

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision

2025 Request for Proposals

Sponsored Scholarship Program

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) seeks to build the evidence base necessary to deepen the understanding of what shapes counselor education and supervision, how we can best serve communities, and what types of policy and system changes can have the greatest potential for impact. In response to this call, ACES is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) and will award a total of \$100,000 in funding across 3 to 5 exemplary projects that demonstrate the potential to significantly advance the body of research in counselor education and supervision. **Proposals are due July 15th at 11:59 pm (EST)**, and recipients will be recognized at the 2025 ACES Conference.

In particular, ACES is interested in proposals that reflect counseling and counselor education outcome research and contribute to the advancement of the counseling profession. Preference will be given to proposals that address the specific following areas:

1. **Mental Health Equity and Underserved Populations** (e.g., Black maternal mental health; suicide among Black men, adolescents, and boys; social determinants of mental health and broader social factors; mental health access in U.S. and global contexts; outcome research focused on school populations, and prioritizing counseling in youth mental health),
2. **Emerging Issues and Innovations in Mental Health** (e.g., the impact of artificial intelligence on the counseling profession; training recommendations and ethical use of psychedelics in mental health care; and the effects of climate change on mental health),
3. **Mental Health in Specialized Contexts** (e.g., mental health service provision/curriculum in school settings, mental health and the armed services; mental health among athletes; and the impact of eating disorders on mental health), and
4. **Professional Practice, Training, and Workforce Development** (e.g., expanding access to care across the counseling pipeline from student to licensed professional; supervision practices and telesupervision in both school and clinical settings; and the effects of deregulation in occupational licensure).

An additional grant award opportunity is available from our partners at Intelligent Video Solutions (IVS). IVS is offering a **\$5000** grant to an ACES member for the purpose of conducting research that focuses on clinical skills acquisition utilizing technology in the observation process. This opportunity uses the same application process as the other ACES grants.

Each awarded program should be completed within one year of the award and have clear potential implications for influencing public policy at the state, regional, or national levels. Grantees may request project extensions beyond one year, provided they provide appropriate

justification and are approved. We encourage counseling students, counselors, counselor educators, and practitioner-scholars to apply for this unique opportunity.

Eligibility: Grants are available to any Professional or New Professional Member of ACES. Membership in ACES must be maintained and current throughout the life of the funded project. ACES research should be led by ACES members and we recognize that other members of the team, outside of the ACES domain, may serve a valuable role in the research (eg. methodologist, statistician, content expert). It is expected that individuals listed as PI or Co-PI **must** hold active ACES membership. (Additional key personnel and co-investigators need not be ACES members.) An individual may only appear on **one** Proposal as PI or Co-PI. Applicants who do not meet eligibility criteria will not be considered.

Guidelines: Proposals that do not follow the guidelines below will be disqualified from review. Proposals must be submitted in PDF format, including both a de-identified copy for review and a separate, non-de-identified, PDF copy. The non-de-identified copy should include the name of the PI and Co-PIs, their professional affiliation, as well as their ACES membership number (*which is different from the ACA number and can be found in your ACES membership profile*). No indirect costs (IDC) will be funded in this RFP and all budgets may only be up to the maximum amount listed for the associated PI. Proposals should not exceed five single-spaced pages (excluding the title page and references) and must adhere to the 7th edition of the APA Manual. Inquiries and submissions should be emailed to Dr. Harvey Peters and Dr. Gerta Bardhoshi at [acesgrants@acesonline.net].

Proposals must address and follow the structure outlined in the template below:

- Title page
- Purpose Summary Statement (information about the project, proposed start and end date, research question(s), and brief summary).
- Statement of Problem and Need
- Brief summary of extant research
- Research Methodology
 - (a) research design, description, and rationale,
 - (b) sampling and recruitment procedures,
 - (c) description of key constructs, measures, and data sources,
 - (d) data collection procedures,
 - (e) data analysis procedures,
 - (f) psychometrics, rigor, trustworthiness, and/or methodological integrity, and
 - (g) strategies for ensuring ethical compliance in research.
- Description of congruence with ACES values, mission, and research goals identified in the call
- Implications for diversity, equity, inclusion, and advocacy; counseling and counselor education, and public policy
- Plan for dissemination of results
- Proposed timeline
- Budget summary and rationale (no indirect costs [IDC] allowed)

Formatting Requirements

- **Page Length & Spacing.** No more than 5 pages, single-spaced. This includes only the narrative (i.e., proposal summary, significance, research plan, personnel, budget).
- **Font.** 12-point font, Arial or Times New Roman only
- **Citations.** APA format (no numerical citations). A Reference document must be included with the application as an appendix.
- **Tables & Figures.** Tables and figures may be smaller than 12-point font but must be legible. The use of color is acceptable in charts and graphs.
- **Appendices.** *All appendices must be labeled with the appendix letter and title and attached to the project narrative as a single document.*

Requirements for Awardees:

- Complete paperwork to process allocations of funds, including submitting an IRB approval letter for the research project within three months of the award announcement and specify if the check is written to the PI or the institution/organization
- Complete a mid-year and final report
- Recognize ACES in any professional or scholarly products yielded from the awarded program
- Submit a 1-paragraph synopsis of awarded program suitable for dissemination in an announcement to ACES membership
- Submit a brief, 2-page white paper suitable for dissemination by ACES as a policy paper
- Submit a manuscript to a national or international professional counseling journal based on the funded project

Rubric

Category	Exceeds Expectations (5)	Meets Expectations (3)	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)	Score
Purpose Summary Statement (information about the project, proposed start and end date, research question(s), and brief summary).	Provides a comprehensive and detailed purpose statement that includes clear project information, precise start and end dates, well-articulated research question(s), and an insightful summary that demonstrates a strong vision for the project.	Provides an adequate purpose statement that includes the essential project details, research question(s), and summary, though some parts may lack depth or clarity.	Provides an incomplete or unclear purpose statement with missing details (e.g., project dates, specific research question(s), or a coherent summary) that weakens the project’s outline.	
Statement of Problem and Need	Clearly defines the problem with a thorough and evidence-based explanation of the need, using robust contextual details and directly linking the significance of the problem to the proposed project.	Provides a clear description of the problem and the need, though the explanation may include fewer supporting details or less context than desired.	Fails to adequately define the problem or articulate the need, making the significance of the project ambiguous or unsupported.	

