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# KL: You’re listening to “Research in Action”: episode one hundred and sixty-one.

# [intro music]

# Segment 1:

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

**KL:** In this episode, I'm joined by two guests:

On today's episode, I'm joined by two guests. Monica DT Rysavy is the Director of Institutional Research and Training and an Assistant Professor at Goldey-Beacom College in Wilmington, Delaware. In this role, she leads all institutional research and data analysis projects for the college. Her office provides faculty and staff training support by developing new training offerings, asynchronous and synchronous face-to-face and online programs on a variety of instructional technology, survey research, and data management, analysis and interpretation topics.

Before transitioning to higher education, Monica worked as a high school business technology instructor in Delaware public schools. She earned her PhD in learning design and technology from the Pennsylvania State University and an EdD in education leadership from Wilmington University.

Russell Michalak is the Director of the Library Archives and Learning Center and an Assistant Professor at Goldey-Beacom College in Wilmington, Delaware. He oversees the annual budget, supervises librarians and paraprofessionals, and manages the delivery of research, information, instructional services, the tutoring center, and archives.

Before joining GBC, he worked in various roles at the libraries at the Claremont Colleges, Duke University, and the University of Utah. Russell earned his MA in library and information studies from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and a bachelor's in history from Occidental College.

Monica and Russell's current collaborative research agenda focuses on information literacy-related topics with an emphasis on utilizing online training modules to increase student's information literacy skills as well as academic library and institutional assessment.

Monica, Rusty, thank you so much for joining me on the show today.

**RM:** Thank you for having us, Katie.

**MR:** Thanks for having us. We're excited to chat.

**KL:** So, I wanted to have you both on the show because over time, you have developed a strong research partnership, and I think this is something that people are really interested in learning more about. First of all, can you describe a little bit about the research partnership that you've developed?

**MR:** Sure. Rusty and I researched topics related to information literacy, onboarding, and academic libraries, and assessment, mainly new ways of looking at academic library assessment, but also institutional assessment topics. As I run institutional research and training at our small, private college, Goldey-Beacom College, which is in Wilmington, Delaware. We actually also look at different ways of using institutional tools that are typically library tools in different ways, so across departments.

For example, we use things like live in sites, which is a product from Springshare, and we use that outside of the library to create the fact books at the library and for the institution.

One of the things that's kind of cool is we recently counted up all the articles we've done together since we first started publishing, and we realized we're at 22 publications including a few pending in the last two and half years, so, that was fun to figure out

**RM:** And I think a little bit more to the publication side of that is that we recently Kenninf Arlitsch has promoted us and got us onto the Journal of Library Administration and Editorial Board, and has given us a really good opportunity to publish regularly. Before, we looked a lot of calls for proposals, and now we have a venue where we can publish four times a year and on a regular schedule, and it's really cued our editor, Gary Pakin, just wrote us, we have two months out until our next editorial is due, so we're really excited about that.

But when we do publish, we try to, our typical output for our research are peer view journal articles, book chapters, and editor collections, Acronym commerce presentations, and most recently, producing edited collections. We've presented somewhere around 30 times in the last two and a half years. We really try to get our presentations in line with our publications.

Whenever Monica sees a call for a new proposal for a presentation, we're like, can this actually go to a publication, or, do we need to table this for another venue or another time, because if it's not going to go to a publication, it doesn't make sense if we can't kind of double dip on the topic.

**MR:** And we do things a little bit backwards when it comes to presenting. When I was doing my doctorate work on [SSA 00:04:56], we typically would present, sometimes before we had things written, or before our data was collected, because we would look at, say a round table, or a post, or a panel to try to get ideas for what we were going to do.

But, then, I often have things written before we present on them. We typically have written at least 3/4 of the way, if not actually published or pending publication. Then, we're doing more of a conference on concurrent session, as opposed to doing a round table presentation, or something like that.

