Applicant Student ID	Reviewer Notes	Background and Research Description - Academic/professional goals and interests are clearly stated.	Benefits - Activities are stated and explained and linked to the larger New Mexico community, etc.	Composition - Proposal flows logically and writing style - Technical terms are defined, etc.	Budget - Applicant used the budget template provided. - Supporting documents provided. etc.	Letter of Support - A letter of support/recommendation from a UNM faculty member			
102058480	Amount Requested: $2900 Meets word count requirement? No – 1182 words Budget template complete? Yes, the budget is complete Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Applicant provided supporting documents that are not directly linked to NMRG •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes budget seems reasonable and justified Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? – No Some jargon were not easy to understand and was not explained 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification. Applicants application proposal has a word count of 1182, which is more than the maximum word count of 700. Also applicant provided supporting documents that were not related to the budget.	24	24	9	25	10			
102058480	1. Amount requested $2900 2. Meets word count, and a letter of support is included with a complete budget template 3. Information in the budget is not clear, and the budget supporting document is not convincing enough. Applicant did not state her academic/professional, and research interests 4. Application qualifies as all requirements for NMRG were followed	20	25	10	17	10			
102058480	Academic and research were clearly explained. Activities were not explained how it linked to the NM community. There is letter of support was strong. There is no enough supporting document to support the application. The application used the budget template, however, it did not clearly indicate the budget and followed the instructions of the template. Overall, the application were logically composed.	25	15	10	10	10			

102054507	1.Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $3000 2.Application Compliance, Meets word count requirement? Yes – 697 words Budget template complete? Yes, the budget is complete Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Applicant provided required supporting documentation •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals?Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes, however, some links in the budget, such as the link for mileage, did not provide the required information. The link provided general information about UNM mileage policy Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for qualification	25	23	9	25	10			
102054507	Grants Scoring Comment Section 1.Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $____300__ 2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (Number?) 598 Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) 3.Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? •Proposal explicitly states that research is the applicant's master's thesis and supports their goal for a career in land management in rural New Mexico. •Proposed activity is to collect data though participant observation and semi-structured interviews in Northern New Mexico •Funds requested to support travel and lodging in October and November, 2025. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? •The research activity is the applicant's master's thesis in Geography and will strengthen their expertise in qualitative research on land use and rural identity. •Research benefits the academic community by adding a qualitative insight to largely quantitative land management literature with locally relevant knowledge for North New Mexico. Still, it is not explicitly indicated what benefits the community members	25	22	9	30	10			

102054507	Amount Requested: $3000,Meets word count requirement?: Yes (~700 words) Budget template complete? Yes, Required supporting docs (letters of support) included?: Yes Evaluation of Narrative; The narrative is well-written, clear, and grounded in place-based qualitative inquiry. Demonstrates both personal and academic investment in the research topic. The timeline and methods are clearly described and appropriate for the research goals. Academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes – The applicant is a Geography M.S. student planning to graduate Spring 2026. Interests are in rurality, land management, and human geography. Activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes – Thesis research in Northern NM (Chama region), from August–November 2025; includes participant observation and interviews. Clearly tied to applicant's field and/or goals? Yes – Research aligns with Human Geography, qualitative methods, and rural land use. Benefits to academic/professional development clear? Yes – Supports thesis completion, aligns with career goals in rural land management, and deepens expertise in qualitative geography. Benefits to academic or NM community explained? Yes – Seeks to inform policymakers and add qualitative perspectives to dominant quantitative approaches; focuses on under-researched New Mexico rural issues. Budget reasonable, well-researched, and justified? Not assessed – Budget document not included. Narrative implies that funds are for in-situ data collection support. Proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes – Accessible, concise, and well organized. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? The applicant presents a clear, timely, and compelling research project aligned with their field of study and career goals. The proposal identifies a significant local issue and uses appropriate qualitative methods to address it.	25	25	10	30	10			
102026958	Amount Requested: $3,000 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (≈670 words) Budget template: Complete Supporting docs: Included, but contain personal identifiers Anonymity: Not compliant (full name in receipts and travel documents) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Clearly defines project goals, design, and methods. Demonstrates understanding of public budgeting and participatory governance. Contributes to NM public sector transparency and civic engagement. Strengthens UNM's applied public administration research portfolio. Budget: Reasonable and justified; compliant in format but includes identifiable information. Composition: Logically organized, polished, and professional. 4. Recommendation: Disqualify. Although the proposal is academically strong and aligns with GPSA's mission, it includes the applicant's full name and contact information in budget documentation, violating anonymity requirements. Per GPSA policy, the application must be disqualified on procedural grounds.	23	23	9	27	10			

