Episode 28: Todd Campbell

# KL: Katie LinderTC: Todd CampbellKL: You’re listening to *Research in Action*: episode twenty-eight.

# [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.

On this episode, I’m joined by Dr. Todd Campbell, an Associate Professor of Science Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Connecticut. His research focuses on teaching and learning in science education. More specifically, cultivating classroom versions of scientific activity through modeling as an anchoring epistemic practice, technology tools in scientific activity, and science teacher professional development. Dr. Campbell is the PI for a National Science Foundation Discovery Research K-12 project focused on science teacher professional development. Cumulatively, he has been PI for approximately $6,000,000 in research funding and has published in numerous journals including the International Journal of Science Education, Review of Research in Education, and Research in Science Education, and has served as guest editor of the Journal of Science Education and Technology, and National Science Teachers Association’s journal The Science Teacher.

Thanks so much for joining me Todd.

**TC:** Thanks for having me. I’m excited about this.

**KL:** So one of the things about your bio that I think is really interesting and could be really helpful to our listeners is that you have experience applying for larger research grants, and so I thought I would start by talking a little about that. What kind of preparation do you need to apply to a large research grant? What are some of the things that you do to kind of lay the groundwork for that?

**TC:** First I would start, before I actually answer that question if it’s OK, so I think it was really important for me to get a chance to work alongside someone. So when I was in my doctoral program, my mentor, my PhD chair, actually had me apply for a grant and we were co PIs together. So getting a chance to work alongside him, who was a seasoned veteran, was really helpful for me. So that is just a starting of if you get that opportunity. And I know everyone doesn’t, but it really is helpful, I think, if nothing else, to build your self-efficacy to think you can do these kinds of things.

**KL:** Mmm mhmm

**TC:** But so what kinds of preparation for applying for a large grant. I think you really need a strong kind of grounding in the relevant research. So like I know that there are certain types of grants that I probably shouldn’t apply to because I think there’s people in different areas doing work that is way more relevant than what I might be doing in a particular area. So even if I see a solicitation that is offering large amounts of funding, if I don’t have the background or if I don’t feel like I’m connected to the relevant literature, then I back away a little bit or I steep myself up in trying to get up to speed in that kind of literature. So really making sure that like you have a strong grasp of the literature in the area that you want to apply to would, I think, be one of the biggest things you should prepare for.

Another thing I thought of was just kind of networks of partners to draw from, and from that maybe schools, teachers, and even other researchers. So as I’m preparing for a grant and thinking about a grant I might do, I start thinking about who I want to do this with and what do they bring to the table that would be appealing to funders as well. So, for instance, schools might bring certain context that are unique that would take kind of the area of focus that I’m interested in in a unique direction that may not have been looked at in the past. And then if I have teachers that I really work closely with that really helps me even be more confident, and it also kind of pushes me a little bit because I am always kind of looking for—I want to build strong relationships and collaborations with teachers, and I think finding grant funding that connects our work, like gives us, kind of gives us enough capital to do the work we are going to be doing. So it gives us a reason, but it also gives us some funds to support the work, and also puts some expectations in front of us so that it is not just us being nice to each other; we’re each kind of committing to it and we have a larger objective that we know we got to get accomplished.

And then the last one is researchers: trying to think about, as I prepare, like who would be really strong collaborators that would be essential. So as I think about the review panels that will be looking at our proposal I try to think about, you know, if we don’t have someone what is going to be a glaring hole. And sometimes in my field of science education, like not having a scientist might be a big red flag. I am a science educator and I bring some content and knowledge, but scientists bring a lot more, especially research scientists, and then also like statisticians. I have facility in quantitative and qualitative, but sometimes I could even gain from finding other researchers depending on the project focus.

I think, let’s see, and then I thought I would throw this in just because I had such a good experience with it, was I think trying to make sure you line yourself up with a really good external evaluator. It might not seem like a really big thing, and in the end it may not be uncertain, but for me I found the kind of the best, in my opinion—I know there are a lot of really good external evaluators out there—but I found such a good external evaluator, that’s nationally known, and as we interact I learn so much from this individual. So it’s almost like I’m working with a colleague that I would have really wanted to work with anyway, and I’m going to be spending five years with them, so if there is ways they can help me grow and be more cognizant of the way I am doing—which is what this particular external evaluator I use does—then I think I do that. I get a little hesitant when I’m asked to be on a grant and the PI said “Well I have a friend who will do that external evaluation,” and I think maybe friends can do it, but there are people who do this for a living who are really good at it, so I am skeptical of using friends or even [indiscernible] on proposals sometimes.

