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Aaron Wagner:

Methodology Minutes is brought to you by the Methodology Center at Penn State. Hello and welcome to methodology minutes. With me today is Lisa Dierker. Lisa is professor of psychology in the Walter Crowell University, professor of social sciences at Wesleyan University. She's also an investigator at the Methodology Center and has had collaborations with the Methodology Center stretching back for years. Lisa's research focuses on applications of state of the art quantitative methods in understanding the development of nicotine dependence and other addictive behaviors. In this podcast, we're not focusing on her research primarily, but on grant writing. Lisa has been the principal investigator of several grants from the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation and different foundations and trusts. Lisa, welcome and thanks for being here.

Lisa Dierker:

Thanks for having me.

Aaron Wagner:

Start off by giving us a little bit of a background about your research and more specifically what type of successful grants have you written in your career?

Lisa Dierker:

Sure. Yeah. I am an addiction researcher. My background is in developmental psychology and then a postdoctoral training in psychiatric epidemiology. It's really interested in putting those pieces together in interesting ways and marrying them with methods. My grant writing, I've had a career development award through the National Institute of Drug Abuse. I, as you mentioned, have had some foundation funding as well, medical research foundations and more recently, interested also in education, how to get more people asking these kinds of interesting questions by giving them the skills they need to do that and then NSF funding as well. So.

Aaron Wagner:

Thanks. Beyond the obvious of getting money, what do you think is the value of grant writing?

Lisa Dierker:

I think the grant writing can really help you work on cohesiveness while having a real breadth to the work that you do. I like grant writing, particularly because, unlike the papers that you write where you're really saying what you did and maybe some next steps, which is wonderful, grants are all about vision. They have to be incredibly concrete the way an empirical paper is, but they're also about what is possible. I think that is really why I enjoy grant writing so much.

Lisa Dierker:

I don't mean I enjoy grant writing by just, I have no ideas and I sit down, here's a blank piece of paper, but I find that understanding what grants can do as ideas come to me, I feel like I'm always percolating on a grant. They tend to be in very different stages of development from, hey, this would just be a great idea. I wonder how I would do it to even percolating on specific aims to the point where I finally sit down and they come up. They come pretty quickly, not because they didn't take a long time, but I did a lot of work on them in the process of doing my research, in the process of collaborating with people, in the process of doing science. I think you're crafting your vision while you do that, in a sense potentially percolating on new grants that can be written.

Interviewer:

Awesome. Thank you very much. Sometimes we can learn from other's mistakes and maybe our listeners could learn from yours if you've ever made any. Presumably, you've been involved in submitting grants that were not funded. Is there any common thread that you can trace through unsuccessful submissions or submissions that in retrospect you can say, those we're not going to work out?

Lisa Dierker:

That's a great question and I have a couple of answers to that. First, I want to just sort of create some context. I have been a university professor for many years in most of my career, dating back to the late 90s. Grant writing for me was a way to move my work forward in meaningful ways. It was not a way to stay funded. Right? I didn't have to, from the beginning of my career, fund my own salary year-to-year for decades at a time. With that approach, I'm sure I would have written lots of grants, thrown them out there and saw what stuck. That's a perfectly reasonable approach within the context of really needing to fund your work and your salary, so that you can continue to do your work.

Lisa Dierker:

From the position of a hard money position that many people also have a different direction within academics, I have not taken that approach. Yes, I certainly have had grants that have failed, but they often have failed because they were written before their time or before I have the experience necessary. One of the reasons I've always been very positive about grant writing is because even if one didn't get funded, something great would come of it later. I think it could be very demoralizing to spend the kind of time that grant writing really takes and then have them fail and think, "Wow, I really messed that up."

Lisa Dierker:

Generally speaking, there are things that, "Yeah, this may not be the time, that might not have been quite the way the idea needed to be packaged, but put it in the file cabinet for now, not the trash can, and they've always come back. The best example of this is the first grant that I wrote when I started as an assistant professor. I was convinced I needed to be an independent scholar and the best way to prove that was to get an RO1. I was clear about that. I had been collaborating with some folks in the community. I felt that the work I was doing in addiction could really help move the community health innovations that they were trying to do forward.