102026958	Amount Requested: 3000 Meets Word Count Requirement? Yes ~ 700 Budget Template Complete? Yes Required Supporting Docs (e.g., letters of support)? Yes, Faculty mentioned his name Evaluation of Narrative a. Academic and Professional Alignment Clearly stated academic interests & degree stage: The applicant is a graduate student in Public Administration at UNM, aligning their proposed research directly with both degree requirements and career goals in public financial management. Strong fit with academic/professional goals: The project connects public budgeting, equity, and participatory governance — key focus areas in the field — and will build valuable research and practitioner networks. b. Research Description Clear description of the project's purpose and timeline: The proposed study evaluates Participatory Budgeting (PB) practices across major municipalities in New Mexico and Texas from July 2024 to May 2025. Well-defined research methods: The project includes document reviews, stakeholder interviews, surveys, and comparative analysis — a robust, mixed-methods approach that's appropriate and rigorous. Clear deliverables: The study will produce a final report and presentation to state agencies, academic peers, and community organizations. There is also a clear plan to submit to academic conferences and peer-reviewed journals.	25	25	10	30	8			
102026958	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $2,854.64 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈680 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Yes – Faculty letter included and supports the NMRG research 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background (/25) Score: 24 / 25 •Applicant's academic and professional goals are clearly articulated (MPA student at UNM focused on fiscal equity and participatory governance). •Research is described in strong detail—multi-city comparative evaluation of participatory budgeting across New Mexico and Texas municipalities. •Activities, timeline, and methods (document review, interviews, surveys) are clearly tied to applicant's academic field and future career goals. Benefits (/25) Score: 25 / 25 •Benefits to applicant's professional development are clearly explained—strengthens skills in budgeting, equity analysis, and public engagement. •Benefits to New Mexico communities are well detailed—project outcomes will inform more equitable and transparent local budget practices. •Strong alignment with GPSA's mission to support applied research with statewide impact. Budget (/30) Score: 0 / 30 •Applicant used the correct GPSA budget template and attached receipts.	24	25	10	0	10			

102025046	Amount Requested: $3,000 Word Count: ~670 (within required 600–700 range) Background The proposal presents a timely, policy-relevant research problem on extreme heat vulnerability and climate-health risks in New Mexico. The research questions and methods (remote sensing, GIS, spatial statistics, and field validation) are well-designed and feasible for a graduate project. Demonstrates strong integration of public health and climate science. The proposal provides clear professional alignment — directly supporting the student's thesis in GIScience and environmental data science. Benefits to New Mexico are compelling, especially through production of a Heat Vulnerability Index and maps that local governments can use for planning and health interventions. Mentions dissemination plans (UNM seminars, conference presentations, and community workshops). Excellent structure — concise, professional, and logical flow. Technical terms are defined and used appropriately. Minimal errors; however, one paragraph blends methods and benefits, which slightly affects readability. Budget items include travel (car rental, lodging, and per diem), equipment (temperature logger), and software/data acquisition. Budget is well-calculated and justified for statewide data collection trips (Albuquerque → Grants → Hobbs). Supporting documents (rental car quote, hotel estimate, equipment quote) are attached and valid. However, per GPSA/NMRG guidelines and UNM travel policy, car rental expenses are allowable only when necessary and cost-effective compared to personal or university fleet vehicles. Policy 4030	23	24	9	28	10			
102025046	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $2,854.64 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈680 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Yes – Faculty letter included and supports the NMRG research 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background score(24/25) •Applicant's academic and professional goals are clearly articulated (MPA student at UNM focused on fiscal equity and participatory governance). •Research is described in strong detail—multi-city comparative evaluation of participatory budgeting across New Mexico and Texas municipalities. •Activities, timeline, and methods (document review, interviews, surveys) are clearly tied to applicant's academic field and future career goals. Benefits score(25/25) •Benefits to applicant's professional development are clearly explained—strengthens skills in budgeting, equity analysis, and public engagement. •Benefits to New Mexico communities are well detailed—project outcomes will inform more equitable and transparent local budget practices. •Strong alignment with GPSA's mission to support applied research with statewide impact. Budget score (0 /30) •Applicant used the correct GPSA budget template and attached receipts. •However, all expenses (travel, lodging, meals, car rental) are not allowed under Section 5.B(3) of the GPSA Grants Code. •No eligible research costs (e.g., supplies, transcription, software) are listed; budget fails compliance. Composition score(10 /10)	25	25	10	15	10			
102025046	Not recommended for NMRG. Based on the recommendation letter, the applicant's research is impactful in Ghana but does not align with NMRG's thematic or geographic priorities.	22	20	8	25	8			

