

**Journal Publication Proposal and Reflection:
Ethical Funding Literacy in Counselor Education**

Tara Lynne Chase

Grand Canyon University: PCE-834-O500

Dr. Torrenzo Moore and Dr. Charlotte Phillips

December 24, 2025

Part 1:

Journal Publication Proposal: Ethical Funding Literacy in Counselor Education

Selected Professional Counseling Journal

The professional journal selected for this manuscript proposal is the Journal of Scholarly Engagement (JSE). JSE publishes peer-reviewed interdisciplinary scholarship that examines how research, teaching, and professional practice intersect to promote meaningful engagement within academic and community contexts (Journal of Scholarly Engagement, n.d.-a). This focus makes JSE an appropriate outlet for scholarship examining grant writing and grant reviewing as forms of professional and ethical engagement in counselor education.

JSE employs a double-anonymous peer-review process and provides transparent guidance for authors regarding manuscript preparation, submission procedures, and editorial review (Journal of Scholarly Engagement, n.d.-b). These features support emerging scholars, including doctoral learners, who are developing publication competencies aligned with counselor education leadership expectations.

Evaluation of Topic Alignment With the Journal

The focus of my Topic 6 assignment, examining the complementary roles of grant applicants and grant reviewers in counselor education as pathways to ethical funding literacy and advocacy, aligns closely with JSE's mission and scope. JSE emphasizes scholarship that moves beyond theory alone to address how professional practices shape institutional and community outcomes (Journal of Scholarly Engagement, n.d.-a).

Grant writing and grant reviewing are not merely administrative tasks; they are forms of scholarly engagement that influence whose programs are funded, which populations are served, and how ethical accountability is maintained within counselor education systems. As outlined in my Topic 6 paper, counselor educators serve as both advocates and stewards of limited resources, particularly when developing grant-funded initiatives for marginalized communities (Chase, 2025).

This topic is also timely given ongoing concerns about bias, equity, and transparency in funding decisions. Empirical work has documented variability and inequity in peer review processes, reinforcing the need for counselor educators to understand funding systems from both applicant and reviewer perspectives (Ginther et al., 2011; Marsh et al., 2008; Pier et al., 2018). By framing grant participation as ethical scholarly engagement, this manuscript aligns with JSE's emphasis on reflective, practice-informed research.

Manuscript Submission Process and Required Content Areas

Based on a review of JSE's "Submission Information" and "Review Process" pages, the manuscript submission process includes the following 5 steps:

1. Prepare a manuscript aligned with the journal's scope and formatted according to APA guidelines.
2. Submit the manuscript through the Scholastica platform, including required author metadata.
3. Editorial screening for alignment with journal mission and basic methodological rigor.
4. Double-anonymous peer review.

5. Editorial decision informed by reviewer feedback (Journal of Scholarly Engagement, n.d.-b).

Required content areas include:

- Manuscript title
- Abstract
- Keywords
- Manuscript type
- Full manuscript text
- Tables or figures (if applicable)
- Author information entered separately in the submission system

Proposed Manuscript Content

Manuscript Title

Ethical Funding Literacy in Counselor Education: A Qualitative Examination of Grant Applicants' and Reviewers' Professional Roles

Abstract

External funding plays a critical role in sustaining counselor education programs, training clinics, and community mental health initiatives, yet doctoral training often emphasizes grant writing without equal attention to grant reviewing. This qualitative study explored counselor educators' and advanced doctoral learners' experiences serving as grant applicants and grant reviewers, with attention to how these roles shape ethical reasoning, leadership development, and

advocacy for marginalized populations. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 counselor educators and doctoral candidates who had participated in at least one grant submission and one grant review process. Using reflexive thematic analysis, four themes emerged: (a) grant participation as systems-level advocacy, (b) ethical tensions in funding decisions, (c) reviewer insight as funding literacy, and (d) leadership identity through dual-role experience. Findings highlight the importance of intentional training in both grant writing and grant reviewing to support ethical resource distribution and professional identity development in counselor education.