**KL:** You’ve raised excellent points, Todd, and I have to echo your external evaluator point because I have also found someone that I work with who’s incredible, does it for a living, and I’ve learned so much from that person as well. But one of the things in a couple of your comments that you raised is really pointing to making sure that it is the right fit for you as a researcher and that you have the networks in place to really make a successful application. I think for people, perhaps who are just starting out looking at these larger grants, there’s quite a mechanism for the review of the grant that you really don’t want to enter into it in a way that could waste people’s time. Because you are putting in a significant amount of time to draft the proposal, the reviewers are putting in a significant amount of time to decide if the proposal is worth moving forward, so you really do want to make sure that it’s a good investment of everyone’s time to be looking at your project and seeing if it’s a good fit for the funding. So I’m wondering if you can talk a little bit about how you know if you, you know, have that right fit, if you have the experience needed to be successful, if you have maybe the pilot data that you need to move forward, so that you are really not putting something together that, you know, that maybe from the get-go wouldn’t be funded.

**TC:** Right right right. That’s difficult. I’m not sure I have always stood back and been reflective enough. One of the things I thought about, especially as I went up for tenure, and even now as I consider moving up again for promotion, is kind of like what am I about and what priorities do I have, and then does the grant funding, or the solicitation, help me move in the direction that I am best suited to move in. So I’ve thought about this with graduate students, as well as with PhD students in particular. Like I always want to be really democratic and let my co-PIs or let me PhD students really decide what they want to do, but in doing that I have sometimes gotten in trouble because I am so far away from any kind of expertise that I have. I don’t have as much that is valuable to contribute. So I am trying to think that way strategically when you are going to put in for a grant proposal. Many of them are three to five years. That is such a large commitment on your part, so it has got to be something that I value, that I can see is pushing the research on a trajectory that I value forward. And it sounds a little selfish, but it almost it has to be because you are going to be in the middle of something and you want to make sure that you are ready for that. So something that was told to me—I think this was after one of our projects was funded—is it better to need to be careful what you ask for?

**KL:** Mhmm.

**TC:** So I would echo the same thing, so you know, as far as, I think you mentioned like pilot data, having pilot data. I don’t know that I have done—like I think it is a really good idea to have that pilot data, but I don’t know that I’ve ever like set myself up, you know, with a round of piloting and then doing. I think I’ve set myself up with I’m doing research in this area, so I’ve done enough research and I’ve published in this area. And that becomes kind of the pilot: the confidence of I’ve got this body of research I have already done that I can draw on, I haven’t I went out ahead of time and said I am going to work with a district to collect data and then apply for a grant. So I haven’t moved in that way, although I think it’s a good way to move. I just haven’t had the luxury and time and resources to do that many times.

**KL:** I think you’ve raised such an excellent point about really thinking about the trajectory of your career. And I don’t think this is selfish at all, I mean this is a significant commitment of your time. It can also really change, you know, the direction of your career based on a project and the collaborators that you might have on that grant. So I think that is just such an important point for researchers to be thinking about. We are going to take a brief break. When we come back we will hear a little bit more from Todd about managing large research grants. Back in a moment.

# Segment 2:

[intro music]

**KL:** Todd, before we chat a little bit about managing large research grants, I’m wondering if you could talk about some of the strategies you’ve used to put together successful grant proposals. And it may be that some of those strategies end up impacting how you managed the grant. Kind of planning in the future, or planning in the past for what will happen in the future, but can you share some of the strategies that have been working well for you.

**TC:** Yeah. One, and I think this is something that even the large funders in this step, and I’ve worked with IS, but I imagine they might offer the same, is trying to make public the proposals that have been funded, at least make public the kinds of proposals, and then you can reach out to those who saved them. So I’ve always tried to see if I recognize a researcher who has been funded, and then even asked to see their proposals that they’d be willing. So it’s really helpful for me to see, kind of the case they’re making, how they’re making it. It also lets me see, you know, what’s out there, at what level, what is kind of the standard that I am trying to compare.

