Episode 87: Stuart Buck

# KL: Katie Linder

# SB: Stuart Buck

# KL: You’re listening to “Research in Action”: episode eighty-seven.

# [intro music]

# Segment 1:

# KL: Welcome to “Research in Action,” a weekly podcast where you can hear about topics and issues related to research in higher education from experts across a range of disciplines. I’m your host, Dr. Katie Linder, director of research at Oregon State University Ecampus. Along with every episode, we post show notes with links to resources mentioned in the episode, full transcript, and an instructor guide for incorporating the episode into your courses. Check out the shows website at ecampus.oregonstate.edu/podcast to find all of these resources.

On this episode, I am joined by Dr. Stuart Buck. As the vice president of research at the Laural and John Arnold foundation. Stuart works to insure that research founded by the foundation is as rigorous as possible. And that the foundations major investments are evaluated by independent experts. An attorney and research expert with a background in education policy, Stuart has written and co-written numerous scholarly articles that have appeared in journals such as Science, Harvard Law Review, Education economics, Education Next, and The Review of public personal and administration. Stuart has testified before the U.S. commission on civil rights. And has been a panelist at major academic conferences including The Association for Education finance and policy, The Association for analysis and management and the Harvard program on education policy and governance. He is the author of a Yale University press book on education in the African American community, “Acting White”. Stuart holds a PhD in education policy for the University of Arkansas, where he studied econometrics, statistics and program evaluation. A JD with honors from Harvard Law School, where he was an editor of the Harvard law review. And bachelors and master’s degrees in music performance from the University of Georgia.

Thanks so much for joining me today Stuart!

**SB:** Thanks, I am happy to be here.

**KL**: So I would love to hear a little bit more about how you came to work for a foundation. What was your path way to working with the Arnold foundation?

**SB**: Sure, so I have been with the Laural and John Foundation for about five and a half years. Prior to the foundation I kind of had a torturous path. I went to undergrad studied music, then realized there wasn’t much of a future as a classical music performer. So then I went to law school, graduated, practiced law for a few years then realized like many of my fellow lawyers I wasn’t terribly happy with the billing hours and so took a different direction and was considering going into academia. So I did a PhD in education policy. And as I was finishing that up I had a colleague who went to go work for the Laural and John foundation, which was then fairly new it had just started up. And really just because of my connection and friendship with my colleague. When he went down to Houston to work for the foundation, he recommended that I apply for a position that was then called director of research that had just opened up. And so I took a look at it and decided to come here rather than pursuing the academic path way. And so I have been here ever since.

**KL**: Okay so I feel like for the sake of our listeners and I am just curious as well. Um you have pursued two pretty time intensive degrees, your JD and your PhD. And I am wondering if you can talk about how you decided to go back for the PhD. Especially after you already had the JD you had been working with that. What led you to decide, “Okay I think I need to go back and get some more credentialing here”?

**SB**: Right, I guess it just kind of was the recovering lawyer pathway. I have quite a few classmates from Harvard law school where I went. Who try practicing law for a while who actually end up in politics or academia or investment banking or doing something completely different than practicing law. So I think law school for a lot of people I in our society is sometimes a kind fall back graduate degree for liberal arts majors, who can’t think of anything else to do quite frankly. So that quite honestly was the case for me and so after a few years of practicing law, I just decided that I had enough and didn’t foresee doing this the rest of my life so um you know just had to figure out what to do next.

**KL**: Well I always think it is very interesting when we had guest on this show who have done kind of these different career shifts. And who have moved around in these different areas because, academics are starting to do this more and more as well. I know we have a lot of academics in our audience. So tell us a little bit more about the research related work that you are doing for the Arnold Foundation. Since we always like to hear different career paths that researchers are engaging in. So what does that look like for you?

