order to prepare the next generation of forensic scientists while maintaining a solid foundation in the natural sciences at the undergraduate level, the results highlighted a preference for specialized coursework within specific disciplines. Experts, paying little heed to train, are looking for candidates with openness to cutting edge educational plan content notwithstanding refined proficient abilities and decisive reasoning capacities. According to the current accreditation guidelines, the needs of employers of crime laboratories have changed, shifting from a general, broad-based criminalistics curriculum to a focused, subject-matter-rich curriculum with additional management and professional content.

**Keywords:** Forensic science • Undergraduate education • Graduate education • Laboratory survey • Educational requirements

## Introduction

Practitioners and educators have worked together for a long time to encourage the ongoing development of the ever-evolving field of forensic science. It is common knowledge that high educational standards are necessary for developing a capable workforce of scientists, managers, and supervisors to serve the criminal justice sector. In the early 2000s, the media's glamorization of the field and the popularity of forensic television shows coincided with an increase in the number of forensic science degree programs offered by academic institutions. At first, without a trace of rules or certifying bodies, scholarly establishments could assign anything a measurable science certification, even without a trace of establishment in inherent sciences. In 2009, the Public Foundation of Sciences (NAS) report proposed an update of undergrad and graduate projects in legal science to address the current lacks in the perception of logical standards and techniques. Accordingly, the scientific instruction local area has kept on creating undergrad and graduate program contributions [1].

In the United States and Canada, 90 academic institutions with forensic science majors and 147 criminology majors were found in a search of the Princeton Review. However, a more in-depth examination of these programs' curricula reveals that, despite the NAS report, many "forensic science" programs still place an emphasis on criminal justice courses over a solid foundation in the natural sciences. Academic programs that do not adequately prepare graduates for careers in forensic science have spread as a result of a lack of strong practitioner involvement in many of these new programs. Sadly, the gullibility of approaching understudies about the field makes it challenging for them to evaluate the qualities and shortcomings of projects advertised [2].

***Address for Correspondence:** Barry Logan, Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece, E-mail: loganbarry@gmail.com*



**Received:** 02 June, 2023, Manuscript No. jfr-23-95607; **Editor assigned:** 05 June, 2023, PreQC No. P-95607; **Reviewed:** 16 June, 2023, QC No. Q-95607; **Revised:** 21 June, 2023, Manuscript No. R-95607; **Published:** 28 June, 2023, DOI: 10.37421/2157-7145.2023.14.548

## Literature Review

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) established the Technical Working Group on Education and Training in Forensic Science (TWGED) in 1999, a decade before the NAS report was published. The collected gathering of legal science teachers, research facility chiefs, and coaches were answerable for creating techniques to meet the instructive necessities of the field satisfactorily. The basis for supporting entry into a career in the field of criminalistics was specifically addressed in a comprehensive report that included curricular recommendations for both undergraduate and graduate degree programs. A natural science core was included in the sample curriculum for undergraduate degrees in forensic science, and forensic science-specific courses were added, recommending a minimum of 46 and 15 credit hours, respectively. Graduate degree programs were not recommended in the same way. Instead, a general list of topics from various fields was provided [3].

To establish a foundation for the accreditation of forensic science degree programs, the Forensic Education Programs Accreditation Commission (FEPAC), which was established under the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS), adopted the TWGED recommendations in 2001. At the hour of distribution, 28 lone rangers' in legal science projects and 21 experts' in criminological science programs have been authorize by FEPAC. Although the TWGED's recommendations and the formation of FEPAC were significant steps toward standardizing forensic science education requirements, only a small number of degree programs are eligible for this distinction. Currently, programs that take a generalist approach—that is, programs that require a broad spectrum, multidisciplinary curriculum—can apply for FEPAC accreditation and review. Students are taught a variety of principles that can be applied to a wide range of career options through these programs. In contrast, specialized academic programs aim to produce subject-matter experts in a narrow field by concentrating on a specific topic or field [4].

A third-party individual solicited responses for the electronic survey that was conducted with the help of SurveyMonkey®. Members approached the study between October 2018 and December 2018. Emails were sent out to members of the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors (ASCLD) via their weekly Crime Lab Minute to recruit participants. There is no way to determine the total number of people who received the link to participate because the community directors and leaders who received it passed it on to senior hiring managers from industry and research organizations. There

were no printed copies of the survey distributed. The goal of the survey was to get information from crime laboratory directors and senior practitioners about the educational requirements of applicants for entry-level forensic scientist positions [5].

Institutions are permitted by the FEPAC guidelines to provide students with the option to "track select" a concentration; allowing students to take elective classes in a particular field. However, when specifically examining FEPAC-accredited graduate programs, the degree designation and, as a result, the majority of the curriculum (half of the required credits) are still made up of a wide range of generalist courses, preventing a true depth of coverage in a particular field that is uncommon at the graduate level. There is currently no active accrediting body for any other specialized graduate programs, possibly with the exception of digital forensics. While a general comprehension of measurable science as a multidisciplinary try is basic, the working model for the act of scientific science keeps on developing from generalist to subject matter expert. However, there is a growing gap between the general academic preparedness that provides a basic understanding of a variety of topics and the requirement for new hires in the practitioner community to have a much greater depth of knowledge in specific disciplines [6].