102024766	Eligibility & Status; Amount Requested: $3,000 Application Compliance; Meets word count requirement: no (1,137) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): No budget sheet is empty Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes – includes community and state agency partnerships, project description, and implementation plan: Yes, master's student in Community and Regional Planning focused on water governance, Indigenous planning, and climate resilience. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Partially, the project applies GIS, hydrological modeling, and remote sensing for water planning in the Torreon Chapter of the Navajo Nation (March–December), specific research activity/need for travel in this specific time is unclear. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, directly aligned with academic training and long-term career in natural resource and environmental planning. Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, strengthens GIS and modeling expertise, advances degree completion, and prepares for a career in Indigenous water governance. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? - Yes, produces community-relevant spatial tools, enhances UNM's applied research, and supports water resilience in Torreon and other rural NM communities. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No, unclear how the budget directly helps the research/why the student is travelling at this time, and why they need specific items Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Paritally, some jargon Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification (State clearly), Disqualification; Why: overword count, incomplete budget template	25	15	5	0	10			
102024766	Grants Scoring Comment Section , 1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___3,000__, 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (Number?) 1,114 , Budget template complete? (Partial) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) • Yes. The applicant is a master's student in Community and Regional Planning focused on water governance and Indigenous planning. • For the most part. The project will involve GIS mapping, remote sensing, hydrological modeling, in Torreon Chapter and Navajo Nation with a March–December timeline. Not sure if this is for the 2026 year, it's not specified. • Yes. The work directly aligns with environmental planning, GIS, and Indigenous water governance, supporting the applicant's academic and career trajectory. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? • Yes. The project builds expertise in GIS, hydrological modeling, Indigenous planning, and decision-support frameworks. • Yes. Outputs support Torreon Chapter's land use planning, broader tribal water resilience, UNM research, and potential replicability for other rural communities. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? • No. Blank template uploaded Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? • Yes. The proposal is clear, structured. Though some words seem technical and could be explained e.g. Normalized Difference Vegetation Index • Recommend disqualification. Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification) Word count way above limit.	25	25	9	0	10			

102024766	1. Eligibility & Status, Amount Requested: $ 3000, 2. Application Check Meets word count? No Word count: 1115, Budget template complete? No Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation, Background, Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes, Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes, Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Based off of supporting data, possibly but without the completion of budget template it is not 100% clear Writing Quality, Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes Disqualify . Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is very thorough, the application far exceeds the max word limit and also fails to complete all of the requirements (budget template). For this reason, I do not believe a grant is appropriate in absence of the required information and guidelines.	25	25	9	10	10			
102023027	Not recommended for NMRG. No recommendation attached.	23	20	8	30	0			
102023027	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $ 2008 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 646 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal and budget documents are comprehensive and supportive of their application, there are some essential items missing. The application does not have a completed UNM faculty recommendation or a letter of support from an external NM-based organization, leading to disqualification.	21	20	9	25	0			

102023027	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $2008 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (631) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Budget was not well researched and includes amounts cannot be verifed with the links given in the budget Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? No Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Application didn't include a letter of recommendation from a faculty member. However, the faculy member stated that, "This form will not allow me to paste my letter. I will try to send it in body of email to GPSA"	25	25	10	15	0			
102021435	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__2745___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number=689) Budget template complete? Yes but the supplementary document is the same budget. Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant did a great job by building connection on his academic background with his professional goals and clearly stated the timelines for undertaking the research and a clear emphasis on how this research will benefit museums in the state of New Mexico. The Budget was well completed but with no proof of supplementary documents. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I disqualify this application because the applicant was unable to provide the needed supplementary document but just resubmitted the budget template as supplementary documents for the grant.	24	24	8	15	10			
102021435	The background and research were clearly described and explained. Activities were explained and benefits linked to unm community. The application were composed logically. The application followed the budget template and instructions. However, with the supporting document, the applicant uploaded the same budget template. Therefore there are not enough supporting documents. The letter of support from the faculty is strong.	20	25	9	15	10			

