



# Play Therapy Research Award

## Awards of Excellence

### Purpose

The Association for Play Therapy (APT) acknowledges outstanding published research that significantly develops, promotes, or advances the value of play, play therapy, and credentialed play therapists.

### Criteria

The Play Therapy Research Award is presented to a Nominee who:

1. Is an APT Professional member in good standing
2. If collaborating with others, is the lead researcher
3. Abided by the code of ethics, standards of practice, and all other legal standards or requirements promulgated by those authorities from which Nominee has been granted a license or certification.
4. Authored or edited research in *peer-reviewed* publications in, or authored *significant research contributions* to the field of play therapy that (see point values assigned on Evaluation Form):
  - Is original
  - Is deemed to potentially offer high impact towards advancing the field of play therapy
  - Is not a student thesis or dissertation
  - Pertains to theories, models, techniques, and other aspects of play therapy that significantly elevates and advances its credibility, effectiveness, and acceptance
  - Is published within the most recent 12-month period concluding December 31
5. Is nominated by three or more APT Professional members in good standing

Although an annual award, it is presented only if merited and only to one individual a year.

### Benefits

1. The award recipient is honored during the next APT Annual Conference.
2. Submissions are automatically submitted to the Editorial Board to be evaluated for possible publication in the *International Journal of Play Therapy™* (Journal).

### Selection Process

1. Nominator and at least two additional Nominators, all of whom must be APT Professional members in good standing and have personal knowledge of the authored or edited research and its content and significance of the Nominee, must post their own contact information, sign the Nomination Form (via checked box), and be prepared to resolve any discrepancies. Self-nominations are strictly prohibited.
2. Nominator must post all information requested about Nominee's authored or edited published research submitted in consideration of this award.
3. Nominator must submit completed a) Nomination Form, b) Nominee's Vita, and c) the research (or, if online or a book, the research citation) to APT by **March 31**.
4. If Nominee is selected, Nominee and Nominator will be advised by **April 20**. If not selected, only Nominator will be advised.

### Previous Recipients

**2007** Garry Landreth, Sue Bratton; **2008** Dee Ray; **2012** April Schottelkorb



# Research Award - Nomination Form

## Awards of Excellence

**Nominators:** To submit an award nomination, please:

- Review the above award purpose, criteria, benefits, and selection process
- Review the evaluation criteria to ensure that the Nominee can earn the minimal 15 points required for consideration
- Complete this Nomination Form and submit with vita and materials to CEO Kathryn Lebbby at [klebby@a4pt.org](mailto:klebby@a4pt.org) not later than **March 31**.

### **Nominee**

I, the Nominator, hereby nominate the below APT Professional member:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Degree: \_\_\_\_\_ License: \_\_\_\_\_ Mental Health Discipline: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City, State, ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

By our signatures below, we attest that we are each an APT Professional member in good standing and, in compliance with our ethical standards, that the information on behalf of the Nominee herein is accurate and complete.

### **Nominators**

1) Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City, State, ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

I have checked this box to attest that I endorse this nomination.  Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2) Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City, State, ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

I have checked this box to attest that I endorse this nomination.  Date: \_\_\_\_\_

3) Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City, State, ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

I have checked this box to attest that I endorse this nomination.  Date: \_\_\_\_\_



# Research Award - Nomination Form

## Awards of Excellence

### To be completed by Nominator

1. The Nominee a) authored or edited the published research b) within the most recent 12-month period concluding December 31. Yes  No
2. The Nominee is the lead researcher. Yes  No
3. The research is original. Yes  No
4. The research is not a student thesis or dissertation. Yes  No
5. The research pertains to theories, models, techniques, and other aspects of play therapy that significantly elevates and advances its credibility, effectiveness, and acceptance. Yes  No
6. The Nominee is nominated by three or more APT Professional members in good standing who are familiar with the content and significance of the Nominee's submitted work. Yes  No
7. Citation of Published Research: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Outcome of Published Research: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Briefly describe why the published research is high impact and how it substantially advances the field of play therapy.
10. Included is at least one copy of the book or article upon which this nomination is based (it is preferred that this nomination be transmitted via email and the work attached in PDF format).  
Yes  No



# Research Award – Evaluation Form

## Awards of Excellence

**Nominators:** Research entry must have been published during the most recent 12-month January thru December period.

**Evaluators:** To ensure that this process is conducted ethically and transparently, please excuse yourself from this process if you are affiliated with one or more of the Nominees. Evaluate this nomination, complete this Evaluation Form and assign rating points to each criterion below, add comments if desired, and submit this form to CEO Kathryn Lebbby at [klebby@a4pt.org](mailto:klebby@a4pt.org), not later than **April 15**.

