

Megan O'Brien Memorial Award for Leadership Excellence in Research

The distinguished student researchers selected for this award embody the best traits of Megan: her compassionate nature, transformative leadership style, exemplary research skills and scientific contributions to the field of Psychology, and her strong and grounded professional ethics.

Recipients of this prestigious award are celebrated for their demonstration of these traits during their student research projects completed at CSUSM.

Eligibility Requirements:

- Must be an undergraduate student majoring in either Psychology or Child and Adolescent Development
- A student may only receive this award once
- Each application consists of a personal statement that comprises responses to four prompts; an advisor nomination is optional
- Applications must also include a full copy of the research proposal, research manuscript, or poster presentation associated with this application

The names of the award recipients will be announced at the Annual CSUSM Psychology Student Research Conference and may also be published online. Award recipients will receive a \$500 prize.

Submission Deadline:

Friday, April 19th, 2024, at 5:00 PM Pacific Daylight Time. To submit, please complete [this application](#).

Here is the information you will be asked to provide:

Nominee's Name:

Phonetic Spelling of Nominee's Name for Pronunciation:

For example: Lehua Phoenix would be phonetically written as Ley-Hoo-Ah Fee-Nicks.

Personal Statement: To be completed by the nominee/s.

Up to 250 words max per question.

1. Briefly describe a research project you have conducted. Mention your specific contributions and how they lead to the successful completion of the research project. Examples might include authoring a research proposal, grant, manuscript, data collection and analysis, paper or poster presentation development and participation, etc.).
2. Briefly describe the most important research skills that you have developed by conducting primary research. Provide specific examples.
3. Briefly describe a couple of areas you have identified for yourself as opportunities for additional growth and development as a scientific researcher.

4. Provide specific examples of how you have positively impacted other students and contributed to their academic success and scientific research skill development. Examples include mentoring, motivating, encouraging participation, etc.

OPTIONAL Advisor Nomination: (Up to 500 words max for the advisor nomination).

The applicant can send a link for a faculty advisor to submit a nomination letter. The faculty advisor will be given this prompt:

Describe specific examples of how the nominee has distinguished themselves from others. Examples might include outstanding scholarship or service (or both), supervising and training other student researchers, cooperating with others within and outside of the lab (e.g., classroom, Psi Chi, Conferences, Research Fairs, etc.), effective communication skills, creative contributions, securing a research grant, receiving a distinguished award or scholarship, presenting their work at a conference, publishing a primary research paper, etc.

The entry will be judged in its entirety based on the following criteria. Each category can range from 0 to 10 points. Presentation ranges from 0 to 5 points. Maximum score possible is 45 points.

CONCEPT & ETHICS - 10 points

earn 8 to 10 points: The nominee showed strong initiative in helping implement the research project. Clear, compelling evidence that the nominee's efforts made a positive difference in carrying out research activities. Examples may include contributing to literature reviews, designing research studies, developing research materials, data collection and analysis, and contributing to writing up research reports and preparing presentation materials, etc. The entry also provided clear evidence of the nominee engaging in ethically sound applied scientific research to explore or address a real-world problem or current societal topic.

earn 5 to 7 points: The nominee was a faithful participant in research activities. The entry provided some detailed evidence of the nominee's contributions to the conceptual design and implementation of the research study, or connection to the area of interest being investigated.

earn 0 to 4 points: Not enough details were provided of the nominee's active contributions to the conceptual design and implementation of the research study, or connection to the area of interest being investigated.

PERSONAL GROWTH - 10 points

earn 8 to 10 points: The entry provided clear evidence of the nominee's commitment to their own personal and professional growth and development. Examples can include engaging in self-reflective and introspective practices, engaging in peer review processes to seek feedback to improve one's work, identifying professional development training, seeking additional opportunities for lab and field experience, selecting specialized upper division and graduate level coursework to contribute to skill development, etc.

earn 5 to 7 points: The entry detailed some evidence of the nominee's commitment to their own personal and professional growth and development.

earn 0 to 4 points: Not enough details were provided of the nominee's commitment to their own personal and professional growth and development.

IMPACT - 10 points

earn 8 to 10 points: The entry provided clear evidence of the nominee engaging in ethically sound scientific research. The entry defined quantitative and qualitative examples of the positive, substantial impact of the nominee's research contributions to the profession/field, college, community, region, or beyond. Examples can include but are not limited to the number of persons affected by a project, community improvement, increased awareness, increased interaction between college and community, increased grant funding support for the research project, etc.

earn 5 to 7 points: The entry gave some detailed quantitative and/or qualitative evidence of the nominee's positive impact in at least two areas: profession/field, college, community, region, or beyond.

earn 0 to 4 points: The nominee's participation had an impact in only one area: profession/field, college, community, region, or beyond.

COOPERATIVE EFFORT - 10 points

earn 8 to 10 points: Without question, the nominee demonstrated a strong commitment to working with all stakeholders connected with the research project (e.g., faculty advisors, IRB and IACUC reviewers, participants, research team members, college officials, and community agents). Nominee did not seek the spotlight but was fully committed to doing what needed to be done to ensure a project's success. They responded to any challenges with flexibility and creativity to help keep the projects on track.

earn 5 to 7 points: Evidence supports the nominee works well with others. Some evidence of flexibility or creativity in addressing any challenges that arise in the "research process" and collaboratively contribute to the success of the research project.

earn 0 to 4 points: Not enough details were provided of the nominee's effective cooperative effort.

PRESENTATION - 5 points

earn 5 points: Spelling and grammar are faultless. Entry is well-written and easy to follow.

earn 3 to 4 points: A few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Entry has some awkward writing OR does not give enough specific details.

earn 0 to 2 points: Spelling and/or grammar errors throughout. Writing is disjointed and does not give enough specific details.