102021435	Amount Requested: $2,745 Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈640 words) Budget template complete? Yes – all columns filled, vendor links provided Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Yes – faculty recommendation directly supports NMRG research project •Academic and professional interests (Ph.D. in Biology, UNM) are clearly described and strongly tied to conservation ecology. •Research project (Assessing the Populations of Freshwater Turtles of New Mexico) is explained in clear scientific and logistical detail, including field sites, sampling plan, and methods. •Objectives (genetic structure and dietary variation) are relevant to applicant's discipline and career path in wildlife conservation. •Applicant demonstrates both academic and community benefit—expanding understanding of New Mexico turtle biodiversity and providing mentorship to undergraduate REU students. •Project supports data collection for the Museum of Southwestern Biology and agencies such as NM Game and Fish. •Strong evidence of broader impact on state wildlife management and student training. •Budget is detailed, reasonable, and fully documented. •All items are allowable under §5.B of the GPSA Grants Code (nets, traps, stakes, PVC pipes, etc.). •No disallowed items (e.g., salaries, computers). Other funding sources (GRAC, MRT) are identified and linked. •Proposal is concise, well-written, and logically structured. •Technical terms are defined, and writing is accessible to a general academic audience. •Adheres to length and formatting guidelines. Letter of Support •Faculty advisor provides a strong endorsement of the NMRG research project, explicitly referencing field methods, mentoring, and dissertation progress. •Fully compliant with §5.F(5)(a) requirement for faculty recommendation. Score: 10 / 10 Notes	24	25	9	30	10			
102014880	Amount requested: $2,854.69, Word Count: ~690 words (within 600–700 range) The applicant clearly articulates academic goals focused on climate resilience, water resource management, and Indigenous community adaptation. Research objectives are specific, measurable, and time-bound, emphasizing the Chuska Mountains as a critical case study for New Mexico's semi-arid water systems. Uses credible, peer-reviewed references (Garfin 2014; Deehan 2024; U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 2021). etc Benefits Direct benefit to New Mexico communities through proposed water-security strategies for Navajo Nation and rural populations. Explicitly bridges science and policy, translating climate data into actionable adaptation plans. Strong contribution to UNM's climate adaptation and Indigenous knowledge initiatives. Broader benefits include training for future environmental professionals and public dissemination of findings to tribal and state water agencies. Composition Exceptionally well-organized; each section (Background → Objectives → Methods → Benefits → Conclusion) transitions smoothly. Clear, professional tone; technical terms ("snow water equivalent," "hydrologic modeling") are defined contextually. Formatting and citations follow academic standards. Budget Budget spreadsheet fully completed and itemized (software, climate-data access, research supplies, travel to data sites). Invoice and spreadsheet demonstrate transparent accounting and cost realism. $2,854.69 request is appropriate for NMRG scope and proportionate to overall research cost. All expenses are eligible and directly tied to research implementation—no personal or unallowable items.	25	25	10	30	10			

102014880	1. Amount requested $2854.69 2. Application meets the word requirement with a complete budget and support letter. 3. The research was described in detail and clearly tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to the academic and NM community is clearly explained with a justifiable budget. 4. Application qualifies as all the requirements have been met.	25	25	10	30	10			
102014880	1. Amount Requested: $2,854.69, Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈640 words) Budget template complete? Yes (template filled; all items listed), Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Yes (Faculty letter from Lani Tsinnajinnie – directly endorses NMRG project) •Academic and professional goals clearly stated (MCRP student, Community & Regional Planning). •Project description is detailed—focuses on climate change impacts on water resources in the Chuska Mountains (Navajo Nation). •Work is directly tied to applicant's degree and long-term professional objectives in environmental planning and Indigenous water resource management. •Benefits to applicant's professional development clearly outlined: strengthens climate adaptation and community planning skills. •Benefits to NM communities explicitly linked to Navajo Nation water-security and climate adaptation efforts. •Research has direct, tangible community and policy relevance. •Budget includes ineligible items under § 5.B (3): computer purchase, travel, lodging, food, printing. •None of these expenses qualify for NMRG funding; 0 % of listed costs are allowable. •Budget therefore fails compliance with the GPSA Grants Code. •Proposal is well written, logically structured, and largely free of jargon. •Clear flow between background, methods, and benefits. Minor redundancies, but overall strong readability. •Faculty recommendation from Lani Tsinnajinnie (Community & Regional Planning) explicitly supports the NMRG •Confirms student's academic progress, project relevance, and funding need. •Meets § 5.F (5)(a) faculty-endorsement requirement. While the research is academically strong and relevant to New Mexico's water-resource and climate-adaptation needs, the entire budget violates Section 5.B (3) of the GPSA NMRG Grants Code (computers, travel, lodging, food, and printing are not sallowed). Because no eligible costs remain, the application must be disqualified on budget grounds (Section 5.H (2)).	23	25	9	0	10			
102009745	Recommendation for Qualification: the student hasn't submitted the budget supporting documents, but the proposal is detailed and specific. It has obvious applications to New Mexico and is important to the student's academic goals.	20	25	10	15	10			
102009745	Not recommended for PDG. No airline ticket purchased. Not recommended for NMRG (General priority and High priority). Not enrolled in at least 6 credits. Second recommendation letter is suspicious.	19	15	6	28	7			

