

# SOCIETY OF WETLAND SCIENTISTS

## STUDENT GRANTS PROGRAM - *Report for 2001*

### **Introduction:**

The 2001 Student Grants Committee consisted of Drs. Michael Scott (Chair), Andy Cole and Kel Wieder. Of the 47 proposals submitted, 10 were selected for funding. Awards ranged from \$937 to \$1,397, with the \$13,015 allotted for student grants distributed among the 10 awardees in proportion to the dollar amounts requested.

Funding success was independent of: degree sought, gender, SWS membership, receipt of a prior SWS grant, or online versus paper submission (even though all funded proposals were online submissions) ( $p > 0.05$ , Chi-square contingency analyses; Appendix I).

### **Innovations for 2001 and changes for 2002:**

#### *Online Submission:*

This was the first year that online application was made available (for both proposals and letters of recommendation). Of the 47 proposals submitted, 40 were submitted online (cf. Table 1). While response to online submission was quite positive, there were glitches in the online process. Most importantly, the software used for online submission (FrontPage) permitted ease of submission, but did not preserve textual formatting of submitted text. In addition, if Figures were submitted with a proposal, they were not successfully preserved during submission.

These problems have been remedied for 2002, with a conversion of application form to a locked Microsoft Word form. Student applicants will be able to email both the application form and their word-processed proposals (including embedded Figures) to an email account at Villanova University ([SWS.Student-Grants@Villanova.edu](mailto:SWS.Student-Grants@Villanova.edu)). Letters of recommendation likewise can be emailed to this account. Upon submission of proposals or letters of recommendation, senders will receive an automated response indicating that their material has been received.

#### *Proposal review:*

This was the first year that proposal review was based on 6 clearly identified criteria, each scored by each reviewer on a numerical scale from 1 to 10 (cf. Appendix II). In addition, each reviewer provided brief written comments about each proposal, emphasizing both strengths and weaknesses. These written comments (but not the detailed numerical assessment) were sent to all applicants as a part of the letter that indicated whether or not their proposal was successful in obtaining funding.

For 2002, the numerical evaluation approach will continue with some small changes. The Student Grants Committee will be larger (Drs. Diane DeSteven, Paul DuBuoy, Lee Foote, Tom Mings, Rebecca Schneider, Kel Wieder). Proposals will be distributed to ensure that each proposal is reviewed by 4 committee members. Both numerical summaries and written comments will be sent to student proposers.

In 2001, discussion among Committee members focused on what to do about proposals with late or missing letters of recommendation. For 2002, application materials clearly indicate that proposals with late or missing letters of recommendation will not be considered for funding.

#### *Posting of abstracts for funded proposals on the web:*

Immediately after funding decisions were announced, abstracts of funded proposals were posted on the web, accessible via the Student Grant section of the SWS web page. The intention is to post abstracts of funded proposals annually, with abstracts of proposals funded in past years also web-accessible in archived files.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. R. Kelman Wieder  
Chair, SWS Student Grants Committee

Table 1. Summary information for 2001 SWS Student Grant applications

Variable	Summary
Degree Sought	Bachelors, 3; Masters, 22; Doctoral, 22
Gender	Females, 31; males 16
SWS Membership	Yes, 22; No, 25
Prior SWS Student Grant	Yes, 4; No, 43
Online submission	Yes, 40; No, 7
Average project cost (mean ± s.e.)	\$ 7,292 ± 1711 (range \$957 - 50,285)
Average requested from SWS (mean ± s.e.)	\$ 1,462 ± 34 (range \$ 863 - \$2,350)

**APPENDIX I - Funding success is independent of several factors**

Table A1. Degree sought vs. funding success

Degree	Funded	
	Yes	No
B.A./B.S.	0	3
M.A./M.S.	3	19
Ph.D.	7	15
<i>Pearson's <math>X^2 = 3.037, p = 0.2190</math></i>		

Table A4. Prior SWS funding vs. funding success

Prior SWS funding	Funded	
	Yes	No
Yes	1	3
No	9	34
<i>Pearson's <math>X^2 = 0.036, p = 0.8491</math></i>		

Table A2. Gender vs. funding success

Gender	Funded	
	Yes	No
Female	8	23
Male	2	14
<i>Pearson's <math>X^2 = 1.116, p = 0.2909</math></i>		

Table A5. Online submission vs. funding success

Online submission	Funded	
	Yes	No
Yes	10	30
No	0	7
<i>Pearson's <math>X^2 = 2.223, p = 0.1360</math></i>		

Table A3. SWS membership vs. funding success

SWS member	Funded	
	Yes	No
Yes	4	18
No	6	19
<i>Pearson's <math>X^2 = 0.237, p = 0.6267</math></i>		



# SOCIETY OF WETLAND SCIENTISTS

## *Student Research Grants Program - Evaluation 2001*

Student Name:

Proposal Title:

Evaluation Criterion	Rating				
	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
Clear statement of hypotheses, objectives, or research questions	✓				
Appropriateness and adequacy of experimental design, research plan, or research approach					
Reasonableness of the projected time schedule for accomplishing the proposed research					
Qualifications and capabilities of the student to conduct the proposed research					
Adequacy and appropriateness of literature citations					
Relevance and significance of the proposed research, as specifically related to the aims of the Society of Wetland Scientists					

**Comments:**