**KL:** Mhmm.

**TC:** Another thing that was really helpful for me, and I’ve tried to do this just for one colleague or faculty at U Conn. For me I have a mentor at Utah State University when I was there, and he did a really nice job of—I was organized enough that we could go through one to two, maybe even three iterations of the proposal. So my first one I thought was pretty good, and then he brought up some—having had funded some funding in the past—he brought up some things that he thought the panel might ask about, and by the time I was done with revisions and a third, you know, three iterations, it was a really much almost much different proposal, but a really good proposal. So it was possible you can find someone who has served on a lot of NSF panels or a lot of funding panels, or has had a lot of grant funding, to set up a schedule so you can go through at least one or two rounds of revisions of your project. I think that’s really valuable too because this summer working with the junior faculty, you know, getting a chance to—you’re really not offering a lot as a veteran researcher if they share the last minute and all you have time to say is “good job,” because there is always something you could offer in some way to improve what they’re doing.

**KL:** Mhmm. Mhmm.

**TC:** And then the last one, I think, I mean people say this but I don’t think they realize it really matters, is just trying to get kind of air time with kind of some of the program officers. And that, you know, sharing your ideas so that they’re really open to giving you feedback, and they’re not on the panel, but they’ve seen enough that usually the feedback they’re trying to give you is to avoid the pitfalls that have befallen other proposals. So I travelled to DC. It seems like a lot to do in the age of video conferencing, but I got in front of program officers and it seems to help. Like even our most recent funding was a third submission, and the last time we decided we had to go there and figure out what was going wrong, and it seemed to work out. So that is something that I think could help as well.

**KL:** I love these suggestions. I think you mentioned in segment one, something that is really helpful is to have someone kind of mentor you into helping you write a grant. And I think for people who haven’t had that experience, your suggestion of finding a sample proposal or asking someone to share it with you is kind of the next best thing, because it gives you a sense of how things are structured. And recently I did put in an IS grant, just earlier this summer as we record this, and I asked for a sample proposal from someone I knew, and it was so helpful. Especially after I finished my first draft, to then go back and look at kind of how they structured what they were doing just to see, you know, how do successful proposals look like and how are they structured. So I’m really glad you raised that suggestion, I think it’s really key. Let’s talk a little bit about receiving the grant and then what you should do to get started on the right foot. I think one of the most challenging things for new writers is they don’t kind of realize that they get the grant, and then it’s kind of hit the ground running. I mean the money arrives, and then it’s time to go. So what are some ways that you’ve really set yourself up for success with your proposals to make sure you can really hit the ground running.

**TC:** This is a great time to ask me these questions; we got the final work on the NSF project last week and USDA project. So when you ask these it makes me think I’d better do this work right now.

**KL:** [laughing]

**TC:** So I think, for me—and I don’t think everyone has to do this, I just think this works well for me, I just think that’s probably the response for the way to think about all my responses is this works for me, I hope it might be helpful to others. I’ve had to have, like it, for me, if I can put it on my calendar—so we have regular project meetings, and I want those because I want us to be—I want us to frequently have our project on our mind. As faculty we are very busy, we’re teaching and other projects in writing or more proposals, so making sure I have a time set aside weekly to meet and come back together and we are going to spend time talking about this particular project. So I would say making sure you’re having regular meetings as possible, I would say making timelines for projects. So publications, setting out these ambitious objectives, because usually when I set them out I accomplish them, and when I don’t they just happen when they happen. Creating, as needed—I’m not sure this is always needed—but creating teacher leaders with role statements. We don’t want to surprise them later with more work than they think they’ve agreed to do on our project. So it’s not somebody the leadership team that already wrote the grant, and we made sure as we think it’s needed we write some role statements, and then we try to even have like mini teams happening. So on the big [indiscernible] 12 project I had, it was a collaborative project with two universities, so we had—I think we had—six co-PIs. So knowing how much talent and expertise we had, we set up different groups with different leaders to do different parts of the project. And we always met to coordinate, but I didn’t, I was careful of, I want to make sure I’m taking advantage of everyone’s expertise. And I think that’s, that’s, those are some of the strategies I could think of.

**KL:** I think you’ve really hit on a key thing, which is the more organization you have, the better in terms of thinking about how to organize both your time, but also the funding for grants. And this is something I found as well writing larger grants, is the more clear I am about the objectives and the timeline in the proposal, the easier it is for me when the funding is awarded to get started. I’m wondering if you can also talk about if there are different kinds of institutional support that you think researchers should seek out when they’re managing grants. Are there, other than the kind of collaborators who get written into the grant, are there other supports that you rely on to make sure that you’re managing a grant efficiently and well?

