

NASP Graduate Student Research Grants

The NASP Graduate Student Research Grants (GSRG) program was created by the NASP Research Committee to support high-quality, theory-driven, graduate student research that furthers the mission and goals of NASP. The Committee intends to award three grants of up to \$1,000 this year.

Eligibility: The Committee intends to award at least one grant for thesis-level research and at least one grant for dissertation-level research, pending a sufficient pool of competitive applicants at each level. Applicants must be enrolled in a School Psychology graduate education program and be regular or student members of NASP at the time of application. The proposed research may be a thesis or dissertation required for completion of the graduate education program, but this is not a necessity. The student must be the principal investigator, and this must be clearly indicated in all application and proposal materials.

Innovation and Creativity: Research topics that demonstrate innovation and/or creativity will be awarded up to 3 bonus points (out of 21 possible). This may include, but is not limited to studies that are highly innovative or show originality in concept, design, or methodology.

Use of Grant Funds: Grant recipients will receive *up to* \$1,000 to be used for the research costs described in the proposal. The grants are provided to cover reasonable and necessary expenses directly associated with the procedures in the research study, but cannot be used for tuition, stipends, or travel unrelated to data collection. The grant may be used to purchase equipment that can be directly used to carry out research activities. Allowable equipment includes any materials that are necessary for direct data collection (e.g., test kits, recording devices, intervention materials). Proposals must specifically indicate how materials/equipment would be employed to ensure completion of research activities.

Purchase of equipment with grant funds must not result in personal gain for the principal investigator or associated collaborators. In the case of durable research equipment, proposals must include a statement describing the disposal of purchased equipment upon completion of research activities. Allowable plans might include donation of equipment to research participants, host research site (e.g., school or school district), or the sponsoring university (e.g., university/department clinic).

Responsibilities of Grantees:

- Submit a 1-2 page progress report to the NASP Director of Research by October 31, 2025, describing the progress made toward the goals of the study.
- Submit a 1-2 page final report to the NASP Director of Research within one month of completion of the study, presenting the results of the study.
- Submit a summary of their research *to be considered for publication* in *Communiqué*. Students are responsible for communicating with the editor of *Communiqué* regarding submission procedures.
- Submit a presentation proposal for a NASP Convention within 2 years of receiving the grant.

Review Process and Timeline: GSRG proposals will be reviewed in two steps. First, 3-person subcommittees of the NASP Research Committee will review proposals. The most highly ranked proposals will then undergo a second-step review by a separate 3-person subcommittee. Each subcommittee will consist of members of Research Committee, as well as one student reviewer. Up to two grantees will be chosen from those proposals undergoing the second-step review. The Committee's rating form is included at the end of this document. Grantees will be notified via email no later than December 1, 2024.

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

Required Application Materials:

1. Demographic Information Form (signed by your program coordinator/director; see the form at the end of this document.)
2. Letter of Application (not more than one double-spaced page describing one's research interests, experiences, and career plans)
3. Curriculum Vitae
4. Research proposal (see requirements below)

Research Proposal Requirements:

- The proposal narrative must include the following elements: (a) title page, (b) introduction (c) explanation of the purpose for the project, including reference to relevant research literature and theory, (d) research questions and hypotheses, (e) methodology, (f) data analytic plan, (g) description of the study's unique and substantive contribution to the science and/or practice of school psychology, and (h) references.
- The proposal must include a budget. Include what the budget items are, why you require the items and/or what they will be used for, and how much each item will cost.
- The proposal must follow the guidelines in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th edition).
- The proposal narrative must be typed using a minimum 10-point font and be *no longer than 6 double-spaced pages* in length exclusive of the title page (and other appended forms/CV), budget, and references.

Applications that do not meet these proposal requirements will NOT be reviewed.

Submitting Your Application:

Completed applications *must* be submitted online as a *single document*. This must include the Demographic Information Form, Letter of Application, Curriculum Vitae, and Research Proposal.

Submit your application at this link:

<http://apps.nasponline.org/membership-and-community/grants/gsra/application.aspx>

Application Deadline: 5:00 pm EDT, September 15, 2024. Incomplete applications or applications submitted after this deadline will not be reviewed. **Questions?** Contact Dr. Nicholas Affrunti, NASP Director of Research at naffrunti@naspweb.org.

**NASP Graduate Student Research Grants
Demographic Information Form**

Name: _____

University: _____

Year in Program: _____

Degree Sought: _____ MA/EdS _____ PhD

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

I attest that:

- Grant funds would not be used for tuition, stipends, or travel unrelated to data collection.
- Purchase of equipment (if applicable) will not result in personal gain for the principal investigator or associated collaborators.
- If applicable, I have included a plan to dispose of purchased equipment upon completion of research activities (e.g., donation of equipment to research participants, host research site school/school district, or the sponsoring university).
- If funds are awarded for my proposal, I understand that I am responsible for any income tax liability to the extent required by law.