102009745	Amount Requested: $3,000, Word Count: 678 words Budget Template: Used the Budget Template, Supporting Documents: complete •Academic and professional interests clearly stated; demonstrates strong grounding in epidemiology, health services evaluation, and community-based research. •Research problem (opioid use disorder among homeless populations) is well contextualized and aligns with New Mexico's pressing health priorities. •Objectives and career alignment are clearly defined., Well-developed mixed-methods design integrating surveys, interviews, and secondary data analysis. •Geographic scope (Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Las Cruces) and timeline (Oct 2025–Dec 2026) clearly presented. •Strong emphasis on both quantitative and qualitative data to identify barriers and facilitators to MAT access. providing actionable policy recommendations. •Requested amount ($3,000) is reasonable for the proposed scope and timeline. Applicant used the official GPSA budget template and provided all required links and documentation. •Most line items are allowable under §5.B(2) of the GPSA Grants Code (materials, software, transcription, field equipment, consumables). One item—data-entry personnel ($200)—is not allowed under §5.B(3)(a) (salaries/assistant stipends prohibited). •Overall budget is realistic and well-documented; 90%+ allowable. Faculty letter from Rachel Torano-Mark supports a Professional Development Grant (PDG), not the NMRG research proposal., Collaborator letter (Ali Usman) supports the research project but does not meet the faculty requirement. Total Score: 84 / 100. The proposal is academically strong, methodologically sound, and directly benefits New Mexico's public-health community. However, the faculty recommendation letter requirement is not met, and one budget line item (data-entry personnel) is ineligible. One item—data-entry personnel ($200)—is not allowed under Grants code Section NMRG 5.B(3)(a) (salaries/assistant stipends prohibited). Recommend: Disqualify.	24	23	10	27	0			
101982821	Not recommended for SRG. No proof of paper acceptance for presentation. No airline ticket purchased. Not recommended for NMRG. The NMRG proposal does not align with NRMG criteria because its context is Uganda.	18	10	7	24	10			

101982821	Budget template complete? (Yes/) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) •Applicant is PhD student in in Evolutionary Anthropology. Proposal explicitly states that research supports the applicant's dissertation and their goal to be in academia. It's tied to their field of study. Not stated what the sample size is though. Funds to support travel and lodging to/at research site in Uganda for March-Jul 2026. Benefits •The research shown to clearly support the applicant's dissertation and shows potential to contribute to the scientific field •Benefits to UNM community, as undergraduates could use the data for research and an assistant will gain field experience. Beyond academics and conservation abroad, impacts on the New Mexico community not explicitly expounded Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? •Budget is justified with links to plane tickets and invoice quoted for a previous trip to the site for accommodation. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? •Yes, the writing is clear, detailed, and has a structure that is easy to follow. The narrative from rationale, methods, and expected contributions flows logically. 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I recommend qualification. -Good proposal and has a right balance of explaining the otherwise research for an everyday person to understand. Submitted support material shows groundwork has already started, and the advisor believes the student has demonstrated resilience to accomplish the study successfully.	25	22	10	30	10			
101982821	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $3000 2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (698) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) 3.Evaluation of Narrative, Great proposal, proposal fulfills all the requirements Complete and reasonable budget backed with supporting documents. Applicant used a bill from the previous field season dated 22nd June 2024 and included in supporting documentation which couldn't be verified Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification Application was great and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Budget were well researched and includes supporting documents though the invoice included in the supporting document dated 22nd June, 2024 and couldn't be verfified Overall, a very strong application and I recommend this application for qualification.	25	25	10	25	10			

101914862	1. Amount Requested $3000 2. Meet word count, but the budget template is partial. The budget template was submitted as a budget supporting doc, and no link was provided to verify the items listed in the budget. 3. Degree, academic, and professional interests were stated. Research it tied applicants field. Applicant did not give a timeline for the research. 4. Application is qualified as all requirement for NMRG was followed.	25	22	10	15	10			
101914862	Academic and professional goals and interests should be explained more clearly with more details. The benefits to the larger New Mexico community should be explained more. The proposal flow and writing style should be improved. The supporting documents are not provided. The budget is not well researched and prepared. For example, what is the size/capacity of an external hard disk drive? A portable 2TB external hard drive can be purchased for less than $80, or a 2TB external USB solid-state drive can be purchased for around $120. In the budget template under the “link to verify budget items”, no links are provided. Also, no quotes are given.	20	23	7	15	10			
101914862	Meets Word Count Requirement? No ~ 810 words, Yes – Budget is itemized and justified in detail. Required Supporting Docs (letters of support) included? Yes The student is a doctoral candidate in the dissertation phase, specializing in environmental and resource economics. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes. The applicant outlines a dissertation research project focusing on consumptive water use in the Middle Rio Grande Valley (MRGV), using municipal and agricultural datasets and advanced geospatial analysis. Is it clearly tied to the applicant’s field and/or goals? Yes. The project is directly related to the student’s field of environmental economics, and supports their career goals in research and policy analysis. The research strengthens skills in data analysis, remote sensing, valuation methods, and interdisciplinary collaboration — all relevant to careers in academia or public policy. The applicant explains that the findings will be shared through white papers, agency outreach, and peer-reviewed publication. The work is positioned as impactful to New Mexico’s ongoing water resource challenges. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes. Budget includes a research laptop, cloud storage, remote sensing access, and processing credits. All items are directly related to the project’s success. The proposal is articulate, logically structured, and accessible to an interdisciplinary review panel. Jargon is minimal and well-contextualized. Qualified: This is a well-crafted, technically sound, and policy-relevant application. The proposal identifies a clear need for funding to support computational and data-intensive research essential to the applicant’s dissertation. The requested resources are reasonable, and the project demonstrates both academic merit and broader relevance to New Mexico’s water resource planning. The applicant also proposes multiple methods for disseminating results, ensuring community benefit and knowledge-sharing.	25	25	10	30	10			

