

SOCIETY OF WETLAND SCIENTISTS
STUDENT GRANTS PROGRAM - *Report for 2003*

- The 2003 Student Grants Committee consisted of Drs. R. Kelman Wieder (Chair), James Anderson, Diane DeSteven, Tom Mings, Rebecca Schneider and Denice Wardrop. Of the 40 proposals submitted, 12 were selected for funding, each at \$1000.
- Application forms and forms for letters of recommendation were made available online as both locked Microsoft Word forms and Adobe pdf forms. Actual proposals were submitted electronically as Word forms, allowing students to embed figures and preserving formatting of proposals. Student applicants and those writing letters of recommendation could submit proposals to an email account at Villanova University (SWS.Student-Grants@Villanova.edu). Upon submission of proposals or letters of recommendation, senders received an immediate automated response indicating that their material had been received. Submission of hard copy proposals and letters remained an option.
- Each proposal was evaluated by three reviewers with the evaluation based on six clearly identified criteria. An evaluation scale of excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor was used. In addition, each reviewer provided brief written comments about each proposal, emphasizing both strengths and weaknesses. These written comments and the detailed numerical assessment were sent to all applicants along with the letter indicating whether or not their proposal was funded.
- As has been the case for the past two years, funding success was independent of: gender, SWS membership, receipt of a prior SWS grant, or online versus paper submission, ($p > 0.05$, Chi-square contingency analyses; Appendix Tables A1-A4). In contrast to the past two years, however, funding success was not independent of degree sought. Proposals written by doctoral students were more successful than proposals written by MA/MS students ($p = 0.0074$; Appendix Table A5).
- Abstracts of funded proposals have been posted on the web, accessible via the Student Grant section of the SWS website.

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. R. Kelman Wieder
Chair, SWS 2003 Student Grants Committee

Table 1. Summary information for 2003 SWS Student Grant applications

Variable	Summary
Degree Sought	Bachelors, 0; Masters, 16; Doctoral, 24
Gender	Females, 23; males 17
SWS Membership	Yes, 20; No, 20
Prior SWS Student Grant	Yes, 2; No, 38
Online submission	Yes, 39; No, 1
Average project cost (mean " s.e.)	\$ 7,662 " 2,069 (range \$399 – \$69,220)
Average requested from SWS (mean " s.e.)	\$ 1,958 " 412 (range \$ 399 – \$14,066)

APPENDIX - Funding success as related to several factors

Table A1. Degree sought vs. gender

Gender	Funded	
	Yes	No
Female	6	17
Male	6	11

Pearson's $X^2 = 0.395, p = 0.5299$

Table A4. Online submission vs. funding success

Online submission	Funded	
	Yes	No
Yes	11	28
No	1	0

Pearson's $X^2 = 2.393; p = 0.1219$

Table A2. SWS membership vs. funding success

SWS member	Funded	
	Yes	No
Yes	6	14
No	6	14

Pearson's $X^2 = 0.237, p = 0.6267$

Table A5. Degree sought vs. funding success

Degree	Funded	
	Yes	No
M.A./M.S.	1	15
Ph.D.	11	13

Pearson's $X^2 = 7.163, p = 0.0074$

Table A3. Prior SWS funding vs. funding success

Prior SWS funding	Funded	
	Yes	No
Yes	1	1
No	11	27

Pearson's $X^2 = 0.401; p = 0.5266$