Student:

(Signature)

(Date)

Program Director/Coordinator:

(Printed Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

NASP Graduate Student Research Grants - Scoring Rubric

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS.)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS.)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT.)	MISSING (0 PTS.)	SCORE	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Student Qualifications to Carry out Project (1-page letter + CV)	Research experiences and interests clearly suggest the student could carry out the proposed project. The research environment and available resources suggest a good chance of achieving stated research goals.	Student's research interests and experiences suggest they could likely carry out the project. The available research environment or resources needed to carry out study may be questionable.	Student has limited research background or experiences to carry out the proposed project, or it is too complex for the person's level of experience and research training.	Research interests, experiences not delineated.		
Purpose and Objectives of Research	Purpose of the study is based upon review of relevant literature. Presents a well-structured, logical argument for the purpose of the study. Specific testable research question(s) are stated.	Purpose of the study is based upon review of literature, but relevant sources may be missing. Presents an argument for the purpose of study. Clear question(s), but may be untestable as stated.	Literature is reviewed, but it does not lead to a structured argument for the purpose of the research study. Vague, untestable research question(s).	No review of pertinent literature. No research questions posed.		
Proposed Design & Methods	Design relevant to purpose of study and appropriate to answer research questions. Use of qualitative vs. quantitative vs. single-subject design is justified. Study procedures are clearly specified and in accordance with well-established research methods. Measures (when applicable) are appropriate and have psychometric support. Limitations to design are minimized as much as possible.	Design is clear and procedures seem in accordance with well-established research methods, but may be lacking in detail or not fully specified. Measures (when applicable) are relevant, but lack psychometric support (e.g., student-created measures or surveys).	Procedures are fatally flawed such that the design does not allow for valid or appropriate conclusions to be drawn. Measures (when applicable) are psychometrically flawed or inappropriate to answer the proposed research question(s).	Details on design or procedures are missing or so lacking in detail that it is unclear what the study would involve. Details on measures (when applicable) are missing or so lacking in detail that it is unclear what measures would be used.		

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS.)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS.)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT.)	MISSING (0 PTS.)	SCORE	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Participants/ Selection	Sampling plan is sufficient to result in generalizable knowledge for <u>group designs</u> (e.g., a priori power analysis verifies proposed sample size), or to establish strong internal validity for <u>single case designs</u> (e.g., at least 3 cases for a multiple baseline design), or are appropriate to the phenomenon studied for <u>qualitative designs</u> .	Procedures for participant recruitment & selection are appropriate & ethical. Sample size may be too small or restricted to allow for generalization.	Sampling plan is insufficient to achieve the scientific goals of the research.	No participant recruitment or sampling plan is given.		
Data Analyses	<u>Quantitative, large n designs</u> minimize major threats to external validity, and appropriate statistical analyses are proposed to answer the stated research question(s). <u>Single-subject, small n designs</u> minimize major threats to internal validity, and a plan for visual analysis is clearly outlined. <u>Qualitative designs</u> include a plan for generating and interpreting themes, and strategies for reducing researcher bias and/or validating findings.	Proposed data analyses are appropriate and consistent with stated question(s), but some design limitations or threats to validity may not be acknowledged or minimized fully.	Weak, flawed, or unorganized explanation of data analyses, which prevents one from concluding that the research question(s) can be answered.	No information given regarding how data will be analyzed/ conclusions drawn		

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS.)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS.)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT.)	MISSING (0 PTS.)	SCORE	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Significance of Research	Presents compelling justification for the significance of the research using well-structured, logical argument. Strong likelihood that results could be publishable in peer-reviewed journal. Addresses an important question whose answer will have useful outcomes.	Shows some effort to present justification for significance of research using well-structured argument. Likelihood of future publication possible.	Weak, unstructured argument justifying the significance of the research. Little to no evidence that results of this study will add to the science or practice of school psychology.	Significance of proposed work not articulated.		
Writing Technique	Uses acceptable spelling, style, and grammar (few or no errors). Writing is clear, organized, and succinct.	Uses adequate style and grammar, but may have some typos. Proposal is understandable, but could be more organized or concise.	Fails to use acceptable style and grammar in that there are several spelling/grammatical errors OR writing lacks organization and clarity making it difficult to understand intent.	Serious spelling, style, and/or grammar flaws. Writing is incoherent or significantly disorganized.		
Bonus: Originality	Study is highly innovative and/or original in concept, design, or methodology.	Strong rationale for study, but proposed concept, design, or methodology are not particularly innovative or original.	Reasonable question, but a replication study or will add little to the literature based in this topic area.	Serious conceptual or methodological flaws.		
				Total Score: (out of 21 possible pts.)		

Other General Comments or Suggestions for the Student Researcher (optional):