**TC:** Yeah, I thought of there’s two. It seems, I don’t know, it also sounds kind of selfish. That’s probably not the right word, but I realize just the benefits of these discretionary thoughts, but that come back to researchers. So researchers that bring the university lots of money in terms of [indiscernible]. Our university, and universities that I have been to in the past, only a couple have always had ways to channel back some discretionary button to the researcher, and it is so valuable because you can’t, five years prior to your project starting, know exactly what will be necessary and really timely and important. So if you have some discretionary funding to put somebody on part of your project that is different than you might have even imagined but really important and timely, like for us when the next generation of science standards came out in the middle of a five year science ed grant. And so to have somebody to help us look at that in ways we hadn’t imagine but have resources to do it was really important. So, I wanted to give reasons for that instead of just saying, “Get the university to give you extra money.” I think, I’m realizing the importance of like a pre-award person to really help you get organized, just as long as it takes to put a proposal together. So anybody that can help you get forms filled out, that seems tedious but are really important at your university is helpful and then, kind coastal work people to help you figure out like your, you know your team is going to be spending more on this area than you thought you initially would but here’s some things we can do base on what we done in other projects. We don’t have it in our school but our engineering school has a grant writer and that doesn’t mean that its someone who writes grants for you, like you still have to come up with the ideas, you still have to be central in pulling it in the direction you need it based on your expertise but having a grant writer who has time to sit down and pull voices together across different print fields sometimes and to spend the time being really meticulous with the art piece and what you’re putting in as part of your proposal, I think is tremendously important and it seems like a lot of money for a university to invest in a grant writer but on the flip side, you know, we are going to fund a grant writer and on the flip side, we could be increasing our grant funding’s by millions and millions of dollars. So, it depends on how you look at the investment, I think. That’s about it. I did want to mention just one more kind of organizational strategy. I’m really, I don’t know, it’s just I didn’t realize how helpful it would be until we did it and I tried to do it in every grant I do, is we setup, like we are always thinking of research we want to do across the grant that might be peripheral to what we originally said we want to do. So, we can put a grad student to investigate something we hadn’t thought of originally but it’s really important but mainly we know what we were going to do when we entered the grant like you said, we write out timelines and how things are going to be accomplished. For us if we had yearly like we said in March, every year we are going to analyze the data comes in for the year so understand decisions working with us and his job is to get all the data analyzed, pre-posted for that particular year. So that’s really helpful to have that and we tried to set it up in the sequence of, get the data analyzed, bring our advisory board together, provide a report to the advisory board, they give us feedback on it, we use that same report with the advisory boards feedback as our end of year report to in a separate whatever and then we move that straight into conference proposals and then publications in the next year. So it was nice to only have to go to the statistician and to let him know each year that you are going to have this data and we want it analyzed by this time. We won’t be coming back to you two months from now with more work for you to do, just do it one year at a time and we’ll live with the fact that there may be something happening in the middle.

**KL:** I love that idea and the efficiency of creating those reports and what those different kinds of data analysis are used for. That’s such a concrete suggestion that’s so helpful. We are going to take another brief break, when we come back we’ll hear a little bit more from Todd. Back in a moment.

# Segment 3:

**KL:** Todd because you are so experienced with grant writing and you’ve done these multiple projects, I’m wondering if you can talk about, you know, is there a lesson or kind of a larger take away that your able to lean from your earlier experience that you’re now applying to the future work that you are doing for grant writing and research?

**TC:** yes. So I put some time thinking about, especially at the end of a grant project thinking about where, what did I accomplish? Or what did we accomplished and where is it going to go from here? And a lot of times, I’m a little disappointed; like I could get to the end of a project and I could see this achieving almost everything I said to achieve. So we get publications where we are able to show that participating in a precaution without a project leads to student gains, teacher participant’s vs non-teacher participants that delayed teacher groups happening. So we get almost the things we dreamed of when we start and I get to the end and I think, “We could’ve done more.” For me, it kind of pushed me in the direction of trying to think about ways that the work that we do in our projects are even more intricate embedded in the systems that we do the work in. One method of thinking about this that’s recently gotten some traction at intercept and other places as research practice partnerships. And so, it tries to honor kind of the pressing problems of practice that happens in these systems as the focus of the research and grant work that you do. So, you know, if I’m really committed to making sure that the work we do is important for the people who help us carry it out, then I’ll make sure that I find initial ways of planning that I’m trying to get at; like, what would be most valuable within your system to address that I might have some expertise and be able to help to address. So if we could co-craft some really important commitments of the project or even co-craft the possible research questions that we are trying to address with our projects that mattered in the districts or mattered to the people who are helping us, then that as much as possible keep them as kind of in the power of—keep them as involved in leadership as possible. So as much as our work, it’s their work as well and that way, they’ll find ways to embed it in their system and use their resources that are, already used for something to connect it to our project. And then by the time we are done, we hope we find other projects that continue our work but if we don’t, there’s ways that the project has been embedded in their system.