**SB**: Sure well maybe first I should say a little bit about what kind of research related work the Arnold foundation does in general. So the Arnold foundation, we are very interested in public policy related issues, issues that relate to dysfunction in society or inequities or inefficiency. And how public policy is formulated and implemented. So that’s kind of abstract so like to give you an example. We are very interested in the criminal justice system and criminal justice reform. We feel that there is probably too much incarceration, that there is over use of detaining people in jail prior to trail when they haven’t even been found guilty yet. And that too much decision making through-out the system is effected by bias and just inequities and the patterns of decision making. And so we are very interested in supporting the use of data, evidence and research within the criminal justice system to help shed light and bad practices and help improve decision making in the criminal justice system. So the kind of research and evidence we’ve supported in that area is geared towards policy change and action to try to improve the criminal justice system. And we are also interested in a number of other policy areas education system is one, the health care system is another where we see inefficiencies both in who is covered and how much everything costs. We are interested in pharmaceutical pricing, we are interested in the practice of research and science in general and whether that’s generating accurate information. We are interested just in the operation of government and whether the public programs we support as tax dollars everything from food stamps which are now called snap, to welfare and different services or in fact achieving the outcomes they could be achieving. We are interested in generating evidence in research, as to how public programs can be best targeted to who needs the most help and how they can be run in a way that is actually most effective. So through all of the types of issues we are interested in research, data, evidence is the consistence theme as to where we want to put the dollars we invest. Because we…again its part of our general philosophy. We think there is just too much reliance on intuition, antidote and heartwarming stories or sometimes scary stories (about the criminal who was let out of jail). And we think that a public policy across all these systems would be better if it was based more on research, data, evidence, etc. And so in many ways we have tried to sponsor such research ourselves, by directly funding academics at universities. And we have also funded efforts to bring the practice and the use of research more closely into the heart of government. So for example we fund the Houston Education Research consortium at Rice University, which is a partnership between some academics sociologist and economists at Rice University. Partnership between them and the Houston school district. So then work hand and hand to develop a research agenda around everything for literacy programs or college and career consoling programs that are used in the Houston school district. To try to improve the practice of those and to try to make sure what the school district is doing is actually helping kids the way they think. And so it’s really a part of it is the partnership between researchers and policy makers. To try to improve policy over time through generating research evidence about what works and for him it works best. So in my role as vice president of research, I know that was a long intro to my role. My role as vice president of research I try to help supervise and advise the foundation board and the team members. On how to make effective research investments. So starting with developing a broader research agenda up front and giving advice to team members on developing research proposals from specific academic or academics and partnership with government. Looking for what’s most rigorous and what’s most likely to help be informative on what public policy can be improved and made more effective. And I just advise the team members and the board on research generally and how to a sponsor research that has the greatest likely hood of being rigorous effective and having impact.

**KL**: We are going to take a brief break. When we come back we will hear a little bit more for Stuart about his work promoting research and integrity. Back in a moment.

[Music Plays]

# Segment 2:

**KL**: Stuart I know you have made a recent transition in our role, but for quite some time you were really focused on promoting research integrity with your work with the Arnold foundation. I wonder if you can talk a little bit about this scholar scope of that work when that was kind of the heavy part that you are working on in terms of promoting research integrity.