101911686	-requesting $3000 (MAX) ~ 685 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents to go with budget, faculty recommendation Qualify for Award (Highly Recommended for Full or Near-Full Funding) Why: This is an exceptional NMRG proposal that exemplifies GPSA's mission — community-engaged research rooted in New Mexico's unique environmental and social landscape. The writing is polished, the methodology sound, and the impact clearly defined. While the missing budget documentation prevents a perfect score, the proposal otherwise reflects strong planning, clear deliverables, and deep community collaboration. If funded, this project would generate meaningful applied outcomes for both UNM and fire-affected communities in Northern New Mexico.	25	25	10	27	10			
101911686	Amount Requested: $3000, Meets word count requirement: No (562) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes, Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes human-environment geographer conducting dissertation-related research on post-wildfire recovery and community resilience. project begins December 2025 with water testing and story collection in San Miguel and Mora Counties, analyzing samples and publishing findings in The Hermit's Peak Community Atlas. directly extends dissertation research, combining community engagement, environmental analysis, and applied geography. strengthens dissertation outcomes, builds collaborative research experience, and enhances applied environmental scholarship. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? - Yes, provides support for affected residents, advances wildfire recovery research, and strengthens UNM's engagement with local communities. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes, covers project-related costs such as water testing, travel, and community dissemination; aligns with stated goals and timeline. Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon?, Yes, Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification (State clearly), Why: Well-developed proposal, budget is justified, partnerships are well-established, and the project meaningfully advances scholarship and public good, given back to the NM community.	25	25	10	30	10			

101911686	Amount Requested: $____3000__, Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number= 533) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant made it a point to state academic interest but did not see a direct correlation with professional goals. Applicant also went further to describe the location but with little details of the when and where. Also the applicant was able to state clearly the benefits of the research to the overall academic community. Budget seem reasonable but overly above the request amount and the there was no supporting documents attached. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualified because the applicant first link in the budget when i tried accessing it comes out as an error and also in the supplementary document section the budget template was placed there again therefore not meeting all the requirement of the budget section which is an important requirement to be meet for recommendation for the grant.	20	20	7	13	10			
101908217	requesting $2960 ~ 690 words (within range) -Completed budget template, no budget receipts included but email exchange, faculty recommendation Qualify for Award (Top-Tier Recommendation for Full Funding) Why: This proposal is a model NMRG submission — clear, technically advanced, and deeply aligned with New Mexico's research and sustainability goals. It combines cutting-edge materials science, renewable energy applications, and AI-driven modeling in a way that demonstrates both academic rigor and tangible public benefit. The proposal effectively bridges disciplines and institutions (UNM and Sandia), and the applicant's career plans underscore the long-term value of this investment for the state's renewable energy sector.A38	25	25	10	30	10			
101908217	The background should be explained more clearly. The benefits to the larger New Mexico community should be stated with enough detail. The composition should be improved. Some technical terms are not defined. The level of technical terms is higher than the general audience level.	22	22	5	30	10			

101908217	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $ 2960 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 679 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Somewhat, there are some areas that could be clarified to aid a layperson in understanding the terminology used	24	20	7	30	10			
101876493	1. Amount Requested $3000 2. Meets word requirement with complete budget template and supporting doc 3. Applicant did not clearly state his/her degree, and also did not provide a timeline for the research. 4. I recommend the disqualification of this application because the research is not based in New Mexico and does not fall under the NMRG application, but rather SRG.	22	22	10	30	10			
101876493	Amount Requested: $3,000, Meets word count: Yes (≈680 words), Budget template: Complete, Supporting documents: Included Clear academic goals and well-defined research plan directly tied to dissertation.Detailed fieldwork description with strong methodological foundation, Supports professional growth through independent field leadership. Benefits UNM students and highlights NM's role in international research. Well-justified and fully documented; aligns with NMRG guidelines. Professional, coherent, and clearly written. 4. Recommendation: Qualify. Why: Strong, well-prepared proposal with clear academic merit, sound budget, and meaningful professional and community impact.	24	24	9	29	10			