We also get ideas for new presentations from conferences. But, we typically talk with either a closed loop project, or a kind of, at least, one part of the project finished before we go on to the next one. That's, kind of, a big over-arching look of our research partnership. I would say, really, that the main points of it are, basically, do all of our research and writing together. We do all of our presentations together, too. It's been exponentially helpful. I'm sure we'll get into some of the ways that we've found that has really been helpful from that.

**KL:** Okay, so, clearly, you both are incredibly productive as a team. I'm really curious, before we, kind of, dive into some of the, kind of clear benefits that you've seen from this partnership, what led you to partner in this way? Because, many academic disciplines, the idea is really to solo-publish, and to, kind of, make a name for yourself. But, this is something where you both have really been committed to working together, and to co-publishing, co-presenting. What led you to think about that?

**RM:** It's really, actually a funny story. About two and a half years ago, we were actually told to collaborate with each other by our current college president, who is about to retire. He wanted us to develop a information literacy tutorial. He said to our English faculty member, who I've been working with for many years, to recruit, and work with, and hopefully, work in the long term with Monica, to create a benchmark for IL data.

So, she had the expertise in the research deployment, and the design. Our faculty member, Kevin Hunt, had the expertise and the population with the students, English composition students. I had, in my staff, had expertise in information literacy, and had basic ideas in instruction design that Monica really had a greater understanding of that. So, we wanted to work together, and he wanted us to work together in creating something that was actually...that we can create a benchmark over a long period of time.

**MR:** Originally, we didn't like each other very much. We didn't get along very well, and it was a little bit of cats and dogs when we were first starting to collaborate. Another part of this, was the fact that Rusty was so enthusiastic about the IL program. I was, really, just trying to get my footing, so to speak, at the college. Learning all the ropes about a new college culture, learning about working with my students, because I had a student professor role, running the ed-tech, which meant the training and development for all the faculty. And, here's this super enthusiastic [*inaudible*], who was really into writing this information literacy assessment program. And, really wanted to talk about it all the time.

**RM:** So much so, that I would come and... anytime I had a reason to come over to the other building, I would drop into Monica's office. As we were discussing, about a half an hour ago, I would hover.

**MR:** I know it sounds like, maybe an unlikely beginning, in a sense that we just continued writing together after that. But also, I think another thing is, maybe other people can relate to this, we, in many ways, both felt a friendship and a connection coming from much larger places, and being in a really small place, compared to where we had been before. So, it's a little bit of fish out of water, because I was very used to being in a department of 30 plus people. For example, I was within an Ed-tech/also in HR type of role. It is a role at the institution logging my PhD, if you needed to get something reviewed, there was a process for that. There was a reviewer, a copy editor, there were several layers of looking at projects before things got pitched to various committee members, etc. We don't have layers here. Which is nice in many ways, because we're small. But also, it was just very different for both of us.

Once we got past our initial frustrations of one another for learning how the other worked best, we kind of, hit the ground running and haven't looked back.

**KL:** So, one of the clear benefits, it seems, from what you're describing of having a research partnership like this, is the volume of what you can do. I'm curious, if you can talk a little bit about your strategies for being such prolific publishers in a relatively short amount of time. It sounds like you do multiple projects at once, maybe passing things back and forth between each other. Can you talk a little bit about that?

**RM:** We created an outline very early on. I think this is one of the huge benefits from Monica, in just finishing her dissertation, is that we basically, we created an outline that we've used for pretty much every publication that we've had. It's very basic. It's just the introduction into lit review, methodology, results, limitations, and a conclusion.

**MR:** And discussion.

**RM:** And discussion, of course, we always have a discussion. We follow that to the T. We don't diverge, we don't change anything for any publication. That has really worked for all of our publications. It's made it a lot easier.

Monica works on the results, while I work on the lit review, and we come together for a discussion. We work on that together. If Monica finishes early on one paper for results, she can move on to another paper for results while I'm finishing up the lit review and visa-versa.