Brief summary of extant research	Offers a comprehensive, integrated review of existing literature that demonstrates deep knowledge of the field and clearly shows how the current research builds on or challenges previous findings.	Summarizes key aspects of the existing research, indicating awareness of the literature; however, the synthesis or depth of analysis may be somewhat limited.	Provides a superficial or incomplete review of the literature, lacking depth or clear integration with the proposed research focus.	
Research Methodology (a) research design, description, and rationale, (b) sampling and recruitment procedures, (c) description of key constructs, measures, and data sources, (d) data collection procedures, (e) data analysis procedures, (f) psychometrics, rigor, trustworthiness, and/or methodological integrity, and (g) strategies for ensuring ethical compliance in research.	Presents a highly detailed, rigorous, and well-justified methodology. Each component is methodologically sound and clearly explained with a strong rationale. The proposal demonstrates that the chosen design, sampling strategies, measures, data collection techniques, analysis procedures, and ethical safeguards are both feasible and aligned with established research practices. The methodology is robustly grounded, innovative, and strongly positioned to produce rigorous and impactful results.	Describes all required components with sufficient detail and demonstrates reasonable methodological grounding. The proposed design, sampling, measures, data collection, analysis, and ethical strategies are generally appropriate and feasible. However, the explanation may lack some depth regarding innovation or a comprehensive discussion of why the chosen methods offer the best approach to address the research problem.	Offers a fragmented or superficial description of the methodology. The proposal fails to provide an adequate level of detail or clarity about the design, sampling, measures, data collection, analysis, and ethical strategies. The procedures do not appear to be methodologically grounded or fully feasible, thus undermining confidence in the potential to achieve reliable results.	
Description of congruence with ACES values, mission, and research goals identified in the call	Clearly articulates, with specific examples, how the project aligns with ACES values, mission, and research goals. Demonstrates a deep and integrated understanding of institutional priorities with evident strategic connection.	Provides an adequate description of alignment with ACES values and mission. While the overall connection is apparent, the examples may be generic or insufficiently detailed.	Fails to demonstrate clear alignment with ACES values, mission, or research goals. The connection is vague or missing, leaving the project's relevance to institutional priorities underdeveloped.	
Implications for diversity, equity, inclusion, and advocacy; counseling and counselor	Offers a robust, insightful analysis of the implications that directly ties the project outcomes to enhanced diversity, equity, inclusion, and broader policy and educational impacts. The	Identifies key implications and provides reasonable connections to diversity, equity, inclusion, advocacy, and policy. However, the analysis may lack the depth or comprehensive	Provides minimal or unclear discussion of implications. The analysis fails to convincingly connect project outcomes with impacts on diversity,	

education; and public policy	discussion is well-supported and forward-thinking.	support seen in an exemplary submission.	equity, inclusion, or broader social issues.	
Plan for dissemination of results	Outlines a proactive, detailed dissemination plan that specifies multiple channels, target audiences, and clear timelines. Innovative strategies and stakeholder engagement are well integrated, ensuring broad and effective communication of results.	Outlines a basic dissemination plan that identifies key channels and timeframes, though some elements may be underdeveloped or lack innovative approaches to engaging stakeholders.	Lacks a clear or comprehensive dissemination plan. The strategy for communicating results is vague, with poorly defined channels and timelines that do not effectively reach target audiences.	
Budget summary and rationale	Presents a comprehensive and meticulously justified budget that aligns perfectly with project objectives. Each expense is clearly explained and supported by sound rationale, demonstrating strong fiscal responsibility and alignment with institutional priorities.	Provides a clear summary of the budget with a basic rationale for expenses. While most costs are justifiable, some details or connections to project objectives may be missing or less compelling.	Offers an incomplete or poorly justified budget. The rationale is unclear, with expenses that do not align well with project goals or demonstrate an understanding of institutional financial priorities.	
Grammar, use of APA, and scholarly writing	Exemplifies superior scholarly writing with precise APA formatting, impeccable grammar, and a clear, concise style that enhances readability and professionalism.	Demonstrates competent scholarly writing and generally adheres to APA formatting and grammar rules, though minor errors may be present that do not significantly detract from overall quality.	Contains frequent errors in grammar, APA formatting, or scholarly tone that undermine the clarity, readability, and professional presentation of the work.	
Recommendation for Funding	The proposal consistently scoring “Exceeds Expectations” on most criteria is highly recommended for funding.	The proposal with a mix of “Exceeds” and “Meets Expectations” might be funded with minor revisions or clarifications.	The proposal largely scoring “Does Not Meet Expectations” should not be funded unless significant improvements are made.	
Total Score:				

** Note: When scoring each category, please feel free to assign intermediate ratings if the proposal’s quality falls between the defined benchmarks (for example, between a rating of 5 and 3 or between 3 and 1). In such instances, assign a score that best reflects the nuanced strengths and areas for growth in the proposal.