101876493	1) Professional goals should be explained more. 2) The Proposal flow should be improved. 3) The applicant provided a supporting document for $1000 from Cordell fund while in the budget table, he/she mentioned $280 and $800 which is $1080. So, the item cost in table is not calculated accurately. 4) Based on the provide link (https://worldsalaries.com/average-tour-guide-salary-in-belize/) in the budget table, daily rate to hire a local guide is about 80 BZD or about $40 per day while in the table, it is mentioned $50 per day. 5) In the provided link (https://www.yaaxche.org/) in the budget table, daily rate of hiring a ranger is not mentioned. So, how the applicant came up with $50 per day? It is necessary to provide the proof of each row in the budget table. 6) In the 3rd row of the budget table, the meal cost for 5 people for 8 days if average cost per meal is $6.50, is $780 not $500. So, the item cost in table is not calculated accurately. 7) In the 5th row of the budget table, the cost per sample is $250 while in the provided link (https://csi.unm.edu/radiocarbon-lab/sample-submission), the cost of Carbon Dioxide is $230. Also, the number of samples is not mentioned. 8) The link provided in the 6th row of the budget table is expired. The applicant should have provided a screenshot of the airfare. 9) The date for the trip is not mentioned in the budget table. 10) The 20% fee mentioned in the 7th row of the budget table is not mentioned in the link provided (https://nichbelize.org/institute-of-archaeology/).	23	25	8	15	10			
101875032	Amount Requested: $3000 Meets word count requirement? Yes – 693 words Budget template complete? Yes, the budget is complete Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Applicant provided required supporting documentation 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes, the budget is reasonable, well-researched and justified Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for qualification	25	24	10	30	10			

101875032	1.Eligibility & Status , amount Requested: $___3,000__ Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (Number?) 693,Budget template complete? (Yes), Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) •Proposal explicitly states that research is the applicant's dissertation in Biomedical Sciences and supports their goal for a career in the pharmaceutical industry developing therapies for neurodegenerative diseases. •Proposed activity is to conduct single-nucleus RNA sequencing analysis of mouse brains to identify how blocking IL-1RAP alters gene expression and protects against Alzheimer's. •Funds requested to support the cost of snRNA-sequencing and data analysis services at the end of Fall 2025 (timing not clearly stated). Proposal partially describes benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development. The research is aligned with the applicant's field and career goals, but it does not explicitly state how (if at all) this work contributes to their dissertation or skill development. The narrative focuses more on the scientific findings than on the applicant's personal training or professional growth •Research benefits the academic community and advances UNM's research agenda. It is a step closer to therapies capable of slowing or halting Alzheimer's progression which would benefit New Mexico's American Indian populations which are said to disproportionately record high rates of AD. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Budget is justified with a quote from LC Sciences attached. Well-written proposal. Research question, background, methodology, are clearly explained, and the narrative flows logically. Technical words are defined and which is a wonderful balance for someone not in the field without whitewashing the science. •Irecommend qualification. Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification) •The submission meets the laid criteria. It is a strong and well-written proposal with a clear research purpose, solid methods, benefits to the applicant, the academic field and the New Mexico community explicitly stated. Work has already started, which shows high potential for success, and the funding could help applicant meet their Spring 2026 graduation goal.	25	24	10	30	10			
101875032		25	25	10	30	10			
101874555	Recommended for NMRG. Applicant meets funding criteria.	25	25	10	30	10			

101874555	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $ 3000 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 698 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Somewhat, the goals of the study are clear but she could be more in depth as to the description Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): This application is very well organized and thorough, verifying that the grant will be used for a good purpose. Her faculty recommendation also makes it clear that this research is of great importance for her field, the university, and our community as a whole. However, she is missing a letter of support from an external NM-based organization, therefore she may need to be disqualified.	25	20	8	30	10			
101874555	The research background and description were stated and explained. The research was linked to professional development and benefits were linked to the unm community. The application used and followed the instructions of the budget template. However, the budget statement is not clearly stating the budgets items. and there were also no links to verify. The supporting documents does not support the application. The recommendation letter from the professor was strong and solid.	23	23	9	15	10			
101844902	1. Eligibility & Status, Amount Requested: $3,000 Meets word count: Yes (≈680 words), Budget template: Complete Supporting docs: Yes (Budget narrative, quotes), Anonymity: Confirmed – no identifying information present Research objectives and approach clearly defined. Focus on New Mexico's STI health disparities is relevant and timely. Excellent linkage to public health outreach and community benefit. Contributes to academic and social understanding of women's health communication. Transparent and reasonable use of funds for participant compensation; regional gift card selection justified Flows logically and maintains academic tone. Qualify. Why: Strong proposal with high relevance to New Mexico's health needs, clear methodological plan, and outstanding mentor support. Well written, ethical, and community-centered research design.	24	23	9	30	10			

101844902	requesting $3000 (MAX) 690 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents to go with budget (narrative) no budget receipts included, faculty recommendation Qualify for Award (Highly Recommended for Full or Near-Full Funding) Why: This is an excellent, socially impactful, and methodologically clear proposal. It addresses a well-defined public health issue in New Mexico through an academic lens that merges theory, data collection, and applied community relevance. The project's design — focusing on stigma and STI prevention among NM women — demonstrates strong community benefit and academic rigor. The applicant's plan to support local coffee shops for participant incentives further reflects a thoughtful, community-oriented approach. Minor deduction only applies for lack of pricing documentation, but this does not affect eligibility or overall quality.51:51	25	25	10	28	10			
101844902	Grants Scoring Comment Section 1.Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__3000____ 2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes (Number= 697) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letter of support included? (No) 3.Evaluation of Narrative The applicant provide little information to his or her research background but just provided a research description. The budget was not well researched because there was not enough information to verify cost of budget and the supplementary documents are not informative. 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualified because in the supplementary document section applicants goes ahead to resubmit the links provided in the budget templates.	18	20	7	15	10			