**MR:** There's two really big keys to, in my opinion, is something I hope other people can take away from this. Publishing prolifically is academic administrators. So, we don't use our day time, during our work hours to do this. We're not research writers. This is not our job, it's not a core component of our jobs. We are lucky that we are able to do data collection during our office hours, or our work hours, because that's part of what we do for institutional light papers of other projects for the institution. But, as long as we have IRB approval, it's something that we could use for other projects, as well.

So, that's something we like to make clear, because people are like, "How are you doing all of this, are you spending all your work day on this?" No, we just stay up very late, and we get up very early, we send a lot of text messages, we email a lot. We work a lot outside of work hours. Time management is a huge part of that. What helps us with that, is I love air table. I know I'm not speaking to just give you [inaudible 00:11:27] because I know a lot of people that I think listen to this show probably like Air Table too.

Airtable is fantastic. It's basically Excel on steroids. We've been able to really leverage that for tracking everything that we do, whether it's tracking just the calls, so the calls for proposals that we're interested in writing for, or presenting for, or tracking the status of a project to see where we are in the pipeline along with getting it done.

One of the most powerful pieces that we've used recently with Air Table is the calendar, where we overlay our conference presentation schedule. Not just what we're doing at the actual conference, but all the ones we've applied to, all the ones we've accepted to do. We like to be home for our respective families, too. So, we're trying to make sure we're not gone too much. We also make sure that we're not traveling so much, that we're really going to be broke, because we do most of this out of pocket as well. We have some financial support from the college, but after about a conference and half, we tend to pay out of pocket. So, that's one of the other pieces.

**RM:** And be here as often as possible, but, I think Air Table has made a huge difference, in terms of keeping us on task. So, as Monica said, we work on the weekend, we work in the evenings, we just love writing. I think that's the biggest thing with our collaboration, is that we both love it. I think without the love for writing, and research, and the finding of the results, we wouldn't continue doing it. We like making our institutions better. We firmly believe that we make our institutions better by writing the case studies, the white papers, and the other research that we do on a regular basis. We like meeting people. That's kind of, another key component of this, not just the writing, but the collaboration of meeting new people at conferences. We want to go to conferences, generally, if we are presenting. So, this encourages us to do the calls.

I think the biggest thing is we were very fortunate in the start of our early collaboration by finding a lot of call for proposals and being accepted to them. I think that gave us the encouragement that we needed to continue on with our writing together.

**KL:** Well, you've offered so many practical tips, already. We're going to take a brief break. When we come back we'll hear a little bit more from Monica and Rusty about the research partnership. Back in a moment.

The “Research in Action” Podcast is just one of many projects we diligently work on here at the Oregon State University Ecampus research unit. It's our mission to make online teaching and learning and research actionable. And one way we're doing this is through the recent release of our Report Readers Checklist. This resource includes a comprehensive set of criteria that offers readers a guide to evaluate the quality and rigor of online education study reports that they may encounter in their work.

Learn more, and download the checklist at ecampus.oregonstate.edu/checklist.

# Segment 2:

**KL:** Monica, Rusty, I'm wondering if you can tell us a little bit about the kinds of projects that would be especially good to work on with a research collaborator. Are there certain things that you have done that you found have worked really well, and thinking maybe about the edited collection that you're working on now, or other projects?

**RM:** We really like finding projects the both people are interested in. I think, as we said earlier, we were told to start working together. We just, so happened, that Monica's first dissertation topic was on information literacy.

So, that kind of helped with sparking an interest, and why we were working on projects together in the first place. But, finding a project where two people are more... are actually passionate about it is really key. I think both of us really, really love assessment. The great thing about assessment is it can be applied in multiple ways throughout the institution. We both see value in assessment to the institution. Whether it's through the library or institutional research, which Monica is in charge of, we've found different ways of working together. I think that's one of the main things.

**MR:** Yeah, and another way, for example, Katie as you mentioned, the edited collections that we have coming out. I love the project management aspect of it. In another life, I was kind of, headed towards that direction as a PM, or being a project manager. When it comes to color coding, organizing, dates, times, milestones, I love all that. That very much speaks my whole language, so to speak.