**SB**: Sure um so for a few years my title was Vice President of research integrity, rather than Vice president of research. And so in that role which lasted up until about the beginning of July this year. I was more focused on external grant making with the purpose of trying to improve the practice of research out in the world. You know trying to improve science, trying to improve social science, science medicine, etc. And so that’s what I was doing for a number of years and in that role I think it was aimed at a number of concerns that we at the Arnold foundation have had about how research is practiced generally. I think the phenomenon of publication biased, is something that caught our eye back in 2012. We read a number of publication and books on it. And publication biased for anyone who hasn’t heard of it is the phenomenon that some types of articles and finding seem to be more likely to get published in respected or top journals than others. The ones that are more likely to get published are those that seem to have some sort of positive and or exciting or surprising or noteworthy finding. And that makes a lot of sense as to why our publication system would favor those types of articles. But at the same time it can introduce bias to the system. So take medicine as an example there are a number of cases were for example there will be six clinical trials done on a particular anti-depressant and one of them showed positive results and the others showed mixed or null results. And that pharmaceutical company that is manufacturing this anti-depressant published the positive exciting results about the anti-depressant effect and the others went unpublished. And so when that happens it leaves the literature in a state where you are seeing kind of a biased sub set of what has actually been done, what research has actually been done. And it leaves you with a misleading picture in that case how effective that anti-depressant actually is. And so that phenomenon of publication bias has been demonstrated in many different fields pretty much ever field we have ever looked at. From psychology to neuroscience to economics, political science, as I mentioned medicine, pretty much every field we have had an occasion to look at. And so that gave us a little bit of heart burn when we came across this in as I say back in 2012. Because as I said earlier we as a foundation want to generate evidence, and data and research to support more effective public policies and we want the decisions or the grant making that we are self-engaged in to be informed by research, data and evidence. But if it turns out when you look at the published literature you are only seeing the tip of the ice burg, and you are seeing the findings that someone thought were noteworthy or exciting enough to publish; and you are missing out on the rest of the findings that got stuck in the file drawer. And that’s a related term “file drawer biased” term that came about in the late 70’s. So if you are not seeing those publications or the articles that ended up in the file drawer, then you are left with a miss leading picture of what is most effective in education or what is most effective in criminal justice or any of the other areas you are interested in. And so it kind of shatters your belief and the possibility of basing decisions on evidence and research if you realized that the research we see is only a selected cherry picked sample in some way of the research that actually exists. And so that’s just publication biased it has even further ramifications. If everyone knows that journals are more likely to publish positive, exciting results in any given field then that in turn can buy us the practices of researchers. In the questions they chose to address or in the way they collect data, or the way they analyze data. And it can do those in unconscious and subtle hard to detect ways. I mean it’s not that ever one is out there manipulating finding and committing fraud that certainly occurs a same portion of the time. But the vast majority of people in research and in science are good. But it can introduce biased that is again harder to detect and can be unconscious because I think we as human beings are effected by many cognitive biases and when you look at data and try to find the most compelling and exciting, interesting story to be told from that data it is very easy for all of us to convince ourselves at the end of a research project we did and indeed find the best way to interpret and analysis that data that tells the most compelling story. And yet all the decisions all the tens or hundreds of decisions that are made along the way on how to interpret or analyze that data. Can be subtly effected to our own unconscious desire to craft to the most compelling article in the end. And so that introduces yet another level of bias, right so you have publication bias, and then you have kind of the researcher induced bias that leads up to publication and once again it leaves you a little dis-hearted. Knowing what you can trust in the world of research. Again not because of any deliberate malfeasance on anyone’s part, but because of all the unconscious biases that are there. And so I think one practice that we have tried to encourage and we wish other would encourage it especially federal funders, is the practice of replication. Because I think it is a traditional value of the scientific method that the result is most likely to be true when it can be successfully replicated by independent researchers, and it is not just an artifact of the one person that did it the first time. And so we sponsored a reproducibility project in psychology that’s what it was called. And they went out and replicated a 100 psychology findings that had been published in a handful of top journals in a set of recent years. And this massive project of replicating a 100 experiments was published in science in 2015, and got a lot of attention because they found no matter how you define replication (there are a number of ways to refine it). It looked like only around 30-40 percent of the 100 psychology findings could definitively be replicated. The rest where either kind of too mixed to really say it had been replicated or you could say you know it had definitely not been replicated. And so that gives kind of a systematic look at what happens as a result of publication biased. We are left in a position where only 40 percent of the literature could really be pointing in the right direction. Um that said I should clarify it is not necessarily the other 60 percent of the studies are totally wrong and never show have been published in the first place. It might be that many or most of those non-replications are occurring because the world is more complex than we originally thought. And so maybe some of those original psychology findings maybe something else was going on and when you try to replica them there is some hidden or unknown factor that changed. And you aren’t even aware of it because no one thinks to measure that kind of aspect of the time or the circumstances or the context of the experiment. And so maybe it sheds light on the fact that we need to be doing more close document of the context and the multiple factors that are going on in an experiment. And trying to really understand the role as it is and maybe some of our articles are simplifying things too much and not repording the full details of what occurred, or the full methods, or the full context. And so – I. Either case though, I think that when not enough findings can be successfully replicated, then that’s an indication either that the original findigns we unduly effected by bias in a number of ways, or that we simply don’t understand enough about the phenomenon or we don’t understand it as much as we thought, because if someone who diligently tries to replicate it cannot do so, then there must be something else going on. So I think those kinds of project can help shed light on how to improve practices of scientific research so that when we have a set of findings in the literature, you can truly take them as replicable and build upon them and extend them and build a body of knowledge that doesn’t, you know, kind of get misdirected and/or dissipated when you try to replicate something that came before.

**KL:** I’m so glad you’ve brought up that study. I do remember reading it in 2015 and I’m feeling a little bit relieved to say, which may be kind of a strange reaction to have to that study, but I think that so much of research culture is to do studies quickly and then to move onto the next thing as quickly as possible so you can be funded for doing something unique, or you know, there’s so many trends that we’re trying to keep up with and all these things, and it can feel really manic. In terms of kind of constantly moving on with our research. But I felt like what the study really showed was, It’s okay to slow down. You can replicate things. You don’t always have to be looking at something completely new and unique. You know? Like sometimes we just need to look at things from slightly different angles so we can solidify what is is that we really know about a particular outcome of a study. And I felt a sense of relief, because I felt like that study really did show that we can take our time with some of this stuff to really make sure that we’re not just putting out results that are – some would consider definitive, when they’re really not. So I appreciate it very much. Thank you for doing that study!

