# Graduate and Professional Student Congress (GPSC) Research Grant

# HUMANITIES GRANT INSTRUCTIONS

Graduate and Professional Student Congress (GPSC) and Office of Research and Innovation (ORI) are excited to offer an additional research funding opportunity to graduate and professional students at the University of Arkansas. GPSC and ORI will be awarding research grants each worth up to $1,500; the number of grants awarded will vary based on amount of allocated funds given each year. To apply, you must be a graduate student in good academic standing in your program (i.e., enrolled for the next year and have a good standing within your department). Priority will be given to dissertation and thesis research. We encourage students from all majors, disciplines, and backgrounds to apply.

To apply you must submit the following documents:

* All applicants must include a signed copy of the adviser/mentor commitment statement from GPSC Research Council which attests to the viability of your project and your ability to complete it.
* The project narrative (directions for the narrative are in the application)

The grant committee reserves the right to decide on the allocation of monies for all proposed projects, or not to award a grant at all. If a student’s proposal is funded, they will be expected to fill out reports on the progress of their study and recognize GPSC in presentations and publications from their funded project  
  
**Application Outline/Guidelines/How to Apply:**Please ensure your proposal covers the areas below; our guidelines are in line with those for federal funding. Please keep in mind that the review committee includes researchers in diverse areas; there is a chance that the review committee does not have someone from your field. Your proposal should be easily understood by someone who is **not**familiar with your field. Excess jargon should **not**be used in your proposal. If jargon is necessary, the specific terms must be clearly defined/explained. Proposals that do not follow the format will be rejected automatically. Proposals that break the rubrics rules will see point deductions that may jeopardize your chances of winning the award*, so follow the directions closely!*

Proposals must be typed in 12-point font, double spaced, Times New Roman with 1-inch margins. The proposal should be uploaded as a PDF document. The proposal **should not exceed 10 pages (citation page(s) not included in page max).** Proposals longer than 10 pages will not be considered. We encourage all applicants to have their proposals read by their advisor/mentor, colleagues, friends, and/or family to ensure their narrative is consistent and understandable. Applicants are also encouraged to use resources on campus, such as the writing center, to improve their proposal. Proposal grammar, format, and citations should be the same standard used for grants in the writer’s field.

**Please format your proposal following this rubric:**

**Introduction (10 points):** This should be a short paragraph of 6 sentences or less that introduces the topic and explicitly states the project’s thesis/purpose.

**General Outline / Explanation (40 points):** This section should situate your topic within the existing field, explain how it challenges or furthers the field, how it further expands our understanding of the subject, and how your work may be practically applied or used outside of academia or what the significance is.

**Resources (20 points):** This section should explain where you are conducting research, what resources you are using, and why. Be *specific* in this section. If you are visiting another institution or need to travel for other reasons, describe why (examples: archival collection, archeological dig site, oral history/ interview, etc.).

**Methodology (20 points):** This section should explain your research method or theory. Use limited jargon or provide parenthetical explanations of unavoidable jargon in this section. Describe how you are acquiring and assessing data, documents, etc. and how the Research Resources listed above support the project.

**Application (10 points):** In this section, you should discuss future plans for your research (e.g., publications, future grant applications, conference submissions, dissertation).

**Budget Narrative (10 points):** Provide a narrative discussion of your budgetary needs. In this narrative, include a timeline for the proposed project and when the funds will be used. These funds may only be used for travel if that travel is to collect data for your research. The funds cannot be used to pay for research assistants but can be used to incentivize participation in research. This section MUST be detailed and specific and should have some time line. (dates of travel or data collection, price of specific airfare or softwares, etc.)

**Reference Section (10 points):** This section should include a bibliography of pertinent work cited in this proposal that demonstrates familiarity with the existing literature of the field. All references must be cited in your field’s appropriate style format. Proposals submitted without references will not be considered for review. This section will not be included in page count, but do not include more than 20 sources.