Rusty's great at it too, but I like it a lot more. So, when we first started writing together, I would turn back drafts that were color coded with all my comments, I drove him nuts. Then he shared, "You know, it really would be better if it was just track pages. "Then later he came... "No track pages, just make your changes." Because I would make so many different ones.

**RM:** Well, some of it is, the first sheet, it can have a lot of track changes, but then after about, I think the third or fourth paper, I was like, "I trust you. You just write." Our writing is not that dissimilar, and I think that's one of the things that actually helps with our writing, is that, at one point, we were writing. There were some paragraphs, and Monica and I couldn't figure out who wrote what. That helps a lot, just the trust with each other that we could... that sounds like either one of us wrote it. We ask each other over and over again who wrote it. It turns... we couldn't figure it out.

Trust is a huge issue with the project management. Monica is very good at color coding, and Airtable. I just do it all in my head. That was one of the biggest things that we, kind of, clashed about. Sometimes, Monica will be like, "Well, how do I know you're actually going to follow through?" I'm like, "I don't know, it's in my head, so I'm just going to remember, and it's going to happen. If I say I'm going to get something done, it will get done." But Monica is like, "We're going to put it in the Air Table anyway. I want to make sure it's color coded. We're going to follow these. We're going to make sure do the drop down menu so that I know it's getting done." I'm like, "Well, I'll get it done, it's in my head."

**MR:** Well, and Rusty brings up a very good point. So, edited collections, much better with two, because I can do the project work two or three, etc. I can do the project management, Rusty can do the really nice collegial follow up emails with all the contributors, which, to be honest, I can write those, but I'm much more of a to the point, very specific individual. So, when it comes to that emotional intelligence quotient, that's one of those things that I take a little bit more time to really resonate with. Because, whereas he's really good with the niceties, I would be, "Where is your chapter?"

I have to warm up into it a little bit, and he's very good at that.

**RM:** I'm a little bit more forgiving than Monica is [*indiscernible*] people late. If it says a due date in the Air Table, it must get done by that due date. Whereas, I can give people a little bit of a leeway. So, I can do the everyday follow up, "This is late. We're expecting this. Please give it back to us as soon as possible."

**MR:** Yeah, and he's really good at keeping me mellow, whereas, in my head, I'm like, "It's late. Where is it? We're done." I'm much more directed by the book. I blame that on being a high school teacher for so many years. But, having projects like that, where you can kind of, split the load and have tasks for what is kind of, working best with our style, or what we like to do. Also, things that kind of, help us balance out what our interests are.

For example, Rusty's mentioned, we do a lot with assessment, we do a lot with information literacy. We both have a lot of crossover interests, so that helps. But having someone else work with you, pushes you outside your comfort zone. So perhaps, early on, when he wanted to do somethings, that I haven't even thought of. But even IL, he mentioned that was my initial first dissertation topic that I stepped away from. I had interest in IL, but it just wasn't the route I decided to go.

When he wanted to do more with IL, it brought me back into that space. When he wanted to write about plagiarism, and the Academic Library's efforts to help with that, that brought me into a whole new realm of authors, that I had never read as part of my dissertation. So, it really pushed me. If you remember, any type of graduate work you've done, where you're reading that pivotal piece, that has the words that are so complicated, you're looking up every other word. That was the type of environment I was going through, reading these new, kind of, articles and being exposed to authors I just wasn't familiar with.

On one hand, it drove me nuts. But on the other, it's like, this is fun, this is pushing me outside of what I'm used to doing. I'm seeing things I don't recognize, making connections I didn't have already. I think working with someone, especially outside your specific area really pushes you to get... to keep honing your craft. It's almost like going back to school without going back to school. That's another really great side benefit to it.

**RM:** I've come up with a lot... one of the great things about Monica is that she tells me no a lot. I actually come up with about six different paper ideas a day.