Lisa Dierker:

I wrote a grant about addiction in the community. The response was, "Okay, you can write a grant, we get that, but we don't believe for a minute you can do this." I thought, "Oh, I can, I can." Of course, I was very junior, I had no track record. It was extraordinarily ambitious. I felt that I had demonstrated that I'd created the relationships. Again, I can understand that the reaction was, we see how to write a grant, but we don't feel we want to, in a sense risk on what you've shown so far.

Lisa Dierker:

I was devastated by that, because I didn't know how... Just because you've got it turned down, sometimes you can just rewrite it and turn it in again. "They don't believe I can do it, there's not a lot I can do to make that grant better." That was what I put in the file drawer. I got the best advice of probably of my career at that point, which was, "Why did you write an RO1? Why don't you write a career development award?" That was really what was my first major grant. As an independent researcher, I received a KO1. That's actually how I got linked up with the Methodology Center and Linda Collins. We worked together on a research network on tobacco. I had written this grant on methodology wanting more training and to become more sophisticated in bringing new methods even from different disciplines to bear on addiction questions.

Lisa Dierker:

I asked Linda if she would be my mentor. I barely knew her and she was very gracious to say yes and brought me into this family of people who were working on similar things, with very similar missions and agendas. That was great. I want to say, about five years later, there was a medical research foundation in Connecticut, the Donaghue Medical Research Foundation, who was looking to do more community work and to make data in the community, really work for people in the community. I pulled that back out of my file drawer, rewrote it a bit and that ended up getting funded not, as an RO1, but based on a mission that a foundation had, that they wanted to do. They were more local so they understood the players involved. There were just so many things that made it work in a sense and that was a really great grant.

Lisa Dierker:

As well, I had some postdocs that worked with me for the first time. Again, I got a lot of good relationships going in the community, which I think is really important for researchers to put their research in context. Yeah. That was a really long circuitous answer to your question, but generally speaking, I think you want to feel good about the grants that you put out there. When they do not get funded, it can be a matter of making some adjustments and resubmitting. More than once, I think I've had the experience of," This was a good idea. I do feel good about it, but it's not the time. It's not the right opportunity. I'm going to wait."

Lisa Dierker:

Everything has come back almost always in the form of grants, but sometimes in the form of a really pivotal paper. Sometimes when you put a grant together and you've really laid out a vision for something, in a sense, you've laid out the work that you want to accomplish over the next two years, the next three years, the next five years. A lot of the writing that goes into it and the thinking, can often generate not just another paper, but maybe a pivotal paper in what you're doing.

Aaron Wagner:

Thanks. What funding mechanisms do you think are best for young investigators and/or graduate students to pursue? Why do you recommend those?

Lisa Dierker:

Hands down the career development, career-wise. What they're doing, they're not asking you to have demonstrated a career yet. Right? They're looking for your potential and they're willing to support that potential and the growth of that potential. As a junior person, as a postdoc, it's incredibly valuable. They basically protect your time to get additional training, to make additional connections, to get your legs underneath of you as it were. The reality is that, if you tried to have a career with only what you learn in graduate school, you wouldn’t go very far. My graduate school training, and based on what I'm doing now, I could probably do 5% of what I'm doing now based on what I learned as a graduate student. Things change. Even if they didn't change, even if they stayed just the same a really vibrant career and things that are going to make a difference and really move science forward, they require constant career development and constant training.

Lisa Dierker:

Without a career development award it can be very difficult with the pressures of being a junior faculty member or in a junior position in a research institution to try to carve out that time and space to do it. Luckily, there are a lot of different mechanisms. As a postdoc, the F32 is really good through the NIH mechanisms. I actually had a KO1 that was a mentored career development award and there are other cases that are appropriate depending on what kinds of training people have. NSF also has career development awards. For people who are do more experimental work or maybe are in cognitive psychology and things like that, sometimes NSF can be the right place for it, but it really protects your time to do the kind of continued career development, skill development that is really, really necessary in those early years.

Aaron Wagner:

Great, thanks. What do you recommend for people who are in their mid-career or senior?

Lisa Dierker:

There are a lot of options at that point and I think you can go in several different directions. Obviously, by then, you can more easily convince people that you are worthy of an RO1, so that's a nice. Another type of mechanism through NIH, the R21s, which are more exploratory/developmental grants, can be really good as well. Basically, they're short, which is nice. Right? These grants are not 50 pages long. I think they're six or seven. That probably includes references. That helps quite a bit. They really are meant to be a little bit more risky or working on things that are somewhat new. Those can be incredibly helpful too. They may not be as large funding-wise as an RO1 or even as long, but they can really help you establish things and move a vision forward in some important ways.

