# Graduate and Professional Student Congress (GPSC) Research Grant

# STEM 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:**

**Project Narrative (10 points):** Describe the relevance of this research to the larger society in three sentences or less. Applications can describe how in the short and long term their research would contribute to the larger field. *The project narrative will not be included in the word count.*

**Research Strategy (30 points):** Discuss the relevance and importance of your research in the context of prior research. Ensure that the reader understands how your proposed research questions fills a gap or need in the field. In this section, you should include the significance and broader impact of your study. Explain the problems or barriers to progress that the proposed project addresses.

**Specific Aims (10 points):** Describe concrete, specific aims of the proposed research project. What objectives are to be achieved at the completion of this project?

**Approach (50 points):** Describe the overall strategy, methodology and analysis to be used to accomplish the aims/goals of this project. Provide a complete and detailed explanation of how the research will be conducted. Include description of proposed participants of the research (or the subject(s) of focus if not human subjects such as passages from books, websites, or artifacts in a museum), the procedures, the research design, any measure that will be employed, and how the data will be analyzed. Further, power analyses are expected when appropriate; if studies use qualitative methodology, justification for sample size is needed. It is expected that any project using human or animal subjects will receive IRB/IACUC approval prior to disbursement of funds.

**Impact to Larger Field (10 points):** Describe how, if the hypotheses are supported for the proposed project, they will impact the larger field. In this section, you should also discuss your future plans for these data. For instance, publications, future grant endeavors, or conference submissions.

**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 executed. Make sure to itemize all direct cost for the requested time period of the proposed project. These funds cannot be used for travel, unless that travel is to collect data; the funds cannot be used to pay for research assistants but can be used to incentivize participation in research. *The budget narrative will not be included in the word count.*

All references must be cited in your field’s appropriate style format. Please ensure all spelling and grammar are correct for the proposal.

# Rubric:

**Reviewer Name: Date:**

**Directions to Reviewers:** Each area of the rubric has a set of total points associated with it (e.g., 30 points for the Research Strategy) and those points are allocated to specific aspects of each section (10 points per key area of the Research Strategy). When evaluating proposals, please allocate and assign points based on if the proposal properly reflected and covered each key area within the overarching section.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewers Name:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Area** | **Total Points** | **Points Given** | **Allocation of points** | **Comments** |
| **Project Narrative:** This should be a clear and concise message about how the proposed project would benefit society.  **\*3 sentences or less** | 10 | 1-2: poor  3-4: acceptable  5-6: good  7-8: above average  9-10: excellent Points Awarded: | 1 – 2: The narrative does not follow rubric and the importance is not conveyed  3 – 4: The narrative does not follow rubric, importance may/may not be conveyed, but the reviewer sees value in the work.  5 – 6: The narrative followed guidelines and is clear, but importance not conveyed as clearly. 7 – 8: The importance of the narrative is clearly conveyed, but reviewer does not fully understand the value of the work; the narrative followed guidelines for this section. 9 –10: The narrative follows guidelines, impact is clearly conveyed, and the reviewer understands the importance of this work. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Research Strategy:** The introduction flows and relevant background information clearly establishes a research question. The reviewer is able to easily understand the research presented to them. The applicant establishes a need for their research.   1. RS information given is relevant to the study objectives (**10 points**) 2. The need to assess this research question is conveyed in the RS (**10 points**) 3. The RS is written coherently, removed of jargon or has limited jargon, and the reviewer can follow the logic (**10 points**) | 30 | 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 is 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. |  |
| **Specific Aims:** The proposal clearly lays out the goal(s) of the study and any proposed hypothesis. The current study reflects what was discussed in the Research Strategy.   1. Aims sufficiently motivated by background information or theory (**7 points**) 2. Concrete and specific; If study is exploratory and no hypothesis | 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 move the argument further along or assist with explaining why this project should be conducted.  5 – 6: The information and material is present, but the information may |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| were proposed, there is clear indication of this (**3 points**) |  |  | 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. |  |
| **Approach:**   1. *Sample/Participants/Subjects:* Researchers discuss who/what will be involved in their study (documents, people, animals) and IRB/IACUC (if needed). The researchers need to justify a sample size for their study (e.g., power analysis) if appropriate. (**10 points**) 2. *Study Design:* The researcher explains their study design (correlational, cross sectional, longitudinal, experimental, secondary). (**10 points**) 3. *Variables:* The variables used in their study are operationalized and described appropriately. They explain assessments/   questionnaires/ tools they are | 50 | 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 is 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 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| using to collect their data. (**10 points**)   1. *Procedure:* Researchers clearly explain what participants will do in their study or what they intend to do with their sample. They explain the procedure step-by- step. (**10 points**) 2. *Methodology:* Researchers explain how they are going to answer their proposed specific aims. What analysis will they conduct? (**10 points**) |  |  | information is clear and concise, and the goals of the section are met. |  |
| **Impact to Larger Field:** The researcher should discuss how their results will impact future research. They should also discuss their plans with the data in the long term.   1. The theoretical or empirical implications of the study are identified or explained (**5 points**) 2. Research makes a broad impact by advancing our understanding of the topic, lending itself to downstream applications to society, policy, opening new   research questions (**5 points)** | 10 | 1 - 2: poor  3 - 4: acceptable  5: 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. |  |
| **Budget Narrative:** The applicant clearly explains how they plan to use the money and has a clear proposed timeline for spending the funds.  1. Must include proposed dates and | 10 | 1 - 2: poor  3 - 4: acceptable  5: 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 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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**) |  |  | 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. |  |
| Total: | /120 |  |  |  |
| Does the reviewer have any other final  comments about the application, applicant, or letter of recommendation? | Yes/Maybe/No |  |  |  |