**KL:** I think that’s such an incredible point and really appoints to kind of the importance of the partnerships and that you build in grant collaborations and that it isn’t just kind of the person who’s funded going in and kind of conducting research that doesn’t have some kind of concrete change for the participants or the community partners who are engaged in that. As you’re talking, this is kind of reminding me a little bit about design based research which is a little bit more iterative, very focused on the practical, very focused on those partnerships. Is design based research something that you have started to engage in or that you’re embedding to your grant proposals?

**TC:** It’s something I’m really now trying to learn more about. So I went to a design-based implementation research workshop at UC Boulder last summer and I’ve been reading a lot in that area but for the reasons you mentioned, you try to look at the work you’re doing as designs. I love the notion of conjecture mapping, so in the learning sciences, thinking about using conjecture mapping as a way of doing research. By putting your hypothesis about how learning happens and how best to support it on the table in harm’s way so that the whole times throughout the project look for ways to either gather evidence to support those conjectures or find ways that your conjectures might need to be revised over time. So we’ve been beginning to work in this area but there are so many more other that are so much more experienced. I see the value because it is so explicit, like we are making conjecture maps and we are saying these are the task structures that participants will engage in and we think we’ll change their experience and the experience of their students and these are the kind of ways that have been mediated so we can gather evidence for the designs but we can also gather evidence for the theory behind the designs at the same time. And we are just starting to network but having just submitted a conference proposal on some work we are doing in the local science center. Like that conjecture map is a really powerful kind of theoretical tool for thinking with your data. So I’m a big beginning advocate of that work.

**KL:** That’s fascinating. I love that idea of—I mean I think, sometimes we think research as being a lot more stable than it is and that sometimes, especially for these multi-year projects, you find out early on that something you thought is just not the case and you have to adjust. Let’s talk a little bit about that. You know when that has happened—or first of all has it happened in your projects and if so, how do you make adjustments for that?

**TC:** I think that has brought out more recently the value of—like the design based work is you already go in thinking that there’s things that you think you know but you won’t be adjusting based on the real world context that you are applying it to. So in the—I’m just going to use the local science journal example because its most recent, we’ve gone in with ideas that we think we know what the task structures that are really important for changing the experience of underrepresented minorities in science learning environment, informal spaces but then we recognized something that we didn’t think was, that we didn’t make explicit foreground earlier. Things like, we realize how important it was for the leaders of those youth to frame the work differently than—like some would frame it in different ways and we saw the impact it would have on the learners. Depending on how the leader of a particular group framed the work they were doing, it would lead to either more kinds of weekly stem identity work from under-represented minorities or less. And so we began to make more explicit that, this is a really important part of leading these kinds of experience for learners. And then we looked at the literature for those areas to bring out some kinds of principles that we could use to think about, since we now are going to foreground on when we should draw on what other people know about them and bring them in our context. We would have just glossed over that or not treat it as one of the most important things but it became one of the most important things when the experiences of learners across groups was becoming more disparate. So, we had to figure out how to address that, so that’s just one example. (31:21)

**KL:** Research can be quite the messy endeavor, but I think when you’re open to it, as you’re pointing out, you can get all kinds of interesting insights as you go along. Todd, I want to thank you so much for taking the time to come on the show and share about some of your experiences with grant writing, this has been wonderful.

**TC:** Thank you, thanks for having me.

**KL:** And thank you 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.

# Bonus Clip #1:

[intro music]

**KL:** In this bonus clip, for episode28 of the *Research in Action* podcast, Dr. Todd Campbell shares about the hardest part for applying for a large research grant. Take a listen.

KL: Todd, given your experience with grant writing, I’m wondering if you can talk about the hardest part for you about applying for large research grants and how you overcome it.