Lisa Dierker:

I have also gotten some funding through, from the National Science Foundation. They are very interested in STEM education in general. I too would like these kinds of skills, relative to doing science, relative to bringing new methods to bear on really important questions in our society, I'd like to bring more people to the table. NSF has funds around that as well, that you could potentially go for. Again, those would not probably be as appropriate for a junior person, but once someone has really demonstrated their commitment to this area, their interest, their vision, and have a bit of a track record, I think those are more appropriate.

Lisa Dierker:

Then the other places are foundations, which I think should not be ignored. I had money from at least three or four foundations and they've been incredibly helpful. Foundations often have a particular mission. If you find that commonality between what you're interested in and what you're able to contribute and their mission, I think it can be a very fruitful relationship. I like conversations, right? Submitting a grant application is great, but there's no conversation that I'm having with the reviewers other than the notes that they give back to me. With the foundations, it's not unusual to be interviewed. I've been interviewed for at least two of the foundations that I've gotten money from. That's really very valuable too, to try to work out where you have that common ground and to learn from what they're interested in, what they've learned from their grant giving, and to allow you to share what you've learned from your grant getting. I think foundations can be incredibly helpful as well.

Aaron Wagner:

Yeah. That's great.

Lisa Dierker:

The other little last one I'll mention too, which is a little different. I've only done this once and there are pros and cons to it, I would say. There are actually large grants that institutions get, so institutional grants, often that come from foundations. There are probably more opportunities for institutional grants from foundations than there are for individual scientists grants. Your institution or your school or university will actually submit the grant, but you as a PI would make it work, in a sense. Those are typically more about changing higher education or changing something in the community or some sort of outreach goal, relative to the work that you do. That is also another option as well.

Aaron Wagner:

Interesting. You're not really familiar with this-

Lisa Dierker:

Yeah, and I will say this too. I, personally, in my career, really enjoy the research and really enjoy asking questions in deeper, more nuanced interesting ways. It's not unusual for people in academia, once they've done research, to be interested in moving, let's say into the administration or into... There are a lot of journeys people can take in this particular careeer. For people who are interested in moving that route, becoming deans and becoming provost and becoming... If that were your interest, actually those institutional foundational grants are how you could create a record of, in a sense, institutional movement that could help quite a bit.

Aaron Wagner:

Thanks. To the heart of the matter for our young researcher listeners out there, what should a researcher do to get started in grant writing?

Lisa Dierker:

Read grants. Absolutely, nothing is more valuable. I cannot tell you how much reading grants has helped me. I also share grants regularly for the reason that I want to be able to help other people the way those who have shared grants with me have helped. I know that there are a lot of training mechanisms out there for grant writing, I have not used those. I have gone to different talks about grant writing. I don't find that helpful at all. I really think reading grants that have been successfully funded tell you everything you need to know. There is so much in there. I had NIH money and some foundation money and I decided I wanted to write a grant to NSF and I said, "Oh my goodness, I don't know what an NSF grant looks like. I don't even know what's this mechanism. What do people say? This is a whole new mechanism. Right? I have no idea. I've never read a grant, never written a grant, I feel like I'm 25 again."

Lisa Dierker:

I reached out to people who had been funded. Now, I don't mean funded to do exactly what I wanted to do. I just mean funded through this particular mechanism. It was incredible. Some of the grants I read, I didn't really like, I didn't think they really delivered the message the way I would like to. Others were just sublime. I read them and I just thought, "This is the best friend ever, and this is just amazing." In the wonderful grants, I could see how they talked about dissemination, how they talked about the background research that intuit, how they talked about what the deliverables would be.

Lisa Dierker:

You just would say, "That's it." You're not really cannibalizing what they wrote because as I said, they're pitching something not even on addiction, or education, or whatever I was interested in, but you can see the meta message and how effective it is. I cannot tell you enough. The first NSF grant I got funded the first time and they asked if they could use it in their training of grant writing for NSF. I have to say, I don't remember whose grant it was, it was something on astronomy or something having nothing to do with what I did, but they deserve the credit. My grants stood on the shoulders, the writing of the grant. The ideas were my own, but the real grantsmanship around it, those ideas came from reading really well written grants. You can say, "Well, what else?" I'm telling you that has been terribly, terribly, terribly helpful to me.