**Nominee:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Evaluator:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

#	CRITERIA	COMMENTS	POINTS
1	<p>The research <u>demonstrates the value and effectiveness of play and/or play therapy.</u>            Scale 1 (poor) thru 5 (excellent)  <i>Numerical rating options:</i>            1 – Not related to play or play therapy            2 – Related to play or play therapy but does not show any value            3 – Related to play or play therapy and shows some value (may contribute to some positive change or experience)            4 – Related to play or play therapy and shows some effectiveness (at least as good as other methods OR better than baseline OR new positive qualitative information)            5 – Related to play or play therapy and shows good effectiveness (better than other methods)</p>		
2	<p>The research <u>increases play therapy knowledge or improves/evaluates play therapy techniques.</u>            Scale 1 (poor) thru 5 (excellent)  <i>Numerical rating options:</i>            1 – Provides No play therapy knowledge.            2 – Provides No new play therapy knowledge.            3 – Provides some new play therapy knowledge by replicating a previous study.            4 – Provides new play therapy knowledge that is somewhat helpful to the field.            5 – Provides new play therapy knowledge that is very helpful to the field.</p>		
3	<p>The research <u>substantially advances the field of play therapy.</u>            Scale 1 (low impact) to 5 (high impact)  <i>Numerical rating options:</i>            1 – Did not conduct play therapy research.            2 – Conducted play therapy research that increases knowledge on the topic.            3 – Conducted play therapy research that significantly increases knowledge on the topic. The researcher has addressed an important problem. The design and analysis are sound and replicable or adds substantial positive information (qualitative).            4 – Meets above conditions and conducted play therapy research that shows play therapy is as/more effective than a control/comparison group or improved behavior/mental</p>		

	<p>health over time (single case study design) or adds substantial positive information (qualitative).</p> <p>5 – Meets above conditions and conducted experimental randomized play therapy research and shows play therapy is more effective than control group or as effective as a comparison group or adds substantial positive information (qualitative).</p>		
4	<p>The research is <u>designed and conducted by rigorous standards, and appropriately analyzed.</u></p> <p>Scale 1 (poor) thru 5 (excellent)</p> <p><i>Numerical rating options:</i></p> <p>1 – Did not conduct the appropriate analysis for the study or created a weak research design.</p> <p>2 – Conducted the appropriate analysis but had errors in analysis.</p> <p>3 – Conducted the appropriate analysis and had very minor errors and design was appropriate to lead to research conclusions.</p> <p>4 – Conducted the appropriate analysis, had no errors, and used a design that positively contributes to play therapy as an evidence-based treatment.</p> <p>5 – Conducted the appropriate analysis by rigorous standards with no errors and used a design that supports play therapy as an evidenced based treatment.</p>		
5	<p>The manuscript was <u>designed and produced in accordance with APA Publication Manual.</u></p> <p>Scale 1 (poor) thru 5 (excellent)</p> <p><i>Numerical rating options:</i></p> <p>1 – Numerous errors in format (margins, headings), text (editing, grammar), citations, and references</p> <p>2 – Some errors in format, text, citations, and references.</p> <p>3 – Some errors in text, citations or references.</p> <p>4 – Only a few errors in text, citations, or references.</p> <p>5 – No errors.</p>		
6	<p>The research is <u>evidence-based</u>, that is, it is methodologically appropriate (e.g. uses replicable procedures, codified in manual), rigorous in its design (e.g. uses RCT, control, comparison group or a rigorous qualitative design), and is clinically relevant (e.g. uses an appropriate sample and setting, references existing literature).</p> <p>Yes 5, No 0</p> <p><i>Numerical rating options:</i></p> <p>1 – Did not conduct evidence-based play therapy research</p> <p>2 – Conducted evidence-based play therapy research but lacked quality in method, design, procedure, or sample. Specify strength and weaknesses.</p> <p>3 – Conducted evidence-based play therapy research and used adequate method, design, procedure, and sample. Specify strength and weaknesses.</p> <p>4 – Conducted high quality evidence based play therapy research. Specify strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>5 – Conducted excellent evidence based play therapy research. Specify strengths and weaknesses.</p>		
<p><b>TOTAL POINTS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least 14 points required for award consideration</li> </ul>			

Notes: If two or more Nominees earn the same number of total points, APT will subjectively assign “impact points” to break tie.