**MR:** Yup.

**RM:** We table most of them, and she puts them in the Air Table. We also have a board up by our office that has a lot of sticky notes with my ideas. She says I can put my ideas there. If we get to them, that would be great, but, it's usually about a year and a half out, and if we haven't done anything with it, she makes me take the sticky note off the yellow piece of paper and puts it in the trash. It's just far enough away that I can't read it, so that I don't know that it's gone. So it's still in my head. But hopefully, we can revisit that in a different time. But, most of the topics that we work on are actually outside of my area too. I originally, I write books in my brain. So I do anything with electronic resources totally outside of my field.

So, I like working with that books. But, I think the one thing that we've recently worked on, well, actually it wasn't very recently now. But about two years ago, we started working with boot camps, and Federal Trio Programs [*inaudible*] programs, where they, the students don't meet the minimum level to articulate into our college or any college. We were working with them with archives, so our institutional archives. We kind of, incorporated the information literacy program in teaching how to evaluate information with all the techniques that you hear about all the time. We wanted to teach them how evaluation is an important skillset to have. So, by incorporating archives, information literacy, and revamping a program that Monica had been working with in the last ten years. She initially started with four other faculty members. Four or three?

**MR:** Three.

**RM:** Three other faculty members of the institution, where she teaches basic computer skills to these kids. We can kind of rekindle her love of teaching these young people.

**MR:** And that's another point, so if you're thinking about working with someone who's outside of your area, they're going to give you the opportunity to have some reflective time on what you're already doing. I know that sounds very obvious, because as practitioners, we should reflecting all the time on what we're doing. But, you get in, sort of, the rinse and repeat mode of doing what works.

I had this course I was teaching every summer, as Rusty says, really since 2008. It was desktop computer applications, it was a month. I had them twice a week for an hour and a half each. I got them through it in the four weeks, and we were done, because it was really meant to be a boot camp for college life. To help students acculturate to the institution. They had other classes, like study skills, and that sort of thing to see if they were really ready for college.

Well, Rusty started giving me some ideas, like wouldn't you want to revamp the program? And as you might have guessed he has some enthusiasm for things that he likes. And he asked, "What about using the archives? We've got all this archival content, we haven't done a lot with it." At first, unfortunately, my reaction probably was no. Because I was thinking I already have this plan in place. But, he's very enthusiastic, he's also very convincing. He said, "You know, we could change it in these ways by working with the archives. And we've give the chance to either look for themselves in the archives." Because a lot of our students have family that have gone here.

**RM:** There's also a sense of community.

**MR:** Exactly. So we even had a student on day one or two say, "You know, my mom went here. I think she was Miss Goldey. Do you think you can find a photo in the archives?"

So being able to help process those connections, if we hadn't spent 15 plus minutes talking about what could we do to change this program that was already working, already, kind of, mastering the objectives we were set out to manage for the college. We wouldn't have been able to stretch it to kind of a two player version. So, it's a long way of saying having someone outside your area to work with on a regular basis that you trust will give you ideas outside of what you regularly do and push yourself to try something else.

**RM:** I believe a lot in collaboration, so, one of the other things I want to do is I want to write [*inaudible*] matter what we did. I really want to write with my mentor Greg Thompson from University of Utah. So one of my goals was to write a paper with him. So, I'm always trying to find someone else to collaborate with especially outside of our institution, because it keeps everything fresh, and gives us new perspectives about our institution and what we do with our own students.

So, we just recently got that one... a paper published in the General Election Archives with Greg Thompson. We worked a lot with Trevor Dawes the vice provost at University of Delaware. We've been in collaboration vocally as well. By the end of the year, we should have five papers published with him. You need to have an MLIS to be an academic library. Another one is hiring factors within the library. We're working right now on [*inaudible*] privacy with him.