Lisa Dierker:

I have an NSF grant right now that's actually in a phase three. Each phase was a different type of grant with different expectations. When I would get the next, let's say I got phased two, I was already asking for phase three grants from people. I wasn't ready to write it. I didn't even know what it would be about, but I wanted to have an idea about, in a sense what it takes. Right? What does it take? When you don't know, I really think reading these successful grants can really take you there in ways that just... The time you're putting into that has incredible payoff.

Aaron Wagner:

Thanks. That is concrete advice.

Lisa Dierker:

It is.

Aaron Wagner:

While preparing a grant, whom should researchers contact and why?

Lisa Dierker:

That's a great question. Through my whole career, I've always heard you should really contact the project officers or the people in the institutions, NSF, NIH, the foundations, who are our grant givers. I haven't been wildly kearsley successful with that. I've gone so far is to prepare grants, months before they're due, yeah, three months before they're due or something and try to pass it by even for someone from one of the funding agencies. I actually haven't met much success with that. I'm not saying you shouldn't do that, I'm just trying to share my own experience with it. The reality is that the people who review the grants and rate the grants, whether they're fundable or not fundable, are not working for NSF, or NIH, or whatever.

Lisa Dierker:

Well, I think it can be helpful to talk with someone at the agencies about their general interests. I think you can get a lot of that from the RFPs and other things that they're already putting out in publishing that you won't get a lot more necessarily from a conversation. I hesitate to say that because every meeting I go to, the people from NIH and NSF are all like, "Come talk to me, come talk to me, come talk to me." Anyway, but my experience has been that, people have not been very available. The people to talk to are really the people you may want to include on your grant as either consultants or even co-PIs or co-investigators, that sort of thing. I have learned that, it does matter who is on the grant. You could have the best idea in the universe, but if you do not take the grantsmanship step of bringing people in who can really contribute to its forward movement, it's likely you will not get the grant.

Lisa Dierker:

I remember when I was doing my KO1, my career development award, that actually required not just mentors, but it also required other people to write letters on your behalf. I remember asking someone at NIH at the time, "So should this be someone who really, really knows me and can just write a great letter, just in a very nuanced way about who I am and what I have to contribute? Or should this be the biggest name person I know and who even knows me sort of?" The answer came back a resounding, "The biggest name you know, who knows you sort of."

Lisa Dierker:

I did that and I do think it made a difference. That was really helpful. That advice was really very, very helpful. It reminded me that, yeah, that there are great ideas and then there's grantsmanship that take those great ideas to a place where they will be funded.

Aaron Wagner:

Yeah. In defense of contacting ones-

Lisa Dierker:

It's okay. I'm so sorry. Wait. Can I say too in my defense, contacting my project officer when I had been funded has been wildly wonderful and supportive. That's been amazing. My project officers have been wonderful. When I just have an idea for a grant, before anything has even happened, is when I haven't found that to be so helpful.

Aaron Wagner:

My experience here, not writing grants, but in seeing grants being written has been that, it has helped some particularly junior researchers steer the ship a little bit when it's so new. Maybe they could've gotten the same experience by reading grants. There's lack of capacity of thinking. I've seen it help to focus people's thinking. I have also gotten the impression that certain project officers have advocated for grants that were borderline.

Lisa Dierker:

That could well be too. Yeah. That's interesting too. I haven't been really good at the politics, I think, of grants granting. On a positive note, as bad as I've been at that, right, I haven't reached out and said, "Make sure you know my name." And that kind of thing. I've been very successful. What I mean is that, I'm glad we're talking about this too because I don't want people to think, if that's not their bag, that they shouldn't write grants either. Some people that saw their bag, they can't wait to call someone and really talk about it and share their ideas.

Lisa Dierker:

Some people feel like, "Oh, I really don't want to do that. I don't feel comfortable and it feels awkward." Or whatever. I think both of those are okay. I think reaching out and talking is wonderful. I think you feel like you've got what you need and that would be a step. It's also okay. I feel really good about the grants, just the process in that way as well, that there was room for me, even though I didn't feel comfortable, not even just making a phone call, but sometimes you're at meetings or conferences and you could go up and talk to someone and I didn't. I just didn't feel very comfortable doing that. For me, it felt forced. For other people, it may not be. I think it's good that that works. In the sense whatever works for you. Talk to people if you want to talk. If you want to go and read grants, that's good. Ultimately, you're going to have to sit down in front of your computer and get it out on paper.