Keywords

counselor education; grant writing; grant review; ethical leadership; funding literacy

Manuscript Type

Original qualitative research

Methodological Overview

This study employs a qualitative descriptive design with purposeful criterion sampling to capture information-rich perspectives from counselor educators and doctoral learners with grant experience. Data are collected via semi-structured interviews and analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Trustworthiness is enhanced through audit trails, reflexive memoing, and transparent reporting aligned with COREQ recommendations (Tong et al., 2007).

Part 2:

Journal Publication Proposal Reflection (Approx. 650 Words)

Developing this journal publication proposal clarified how closely scholarly writing is tied to professional identity in counselor education. Reviewing the submission and review processes for the Journal of Scholarly Engagement made it clear that manuscript submission is not simply a final step after writing—it is a form of scholarly engagement that requires intentional alignment with a journal’s mission, audience, and ethical expectations (Journal of Scholarly Engagement, n.d.-a; n.d.-b).

One of the most important lessons I gained is how much responsibility authors carry in shaping how their work is received. Editorial screening and peer review rely heavily on clarity of purpose, methodological transparency, and relevance. This reinforced the idea that grant-related scholarship must clearly articulate why funding practices matter to counselor education, not just how they function. That realization directly influenced how I framed the abstract and title, prioritizing ethical leadership and advocacy rather than procedural descriptions alone.

Engaging in the manuscript development process also strengthened my understanding of how scholarly writing contributes to my growth as a counselor and educator. The same skills required for ethical grant writing—clarity, accountability, and attention to systemic impact—are required in scholarly publication. Writing about funding literacy forced me to examine my own assumptions about fairness, advocacy, and power within academic systems. It also underscored that scholarship can be an extension of counseling values, particularly when research highlights inequities and promotes transparency.

Qualitative design is especially appropriate for examining grant applicants' and reviewers' experiences because ethical reasoning, leadership development, and advocacy are context-dependent and meaning-based. A qualitative descriptive approach allows participants to articulate how they navigate tensions between advocacy and impartiality, particularly when funding decisions affect marginalized populations. Purposeful sampling ensures that participants have direct experience with both roles, consistent with qualitative standards in counselor education research (Waalkes et al., 2021).

The factors explored in this study include ethical decision-making, perceptions of bias, leadership identity development, and the influence of reviewer experience on grant-writing strategies. These dimensions are difficult to capture through quantitative measures alone, making qualitative inquiry essential. Reporting findings transparently and reflexively aligns with best practice guidelines for publishing rigorous counseling research (Giordano et al., 2021).

Overall, this assignment reinforced that learning to publish is inseparable from learning to lead. Understanding both grant writing and grant reviewing as scholarly practices equips counselor educators to advocate responsibly, mentor future scholars, and contribute to funding systems that prioritize equity, quality, and accountability.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Chase, T. L. (2025). *Grant applicants and grant reviewers in counselor education and supervision: Complementary roles for ethical funding literacy* (Unpublished doctoral coursework). Grand Canyon University.
- Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, 333(6045), 1015–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1196783>
- Giordano, A. L., Schmit, M. K., & Schmit, E. L. (2021). Best practice guidelines for publishing rigorous research in counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 99(2), 123–133. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcad.12360>
- Journal of Scholarly Engagement. (n.d.-a). *Submit a manuscript*. <https://scholarlyengagement.com/submit-a-manuscript/>
- Journal of Scholarly Engagement. (n.d.-b). *Review process*. <https://scholarlyengagement.com/review-process/>
- Marsh, H. W., Jayasinghe, U. W., & Bond, N. W. (2008). Improving the peer-review process for grant applications: Reliability, validity, bias, and generalizability. *American Psychologist*, 63(3), 160–168. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.160>

Pier, E. L., Brauer, M., Filut, A., Kaatz, A., Raclaw, J., Nathan, M. J., Ford, E. C., & Carnes, M. (2018). Low agreement among reviewers evaluating the same NIH grant applications.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 115(12), 2952–2957. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1714379115>

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349–357.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>

Waalkes, P. L., DeCino, D., & Flynn, S. V. (2021). A content analysis of qualitative dissertations in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 60(3), 209–223.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12212>