Each person in the team provides a skillset that otherwise, we don't have... Trevor provides the population, and the connections that we still have. Monica and I provide different aspects such as results and the data analysis [*inaudible*]. So, we try to kind different people who compliment our skillset, is what I'm really trying to get at. So, when you're looking for a new collaborator, you want to find someone that has the same interest as you, and the same passion as you. Also, someone who can off-set you a little bit. Where you can do the things that you might not be as comfortable with. I think Monica can attest to this. I wouldn't touch that with a ten foot pole before I met her.

Now, we're migrating from SirsiDynix, which is an integrated library system, to Koha. And I created my first pivot table, in the system of Koha. Monica was in Prague with the husband and I sent it through SharePoint, to share with business. I won't say anything, about getting super excited. And sent all sorts of screen shots, and so much so that she said my phone bill is exploding, you're not allowed to send any more pictures.

**MR:** Yeah, he actually texted pictures and video of the pivot tables in action, and I started getting AT&T text messages, "You've gone over your data, you've gone over your data." Within two days of getting there. I was like, "No more videos of the pivot table." But I was very happy.

**RM:** I was super excited.

**MR:** That he was so excited, and he had that joy for pivot table. So, Rusty, last time, it leaves me to give my final [*inaudible*], which is, a mentor I had at the University was mentioning to me, when I first was hired, was that a big part of university life, whether you were going to school, or you worked for a college or university, is being invited to have a seat at the table. And that table can be all sorts of things. It can be a committee, it could be an executive council group, or a leadership team. It could be a project, a multi-phased project, but a big part is being invited to have a seat at the table.

We've been very lucky that we've had individuals that we've worked with that have invited us to sit at their proverbial tables, so to speak, to give us opportunities to research bound where we are. But also to help network with us and connect with other individuals that might give us opportunities for us to add value on projects they're already on. But it was also just having the courage and confidence in ourselves that we bring value to that, to whatever projects they're on. And also, being able to be transparent and say, "Hey we don't know a lot about this, but we'd like to learn more. Would you be willing to spend some time with us and talk about it?"

We've found as long as you want to give more than you want to get, you can open a lot of doors for that.

**RM:** I think that, the concrete example is that we were at ALA [*inaudible*], another good friend of mine, Kenning Arlitsch, he's the Dean of Libraries at Montana State University, we were talking to him at dinner about his project. To be totally honest with you, his project on [*inaudible*] was something totally outside of our wheelhouse. We listened, and we listened, and like, sign us up. And it looks like we're going to be working with his data.

Saying yes to things that you might not totally understand what you're saying yes to sometimes, can lead to really positive collaboration projects, [*inaudible*] projects.

**KL:** So, as we're wrapping up our conversation here, today. I would love to hear a little bit from both of you about the emotional support that you can get from a research partner, because we know that writing is scary, and hard, and it takes a lot of resilience, and you do get rejections, and all kinds of things. There's a lot of fear with putting your work out there. How is having a research partner impacted you on that level?

**RM:** I think, a lot, I think there's a lot of fear of being rejected. We've been rejected probably four times now. Full rejections, and we get revise and resubmits all the time. But, I think that, one of the neat things is that our first article, we didn't get any revise and resubmit, it was just fully accepted. I never regret that sometimes, because we look at it and like, well, we would have liked to actually revise that a little bit more. We thought we were going to get a little bit more revision, but I think, I've never been one to fear rejection. So, I just keep on pushing forward and then not going to accept any sort of no answer. I think that actually helps Monica with an initial stages of like, "Well what happens if we get rejected?" I'm like, "Eh, there's always another venue that we could try it for. Try this [*inaudible*]."

But it's hard, bu we rely on each other a lot to make sure that we give the support that we need, because there's times where, if I wanted a venue, where Monica wanted a venue, we vent to each other, for probably several days over text, and at work, and we really want it. It takes the other person to be a little bit, just be calm. And say, "Well, there's somewhere else to put it." Each of us has taken that responsibility, that role for the other.

So there's some times where Monica's been really upset about something, or I'd been really upset about, we didn't like the way someone said something to us. So we kind of lean on each other to make sure we get past that. We move forward.