**Rubric:**

**Reviewer Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Directions to Reviewers:** Each area of the rubric has a set of total points associated with it and those points are allocated to specific aspects of each section. When evaluating proposals, please allocate and assign points based on if the proposal properly reflected and covered each key area within the overarching section. Please provide constructive comments/feedback for the applicant (remember – the applicant may request feedback; comments should be professional and helpful for future improvements).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Humanities Rubric** | **Total Points** | **Points Given** | **Allocation of points** | **Comments** |
| **Introduction:** This should be a clear and concise paragraph that introduces the topic and explicitly states the project’s thesis/purpose. No more than 6 sentences. | **10** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The information is not clear or concise and does not clearly state the project’s thesis/purpose. The reviewer does not understand the project’s purpose. *Applicant failed to follow section rules.*  3 – 4: The information may not be concise, but it is somewhat clear. The reviewer may or may not understand the project’s purpose.  5 – 6: The information is concise and somewhat clear. The reviewer somewhat understands the project’s purpose.  7 – 8: The information is concise but can be made clearer. The reviewer sufficiently understands the project’s purpose.  9 –10: The information is clear and concise, and clearly states the project’s thesis/purpose. The reviewer fully understands the project’s purpose. |  |
| **General Outline/Explanation:** This section should:   1. Situate your topic within the existing field **(10 points)** 2. Explain how it challenges or furthers the field **(10 points)** 3. Show it furthers expands our understanding of the subject **(10 points)** 4. How your work may be practically applied or used outside of academia **(10 points)** | **40** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The information is not clear or concise or *does not follow the proposed rules.*  3 – 4: The information provided gives context and is helpful but does not move the argument further along or assist with explaining why this project should be conducted.  5 – 6: The information and material are present, but the information may not be concise, the narrative is missing, or the reviewer is not convinced of the value of this work.  7 – 8: The information is present and clear, but narrative is not well-defined, the value of this work can be better emphasized, or the information may not be concise.  9 –10: These points are given if all relevant information is conveyed, the information is clear and concise, and the goals of the section are met. |  |
| **Research Resources:** This section should explain:   1. Where you are conducting research and what resources you are using **(10 points)** 2. Why you are needing those resources **(10 points)**   Be specific in this section. If you are visiting another institution or need to travel for other reasons, describe why. *Examples:* archival collection, archeological dig site, oral history/interview, etc. | **20** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The information is not clear or concise or *does not follow the proposed rules.*  3 – 4: The information provided gives context and is helpful but does not move the argument further along or assist with explaining why this project should be conducted.  5 – 6: The information and material are present, but the information may not be concise, the narrative is missing, or the reviewer is not convinced of the value of this work.  7 – 8: The information is present and clear, but narrative is not well-defined, the value of this work can be better emphasized, or the information may not be concise.  9 –10: These points are given if all relevant information is conveyed, the information is clear and concise, and the goals of the section are met. |  |
| **Methodology:**  This section should explain your research method.   1. Describe how you are acquiring and assessing data, documents, etc. **(10 points)** 2. Explain how the *Resources* listed above support the project as explained in the *General Outline* **(10 points)**   *Use limited jargon or provide parenthetical explanations of unavoidable jargon in this section.* | **20** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The information is not clear or concise or *does not follow the proposed rules.*  3 – 4: The information provided gives context and is helpful but does not more the argument further along or assist with explaining why this project should be conducted.  5 – 6: The information and material are present, but the information may not be concise, the narrative is missing, or the reviewer is not convinced of the value of this work.  7 – 8: The information is present and clear, but narrative is not well-defined, the value of this work can be better emphasized, or the information may not be concise.  9 –10: These points are given if all relevant information is conveyed, the information is clear and concise, and the goals of the section are met. |  |
| **Academic Application:**  In this section, you should discuss future plans for your research. For instance: publications, future grant applications, conference submissions, etc. | **10** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The information is not clear or concise or *does not follow the proposed rules.*  3 – 4: The information provided gives context and is helpful but does not more the argument further along or assist with explaining why this project should be conducted.  5 – 6: The information and material are present, but the information may not be concise, the narrative is missing, or the reviewer is not convinced of the value of this work.  7 – 8: The information is present and clear, but narrative is not well-defined, the value of this work can be better emphasized, or the information may not be concise.  9 –10: These points are given if all relevant information is conveyed, the information is clear and concise, and the goals of the section are met. |  |
| **Budget Narrative:**  Provide a narrative discussion of your budgetary needs. In this narrative, include a timeline for the proposed project and when the funds will be used. These funds may only be used for travel if that travel is to collect data for your research; the funds cannot be used to pay for research assistants but can be used to incentivize participation in research.   1. Must include proposed dates and funds to be spent by dates **(5 points)** 2. Researchers properly convey what the money will be used for (e.g., buying supplies, samples, paying participants; **5 points**) | **10** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The information is not clear or concise or *does not follow the proposed rules.*  3 – 4: The information provided is good or helpful, but the reviewer does not find the importance or value to be conveyed appropriately.  5: These points are given if all relevant information is conveyed, the information is clear and concise, and the goals of the section are met. |  |
| **References:** This section should include a limited bibliography of no more than **20** monographs or articles that demonstrates familiarity with the existing literature of the researcher’s field. This section should be formatted in a way proper to the researcher’s field. | **10** | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent  Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: Majority of the references are improperly and inconsistently formatted and consist of *more than 20 sources.*  3 – 4: Some of the references are improperly and inconsistently formatted and consist of more than 20 sources.  5 – 6: Some of the references are improperly and inconsistently formatted.  7 – 8: Nearly all references are properly and consistently formatted.  9 – 10: All references are properly and consistently formatted. |  |
| Total: | /120 |  |  |  |
| **Do you strongly recommend this proposal to be considered for the Research Grant?** Please provide additional comments/feedback, if necessary. | Yes/Maybe/No |  |  |  |