**SB:** Yeah! Thanks! And you make a great point just about the incentive created by – both by journal, and by funders, and the entire academic system, to just rush through and publish or perish, or generate lots of quantity, without valuing being slow and deliberate and careful and replicating, you know, when something deserves to be replicated, and telling the entire messy story of how the research was conducted and how the findings were. As opposed to the kind of nice, clean, tidy story in which everything was perfect and your hypothesis was as predicted. You know, everything looks clean and there’s nothing complicated about it. I mean I think it’s – that often times isn’t the case. And I think, you know, I think the incentives that are being created by the funding and academic system often give short drift to the kind of slower, more methodical, more mundane work of replication. Of just like carefully documenting everything in a study rather than just the most exciting story that can be generated from it. And I do want to say that it’s understandable that we have that kind of incentive system in play. So someone who genuinely discovers a genetic link to a specific kind of cancer, and leading the way to a possible test, or even a drug targeting that gene – like that is more exciting than someone who writes an article saying, “Well I tested a gene for his particular kind of cancer, and it turned out there’s no connection and you can never treat it.” like it’s more exciting to hear about a possible pathway forward. But in the pursuit of the next exciting positive results, I think we have to be willing to test lots of things that may or may not work, that may be messier or harder to interpret, and that may be more in the pursuit of the kind of careful practice of replication, as opposed to just generating a bunch of isolated one-off studies that you can get funded, and then maybe published and move on quickly to the next thing. As you said.

**KL:** Mhm. Well, I completely agree. We’re going to take another brief break. When we come back we’ll hear a little but more from Stuart about the Arnold Foundation’s work with the Criminal Justice System. Back in a moment.

# Segment 3:

**KL:** Stuart, I’m wondering if you could tell me a little bit more about the Arnold Foundation’s work to increase the data and evidence in the Criminal Justice System? Because I know this is an area that you’ve been really focusing on. Um what is that all about?