**MR:** I thought that it really helps, for me specifically with writing, is when I started my Doctorate program, I had a really, a heavy dose of imposter syndrome. I had already done a doctorate. I did an EdD in K-12 Education leadership before I did my PhD, and that's a whole nother conversation. But when I got there, I felt very much as if I didn't belong. I felt like I couldn't write up to standards. These ar all self imposed, I should point out. There were some, of course, class and course regulations, and that kind of thing, but, I just really felt that I wasn't able to read as fast, or as clearly as everyone else could. Like, they seemed to really get the concept much faster than I did. So, I felt like I was always playing catch up with some of the things that I was doing in the program.

It ended, it worked out successfully, it's been the best challenging experience I've ever had. Throughout the program, I published twice. I did one small column for Tetrons, and I wrote with my advisor Dr. Roy Kariata. He was very kind to me. He pushed the heck out of me, and reminded the heck out of me, because my imposter syndrome, was that I was just really hesitant to put pen to paper, because I was afraid it wouldn't be good enough. No one ever said that is was not good enough, but I just kept saying to myself, it's not good enough. It got so much into that loop that I just wouldn't write. I would get my work done, but I wasn't writing and publishing like you can do often times in a PhD program outside of it. Because I had so much fear about that.

When I finished my program, when I finished my dissertation, honestly, my thought was, I'm not writing again for a while. I wanted a break. I was not going to write on my dissertation topic ever again. I wanted to set that thing on fire, and never hear about the topic again. Which, wasn't very smart. Some of my other friends and colleagues have gone forth, of course, to write and publish on those topics. But, it just wasn't for me.

When I met Rusty, and we started writing together, he was just this dose of fresh air with his lack of fear about submitting to journals. He didn't care if got a no, in fact, sometimes, he had crazy grit when we got a no, because he thought we'd find a better place with a better SDRA to put it somewhere else later. He was just so enthusiastic about, "Eh, someone will say yes." that I actually within about a year, stopped having... I was not in my head so much anymore. I stopped being so worried about writing that I could focus on the fact that I liked to write. I really did enjoy it. I just, kind of had to let go of the fear of what someone else was going to say about it, because now we look at revise and resubmits as usually, a really nice iterated list of what we have to say, and how we have to fix things, and change it, and put it into another publication, or it is the same one.

**RM:** Or, we kind of view a revise and resubmit as it may not be an expert reader. I think, there's always that reviewer number too, who you think, maybe they woke up on the wrong side of the bed. We kind of would take it as, "Well, you know, they're coming from their perspective." Monica takes some sort of table, and that helps us a lot. We kind of take the personal aspect out of all that fear that we get from... that could happen when you get rejected a lot, or get revise and resubmit. It kind of takes the label off of things.

We're just like, "Well, yeah, we'll get submitted. We'll be accepted." We're going to get... we want 50. We want 50 in five years as a goal. We're not going to let that not happen. Now with editorials, where they can [*inaudible*] it looks like we're going to have more than 50 in five years. We already have ten for 2019. We're going to accept, we did our first mission to a presentation at the American History Association 2020, so we're already looking forward to that, and 2021 is not too far away.

**MR:** We dedicated in the process at some point. As you can see I might be the data numbers person, but Rusty is also the one that pushes us to keep going in search of our count. When he first mentioned 50 in five years, I really thought he was off his rocker. But it's been a wonderful goal post to strive towards. Will we get 50 in five years?

**RM:** Yes.

**MR:** Maybe. At the same time, we look for quality 50 in five.

**RM:** [Affirmative]

**MR:** So we are striving towards [*inaudible*] or columns for situations, and things that we can feel like we're adding to our fields respectively, and meaningfully.

**KL:** Well, it is been such a pleasure to hear about your research partnership. Thank you so much Monica and Rusty for coming on the show, and sharing a little bit more about your work.

**MR:** Thanks for having us.

**RM:** Thanks, Katie.

**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 a new episode.
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