## Discussion

Throughout the course of recent many years, numerous surveys of scientific science schooling and degree program contributions have been distributed. In 1988, surveys aimed at strictly practitioners were carried out. The agreement view was that a four year education in science's (BS) in science was the best instructive foundation for an effective profession in legal science, noticing that a BS in measurable science as often as possible coming up short on yet fundamental logical information basic to understanding scientific testing procedures. The varying requirements for bachelor's and master's degrees have become more apparent as the number of institutions offering forensic science programs has grown [7].

In order to better strengthen academic programs to meet these expectations and better prepare the incoming workforce for a successful career in the profession, the purpose of this study was to collect information from the employers' perspective on the most desirable educational qualifications and skill sets of applicants for entry-level forensic science jobs across a variety of disciplines. In addition, the study's findings explain how educational programs should deal with current emerging issues that go beyond the topics originally considered by TWGED. Last but not least, we offer suggestions for enhancing accreditation procedures and establishing criteria for recognizing programs that are tailored to the requirements outlined by management professionals hiring future forensic scientists [8].

For applicants seeking entry-level positions in drug chemistry, toxicology, and serology/DNA, participants were asked to provide their preferred number of credits for various courses. Following a conventional semester-based model, members were permitted to choose 0 credits (no courses suggested), 3 credits (42 contact hours), 6 credits (84 contact hours), or 9 credits (126 contact hours) for each topic recorded. The courses that were included in the questions were representative of the forensic science courses offered by undergraduate and graduate degree programs, both accredited and non-accredited. The responses were compared to the minimum levels of education needed to work in each of these fields. For drug chemistry, references were made to the SWGDRUG Recommendations of the Scientific Working Group for the Analysis of Seized Drugs. For toxicology, references were made to the SWGTOX Standard for Laboratory Personnel of the Scientific Working Group for Forensic Toxicology. For serology and DNA analysis, the FBI's Quality Assurance Standards were used as a reference [9].

With ceaseless improvements in innovation and logical methodologies driving changes and setting out new open doors in the act of legal science, the requirement for experts with further developed and top to bottom information is plainly required. While there actually might be a spot in the calling for the valid "generalist" (e.g., little wrongdoing research centers, heritage labs with old pros), the present profoundly specialized, remotely directed, ISO licensed climate and the intricacy of declaration requests steadily expanding levels of mastery and specialization. Measurable science teachers play a part to play in guaranteeing that the necessities of the calling are heard and reflected in graduate level curricular prerequisites. However, it is necessary to maintain the distinction between education and training. Academic specialization is different from awareness and training on how to complete job-specific tasks without understanding why, which requires a greater depth of understanding and critical thinking within a particular discipline [10].

## Conclusion

Academics ought to take seriously regular updates from the practitioner community regarding the most desirable qualifications for new hires. Trends in responses from the profession ought to play a role in determining the direction that educational programs in forensic science will take in the future. This will make sure that a stronger workforce is prepared to face the challenges of the rapidly evolving field that is modern forensic practice. The responses to this survey indicate that graduate-level specialized education is crucial to the training of the next generation of forensic scientists.

## Acknowledgement

None.

## Conflict of Interest

None.

## References

1. Kalafut, Tim, Simone Pugh, Peter Gill and Sarah Abbas, et al. "A mixed DNA profile controversy revisited." *J Forensic Sci* 67 (2022): 128-135.
2. Thompson, William C., Laurence Mueller and Dan Krane. "Forensic DNA statistics: Still controversial in some cases." *The Champion* 36 (2012): 12-23.
3. Torres, Yolanda, Inmaculada Flores, Victoria Prieto and Manuel López-Soto, et al. "DNA mixtures in forensic casework: A 4-year retrospective study." *Forensic Sci Int* 134 (2003): 180-186.
4. Bieber, Frederick R., John S. Buckleton, Bruce Budowle and John M. Butler, et al. "Evaluation of forensic DNA mixture evidence: protocol for evaluation, interpretation, and statistical calculations using the combined probability of inclusion." *BMC Genetics* 17 (2016): 1-15.
5. Gill, Peter, Charles H. Brenner, John S. Buckleton and Angel Carracedo, et al. "DNA commission of the International Society of Forensic Genetics: Recommendations on the interpretation of mixtures." *Forensic Sci Int* 160 (2006): 90-101.
6. Ladd, Carll, Henry C. Lee, Nicholas Yang and Frederick R. Bieber. "Interpretation of complex forensic DNA mixtures." *Croatian Med J* 42 (2001): 244-246.
7. Al-Azem, M., A. El Andari, and I. Mansour. "Estimation of allele and haplotype frequencies for 23 YSTR markers in the Lebanese population." *Forensic Res Criminol Int J* 5 (2017): 00150.
8. El Andari, Ansar, Lama Mourad and Issam Mansour. "Genetic variations and population data on five supplementary STR markers in Lebanon." *Ann Hum Genet* 83 (2019): 82-85.
9. El Andari, Ansar, Hiba Othman, Franco Taroni and Issam Mansour. "Population genetic data for 23 STR markers from Lebanon." *Forensic Sci Int: Genet* 7 (2013): e108-e113.
10. Hicks, Tacha, ane Kerr, Simone Pugh and Jo-Anne Bright, et al. "Comparing multiple POI to DNA mixtures." *Forensic Sci Int: Genet* 52 (2021): 102481.

**How to cite this article:** Logan, Barry. "Senior Practitioners Preferences for Employment and Progression in the Field of Forensic Science were polled." *J Forensic Res* 14 (2023): 548.