**TC:** This is my hardest part, it’s initially deciding to commit, and then committing. So once I commit, I’m a hundred percent in, and I’m on the task of getting it done. But I find myself waffling at times saying, am I going to do it or am I not going to do it, and losing some valuable time at times when I don’t commit early enough. So, I thought of an example, I was in INASEF, a program officer came out to speak at a local university, and one thing he said, and I don’t know how you fact check this, but he said, that it takes about a whole month of a person’s time, who is leading a grant, to put it in. So that’s what INASEF had talked about was, I guess. So, I’m going to commit a month of my time to get a proposal in, and some people, I’m sure that varies with different circumstances, but it’s a huge commitment. So, I need to look at my schedule and I need to decide, do I have the time in my schedule to commit to this, and what’s going to be moved aside. And that’s really important, if I don’t, then I don’t want to put forward a subpar proposal. I don’t want, like you said, I don’t want the review panel having to look at it. And I don’t want it being out there with my name on it, when I didn’t have the time to invest as I should. So, I think I summed it up as ‘jump in or jump out.’ So either try to decide and look at your calendar and decide early if it’s something you can do. Make sure you aren’t over committing in approaching a new proposal. And like, one of the things that we did with one of the largest grants we had, was I kinda backed away from proposal writing for a year or two after, because I wanted to do the one we had really well. But usually at universities, when you’re successful, a lot of other people want to ask for your help, which is great, because you want to be able to give help to people, but, you don’t need to, in my opinion, we have to be careful in that we don’t just keep writing and we have success disaster.

**KL:** Mmhmm

**TC:** [laughing] We call that success disaster. And then one of the other hardest parts is, I guess, getting commitments from partners. Like, often they’re not on the same time scale or time line that we’re on, even if the proposal is due, they have other pressing things in front of them. Trying to get ahead of that early, and recognize that I need to be sensitive to other people’s deadlines and responsibilities.

**KL:** I think both of your hardest parts, they lead to my hardest part, which is knowing when to pull the plug. Especially if you’re a little bit of a ways into writing a proposal, and either you are realizing it’s going to take too much time and you will have to turn in a sub-par, you can’t give it what you need, or you cannot get the commitments from partners, and you need them in order to move forward. When do you decide when you need to stop and pull the plug on the proposal versus really pushing it and trying to get it in and make it the best you can. That’s my hardest part, is making that decision, and it’s a hard judgement call, especially with some of these larger proposals. And you may have a few weeks left until the deadline, but you’re still not quite sure if you can take it all the way.

**TC:** You’re very right, and you’re going to invest so much time. And as a junior faculty which I was writing a lot of these grants, you’re trying to balance, is this going to show up as something that counts, that my university, my institution will value, when they come to decide, do we invite this person back next year. So it’s critical and high pressure, high stakes for us, you know, if you’re a junior faculty. Or even now, like I don’t want to invest my time in things that aren’t rewarded in some ways later on. I would say, like from a positive perspective, this is, in hindsight as I look at all the grant writing that I try to do and have done, usually when I invest the time to write a grant, it’s like making me read the literature at a level and depth that I haven’t, and it’s really positioned me well for research that may not even be connected to the grant but it’s, so it’s, I haven’t ever really found it to be wasted time.

**KL:** Mmhm

**TC:** So even if I hadn’t gotten, or I got to two weeks before and I decided to pull the plug, I’ve done some work, and I just need to figure out now, how can I use this work in another area since I’m not going to use it here.

**KL:** Excellent point. Thanks so much for sharing your experience Todd.

[music]

**KL:** You’ve just heard a bonus clip from Episode 28 of the *Research in Action* podcast, with Dr. Todd Campbell sharing about the hardest part of applying for a large research grant. Thanks for listening!
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There are several ways to connect with the *Research in Action* podcast. Visit the website to post a comment about a specific episode, suggest a future guest, or ask a question that could be featured in a future episode. Email us at riapodcast@oregonstate.edu. You can also offer feedback about *Research in Action* episodes or share research-related resources by contacting the *Research in Action* podcast via Twitter @RIA\_podcast or by using the hashtag #RIA\_podcast.  Finally, you can call the *Research in Action* voicemail line at 541-737-1111 to ask a question or leave a comment. If you listen to the podcast via iTunes, please consider leaving us a review.

The *Research in Action* podcast is a resource funded by Oregon State University Ecampus – ranked one of the nation’s best providers of online education with more than 40 degree programs and over 1,000 classes online. Learn more about Ecampus by visiting ecampus.oregonstate.edu. This podcast is produced by the phenomenal Ecampus Multimedia team.

“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.