**SB:** Sure. So this effort really began five or six years ago with the criminal justice team here, who realized that we have a problem in this country. That people are arrested every day, by the thousands, and they’re taken before a judge, or magistrate, you know, depending on the jurisdiction. Depending on the terms made for – and that person makes a snap-instant decision. Often in 30 seconds. And a snap-instant decision is, “the guy before me, is he dangerous?” or “Can I let him loose?” And if he’s dangerous, or looks like he’s going to flee, I’m going to hold him in jail even if he’s not guilty, or hasn’t been found guilty yet, or I’m going to set a really high bail. But for people who can maybe go free, I might even let them go free, or I’ll set a low bail at a thousand dollars, five thousand dollars. Something like that. And the problem with that is number one, judges, like all humans, can be very biased in making these kinds of instantaneous decisions. And the second problem is sometimes there are kind of counterintuitive and perverse results, and that someone who is very poor, you know, doesn’t have a lot of family resources to fall back on; they have trouble even coming up with the $1,000 to make bail. And so that person ends up in jail possibly for an extended period of time, and if he had a minimum wage job then he ends up even losing that because he didn’t show up, and it leads to a downward spiral of bad consequences for this person who has not yet been judged guilty of anything, whereas sometimes the – frankly more dangerous criminals who have access to lots more resources, can find a way to get out of jail because they can pay the bail. And so you end up with more possibly dangerous people on the street, and more harmless people whose only crime was a jaywalking – to exaggerate a little bit – being held in jail. And so the effort at the Arnold Foundation was, as it began five/six years ago, was to collect a bunch of pre-trial data sets. So the data sets on these people who were arrested, and then what happens to them before they get the benefit of a trial or some other disposition of their case. And just to try to investigate, use data, and research, and analysis to try and figure out what defendants are in fact more likely to be dangerous, or more likely to flee the jurisdiction and never come back, and which defendants are more likely to be safe. And so we created what was called, or what is called the Public Safety Assessment or the PSA, and it’s a tool that is again based on data, that has a number of predictive factors that can be used to rate defenders from one to six. You know, very kind of simple metric, one to six. Who’s the most dangerous and likely to flee? And the factors are kind of intuitive; what you would expect. So if a defendant has fled prior to trial one, two or three times before, then that is highly predictive in the data of whether that person will flee again. Um and, you know, there are other predictors that also make sense about whether the person is likely to commit anew violent crime if you let them go. And those predictors include things like have they been convicted of a violent crime before? So in a way it depends- the tool involves data and results that are kind of intuitive, but yet it puts a little more of an objective framework around these decisions. And so the use of this tool is that it’s applied to judges, and the algorithm just basically runs, you know, pretty much instantaneously on a defendant, and his criminal history, and what’s going on in a particular case and the judge can see, you know, “What’s the rating? What’s the recommendation to do for any particular defendant that’s in front of me?” And the judge still has the right to make the final decision of course. It’s the judge’s purgative. It’s in no way trying to replace the judge with a computer or with an algorithm. It’s just intended to kind of bring the greater use of research and evidence to help inform that judge’s decision, so it’s not based on, “Well do I like the way he looks?” or some sort of other relevant factor, or bias factor that can often affect the way people make decisions. And so that tool, The PSA tool, is now in use across entire states like Kentucky, Arizona and New Jersey. It’s also in use in a number of cities like Charlotte, Pittsburg, and others. And there’s a tremendous number, over 600 other jurisdictions from around the country that have expressed interest in using it. And so that’s been the results of one of our efforts, to use research, and data, and evidence to try to improve practices. But there’s a whole separate research- or forthcoming research agenda. So now that we put this into practice in a number of states and jurisdictions, we want to see whether it works. Right? I mean we hope it works. Cross our fingers, hope it works. But we don’t know, and we don’t want to be implementing something that in fact just doesn’t make much difference, or possibly makes things worse. I mean it wouldn’t be the first time that somebody came up with a great Idea and it turns out it made things worse somehow. So we have some research projects that are ongoing in a number of jurisdictions just to try to see what are the patterns of judicial decisions making over time? And then what are the effects on how defendants are treated and what happens when they’re released from jail prior to trail? And our hope is that the former gathering and editing of data shows that judicial decision making is indeed improving over time in these places, but again that’s something where we’ll just have to wait and see. It takes time for all these cases to roll in, and for these results to show up. I mean criminal justice cases can take a long time to unfold. Sometimes someone will be arrested today and his trial won’t be for six months, you know. You can’t know today whether he was in fact safe for release, you have to wait the six months to actually see what happened, and then you’ll have to wait for enough of a sample to accrue. And so there’s a lot of factors going on here. It’s going to take a while, but we hope that through the greater use of research, data, evidence, etc. that judicial decision making can be improved, and if it doesn’t work than we’ll have to keep going back and iterating and trying again, because it’s hard for me to believe that’s there no way to improve upon the traditional judicial decision making system in which a judge has, you know, sometimes 30 seconds and just a quick glance of the defendant to decide, “Is that person dangerous?” That seems like that can’t be – that can’t be the best possible way to make decisions.

**KL:** So it seems to me that the criminal justice system, it could be one of the most prominent places where you might see decisions being made based on unconscious bias, um and I think about juries, and you’ve mentioned judges here, and I’m sure there are plenty of other places where we might see this happening as well. So I’m wondering if you could talk a little bit about when you’re working within this criminal justice system, and you’re thinking about where to make the most change, like where can your efforts really make the most difference, how are you deciding where to put those research efforts/ because it seems like there can actually be a number of places where you can put those efforts, and you mentioned a team that’s kind of working on this. Can you give any insight as to how you’re deciding maybe where to direct that attention?

**SB:** Well, I mean, I think we’ve put a lot of eggs in the pre-trial basket up ‘til now. I do think the team that we have wants to expand – or have much more expansive research agenda around the aspects of the criminal justice system. We have done some additional research on, or it’s ongoing, on body-worn cameras. So that become sort of a political issue in the fairly recent passed, you know, two or three years ago. And police departments started spending a lot of money on body worn cameras for police, and we were interested in that because we saw, okay there’s this trend that’s happening. And there’s no evidence really, at that point in time, as to what actually happens when you put on body-worn cameras. I mean, it’s very plausible that you could document more cases of police abuse when those occur, and possibly reduce the case of police abuse because the police are afraid of being documented on camera. However, it’s possible that if you give police the ability to shut off the cameras - which makes sense, I mean police use the restroom, they do things that don’t need to be on camera- uh that the rate of police abuse will continue to occur or to rise. It’s also possible that citizens who interact with the police may have different opinions about whether they’re being filmed. They may interact differently and we just don’t know what the exact effects will be, or if the body cameras will even be implemented as they’re intended. I remember a case that happened just recently where somebody accidentally left on his body-worn camera and it caught him planting drugs – in someone’s, you know, next to someone’s yard. And so that’s an interesting case, but that, it was definitely an accident that it occurred. I mean normally the police who know they’re being filmed would take care to, to accidently, leave they’re camera in the car at that point. So anyway, there’s just a number of reasons to worry that- well we’ve spent all this money and its jurisdictions and police departments on this thing that’s supposed to have all of these great affects, and maybe it’s that we’re being fooled into thinking that it will prevent the effects, or that it will cure the problem. And so maybe there are other things that we should be doing to improve the effectiveness or to – you know maybe something else altogether. So that’s a whole ‘another area of research, but I know there’s much more that the criminal justice team is starting to think about in terms of research in the criminal justice system. And so there’s lots of areas of improvement to be made.