Aaron Wagner:

Absolutely. If you are an applied scientist and you wanted to write a grant to apply innovative methods, how would you incorporate innovative methods?

Lisa Dierker:

This is what I have more experience with. I try to do this pretty much in any grant that I write. Really the way to do it, is to show how questions can be asked in a better way, in a sense, in a more nuanced way, in a way we haven't been able to ask them before with methods. I do addiction research. I'm not going to uncover a new risk factor for addiction. They are incredibly well established from longitudinal work, done most of it, even before I came into the field. We have established them again and again and again and again. We want to understand better the who, the why, the when, the how, the, all of those questions about how risk and protective factors work, how that could inform intervention. That's really where methods can take us and how that can be integrated into your grant.

Lisa Dierker:

Well, if we just show that deviant behaviors in youth are a risk factor for addiction in adulthood, yeah, that's not very interesting and no money is going to come forth from that kind of insight. The reality is that, behavior is difficult to predict. We're never going to be perfect at it, but we can get closer to it when we have methods that are more sensitive to the detailed questions that need to be asked. As a substantive researcher, I find methods to really be an incredible way to move my vision forward around the substantive questions.

Aaron Wagner:

Well, you might be not surprised to learn that we have the methodology [crosstalk 00:27:04].

Lisa Dierker:

Yes. Yeah. That's why I love you guys, surely.

Aaron Wagner:

Generally, it's good for a point.

Lisa Dierker:

I was thinking in saying this earlier that, when I first came here and I spent a year here, back in 2008 and I really, really got to know people and really began to collaborate more effectively, I think, I was asking myself as a substance of researcher, what I had to contribute. Everyone here was so sophisticated in what they were doing and what they were really bringing to the field. It was exciting to see that the questions I was bringing had a place and that, that contributed to the bigger work that was being done here. That was very exciting to me. It really showed me too that, collaboration isn't just that. We'll do it 50:50 because it goes faster, but, in fact, we are bringing different ideas, and different viewpoints, and different skills, and different expertise to the table and we're making something new that wasn't possible without all of us together.

Aaron Wagner:

Yeah. As you and I were talking about before the recording of the podcast, that's a really central tenant of why the methodology should exist, sort of, yeah.

Lisa Dierker:

Absolutely. Absolutely. That's been really helpful as well, but I have these ideas, I tried to bring new methods to them, but then to be working with the people who have developed those methods, understand their strengths and limitations that are very detailed in meaningful level, that raises the work as well, raises my ideas, raises the vision, raises the possibility of what we can get done.

Aaron Wagner:

The flip side of the last question. If you were a methodologist, how would you go about getting your research funded?

Lisa Dierker:

Well, I would definitely collaborate. In the same vent, I would collaborate with people who have substantive research questions. Data would also be helpful if they have data. I think it's really important too, what I've seen in, in my own career, as I've had colleagues and others that I've watched. Even if you were a methodologist and you're really into the statistical aspects of research, it's still important to carve out an area. It could be a very broad area like health. I don't think you need to be as micro as someone often in a substantive area needs to be. I wrote a grant once with a postdoc on child abuse and we were bringing new methods to the questions, this postdoc was really interested in launching a career in child abuse and the reviews came back, basically, the person, Ie. me, who's more senior here is not a child abuse researcher.

Lisa Dierker:

Now, my attitude was, I really felt, I could do what we were proposing, but it reminded me that we really do see people as a particular, you need a box to, in essence, sell yourself in, or work in or work from. I'm not saying you can't move outside that box. I mean health is a very large umbrella that I function in within the realm of addiction. As a methodologist, I think it can be dangerous to not have some substantive umbrella that you work from. As I talked about earlier, I do think grant getting can show a real coherence to your work as can a substantive area, bring real coherence to your work.

Lisa Dierker:

I think that can be really very, very helpful. You're almost in a better position if you are a methodologist coming at this because many people want to work with you. Many people need your skills, want your skills. There's no question about what you have to offer. It's quite clear. It's really up to you to, I think, make the decisions that guide you in the direction of greatest interest to you.

Aaron Wagner:

Thanks. Should scientists pursue grant writing in an environment where funding is difficult to get?