**KL:** Well it sounds like you all are just scratching the surface. Thank you so much for sharing about your most recent projects. And Stuart, I want to thank you so much for coming on the show and sharing your experience working for a foundation.

**SB:** Thank you! Glad to do it!

**KL:** Thanks also to our listeners for joining us for this week’s episode of Research in Action. I’m Katie Linder, and we’ll be back next week with another episode.

# Show notes with links to resources mentioned in the episode, a full transcript, and an instructor’s guide for incorporating the episode into your courses, can be found at the show’s website at [ecampus.oregonstate.edu/podcast](http://www.ecampus.oregonstate.edu/podcast).
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# “Research in Action” transcripts are sometimes created on a rush deadline and accuracy may vary. Please be aware that the authoritative record of the “Research in Action” podcast is the audio.

**Bonus Clip**

**KL:** In this bonus clip from episode eighty-seven of the “Research in Action” podcast, Dr. Stuart Buck discusses his tips for finding a job with a foundation.

**KL:** So I can imagine some of our listeners are hearing this and going, “Well that sounds like a pretty cool job… That looks like something that I might want to be doing!” Are there tips or strategies that you have for people that might want to start engaging with foundations as a place of employment? Not necessarily engaging with them as grant partner opportunity, but if they want to become more involved on the other side of the table in terms of working with a foundation. What are some strategies that you might share for people who might be interested in that?

**SB:** Sure. I mean, there are lots of different pathways to working at a foundation. So most major foundations will have people in a variety of staffing roles. So people who handle accounting and or investments, one or more attorneys in house, human resources type positions, communications positions, um and those are kinds of positions that are common to lots of organizations, including profit businesses. And then you have the more problematic team members. People who try to make philanthropic donations and guide where those dollars go. And so there are lots of different pathways to that, that I think having some sort of expertise, often a combination of maybe academic expertise, but also on the ground expertise in a particular issue area that the foundation is donating in – I think that’s helpful. So if you wanted to work for a foundation that gives to the education system for example, it would help to have a degree in education, or some kind of degree that’s in a relevant field like public policy. It would also help to have some on the ground experience working with schools or working with school districts. And the same goes for any other type of position that you’re talking about. So health-care, if you’re interested in health-care, or a foundation that covers health-care related work, you know, academic expertise, whether its public policy or medicine would definitely help. Working for government would probably help – Anything from a state Medicaid agency to a federal – you know the Department of Health and Human Services, or Medicare. Some practical experience helps as well, and so for research in particular, you know, for that type of position that I’m in, definitely an academic background is pretty necessary. And so positions like mine are – I think somewhat common across other foundations. I think they’ll be called something like ‘Director of Evaluation’ or “Vice President of Learning and Evaluation’. There are a number of different – kind of synonymous titles of people that are in charge of research and evaluation at a foundation. And for some of the positions, the focus might be more on the evaluation side, so at a lot of foundations they make a lot of direct investments in social services for example. The person that’s in charge of research and evaluation, their focus will less be about direct research that the foundation is funding, because they aren’t doing as much as that and we’re more about procuring independent evaluations of the social services that foundation is funding. So it just depends on what foundation you’re looking at, and what their overall purpose is. Uh but I think those are kind of the more common pathways of some of the foundations that I’ve seen.

**KL:** You’ve just heard a bonus clip for episode eighty-seven of the “Research in Action” podcast with Dr. Stuart Buck discussing his tips for finding a job with a foundation. Thanks for listening!

# “Research in Action” transcripts are sometimes created on a rush deadline and accuracy may vary. Please be aware that the authoritative record of the “Research in Action” podcast is the audio.