Lisa Dierker:

Yes. I think that the examples I've given previously demonstrate why I feel that way. One being that, every grant I've ever written turned into something great. Oftentimes, it turned into funding, sometimes right away, sometimes later down the line. If not funding, then certainly a pivotal paper or a real opportunity to take your research in a direction that you're interested in going. I think it's not a waste of time. There's advice I've heard given to junior people, even at my own institution where you need to be productive and if grant writing is going to distract you from getting enough papers out and that kind of thing, there's dissuades in a sense from doing it. I would argue, yes, you need to write papers and I'm not saying to just run around with vision. I don't think that's practical either. I think, to think big, you do need to think small first and to think big, you do need to accomplish something first.

Lisa Dierker:

I just think that writing grants is a way to, in a sense, plan a path for yourself. I think it's definitely worth it. Even in an environment where it's difficult to get funding, I think you have to be tenacious in any environment with grant writing. Yeah, you just have to be very tenacious. It can be difficult. I remember feeling early in my career, even when I would get, not just reviews on grants, but reviews on papers, it would take me a day to come. It would take me a day to feel like I'm good. I would just be devastated for a day. After about a day, I'd pick myself back up and decide, "Okay, I see now. I can take it in little bits and see what I can change and see how I can move forward." It does require a tenacity that feels great.

Lisa Dierker:

What I mean is, I feel like tenacity training is good and so I feel grateful. I feel grateful in a sense for the rejections and so forth because it's taught me a lot, it's given me, I think, more strangely and ironically, more confidence. When you can pick yourself up after a day and just keep plowing through it creates a lot of confidence about what can happen. I think you have to look at the bigger picture. It's easy in an academic position to look at a year of your time and think, "Well, what did I really get done?" When you feel like you worked really hard, but maybe you didn't publish that year or maybe things are all in process and that kind of thing. Yeah. I think you need to take a wide view of it and grants definitely, they require a wider view even than papers do.

Aaron Wagner:

Thanks. As parting words of wisdom, could you give your top three pieces of advice on grant writing?

Lisa Dierker:

Top three. Okay. My first I've given really successful grads. It's just so valuable. I would say to collaborate with experienced researchers. It definitely have relationships. I don't think in the modern world, that anyone is successful in grant writing from their office with the door closed. I really do think it requires relationships. I also think those relationships will take you... I think they'll generate those ideas that will take you to grant writing. I think, the scariest thing for me early in my career was, will I have the ideas? Someone gave me the advice, just do the next thing. There's always going to be a next thing and just keep doing it. That was extra strangely good advice. If there are more people around you, that next thing will be usually some pretty dynamite opportunities. I think collaborating with experienced researchers is really great.

Lisa Dierker:

Then the other thing, I was going to say, do what you like. If you really don't like genetics, but you feel like you need to write a grant in genetic, it's really not going to work. You really do need to like what you're doing. Even early in my career, as difficult as sometimes it felt I liked the puzzle of research at its basic level. I just thought the puzzle and putting it together and the satisfaction I felt from it in the forward movement was really wonderful. I think really do what you like, but right when I wrote that down when I was thinking about what's my advice, I wanted to mention too that, one of the reasons that's worked for me is I like a lot of things.

Lisa Dierker:

I always say, I've never met a data set I didn't like and I feel so excited about so many questions. While I think you should do what you like, I want to encourage people to be flexible about how exciting different areas can be, and different questions can be because I certainly have met people who have even struggled to finish their PhD, forget about a career, just couldn't seem to finish the PhD because they felt it had to go a certain way, they had to get the best research of their lives done, they seem less flexible about what it could be and that often was the undoing of that trajectory for them. Do what you like, but be open to the opportunities around you, I think is my third bit of advice.

Aaron Wagner:

Well, thank you. I feel that you have transmitted your enthusiasm for this, to our listeners and I really, really appreciate you taking the time and coming down here and generally it was a good talk.

Lisa Dierker:

I'm glad you did this in person.

Aaron Wagner:

Yes, this was great. We have planned this as a long distance thing and it was a boondoggle. Lisa bailed me out. Anyhow, thank you very much, Lisa.

Lisa Dierker:

Thank you so much.

Aaron Wagner:

You have been listening to Methodology Minutes. Please visit methodology.psu.edu for podcasts, software, reading lists and more.