101763188	Requested amount: $3,000, Word Count: ~670 (within 600–700-word range) The applicant provides a clear research purpose: to determine how precipitation variability influences fungal communities in Larrea tridentata (creosote) flowers. The research is situated in a robust scientific and geographic context—the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge (SNWR)—where climate-driven desert ecology interactions are being studied. Strong alignment with the applicant's academic goal of becoming a researcher and educator in microbial ecology, focusing on climate impacts in desert ecosystems. Directly benefits New Mexico's research ecosystem, as the project focuses on the state's flagship ecological site (SNWR) and a culturally significant desert shrub (creosote). Addresses climate adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and pollinator health, all of which are relevant to New Mexico's environmental policy and sustainability goals. The proposal is professionally written, logically organized, and free of jargon. Technical terms (e.g., "mycobiome," "Illumina sequencing," "Mean-Variance Experiment") are introduced with sufficient context for a general academic audience. Excellent transitions between background, methods, and impact sections. Budget template completed accurately, showing how the $3,000 request covers part of the $4,690 sequencing invoice from MRDNA, Invoice attached; cost breakdown transparent and eligible under GPSA/NMRG guidelines (research services, not personnel or travel). Demonstrates fiscal responsibility, as the applicant is covering the remaining portion through advisor and departmental resources. All expenses directly support completion of the dissertation and align with proposal objectives.	24	25	10	30	10			
101763188	-requesting $3000 (MAX) ~ 690 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents to go with budget, faculty recommendation Qualify for Award (Top-Tier Recommendation for Full Funding) Why: This is an exemplary NMRG General Priority submission. It is academically rigorous, well-written, and perfectly aligned with GPSA's goals. The applicant demonstrates clear mastery of both scientific and applied research aims, with measurable benefits for New Mexico's ecosystems and academic community. The inclusion of supporting documentation and a full budget elevates this above the typical applicant pool — this proposal is publication- and dissertation-ready, reflecting maturity, feasibility, and institutional benefit.	25	25	10	30	10			

101763188	Amount Requested: $3000, Meets word count requirement: Yes (698) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? PhD candidate in Biology researching the floral mycobiome of creosote flowers under simulated drought conditions at the Sevilleta National Wildlife Refuge. project involves analyzing 120 floral tissue samples from drought and control plots at SNWR during the 2025 flowering season., directly supports dissertation progress, professional training in microbial ecology, and career goals in research and education. Benefits, advances dissertation research, enhances molecular biology and field ecology skills, and supports presentation at scientific conferences. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? - Yes, contributes to understanding of climate impacts on desert ecosystems and pollinator interactions, benefiting conservation and public science engagement in New Mexico. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Qualification Why: Strong proposal with clear and community impact. Aligning with both dissertation goals and the mission of the grant. Meets all requirements	25	25	10	30	10			
101723470	Amount Requested: $2985.84, Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 666 words the budget is complete, Applicant provided required supporting documentation •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? , Yes, the budget is reasonable, well-researched and justified Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for qualification	25	25	10	30	10			

101723470	Amount Requested: $2,985.84 Meets word count requirement: Yes (≈690 words), Budget template complete: Yes, Required supporting docs (letters of support): Yes Background: Research goals and methods are clearly defined and tied directly to the dissertation., Project integrates behavioral, cellular, and electrophysiological methods effectively. Benefits: Strong impact on applicant's career as a physician-scientist and relevance to NM's high rates of alcohol-related disorders. Plans for dissemination through NMARC and community engagement strengthen state-level benefit. Budget: Reasonable, justified, and limited to research consumables; fully compliant. Composition: Excellent clarity, flow, and professionalism. Recommendation: Qualify. Why: An outstanding and well-developed proposal with strong scientific merit, relevance to New Mexico public health, and clear professional benefit. The project is well planned, feasible, and thoroughly supported by the faculty mentor.	25	24	10	29	10			
101723470	The research back, the academic and professional goals were clearly stated and explained. The activities were clearly stated and explained and the benefits were linked to UNM community. The application followed the budget template and the instructions. The supporting documents were clearly supports the applications. The recommendation from the faculty was strong. Overall, the application were logically composed.	25	24	9	28	10			
101671896	Amount Requested: $____3,000__ 2.Application Compliance, Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (Number?) 699 Budget template complete? (Yes), Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) •Applicant is a PhD student working on his dissertation in Earth and Planetary Sciences. •Proposed activity is to analyze silicate samples at UNM Nanomaterials Characterization Facility and when and the funding would help with upcoming training and analysis. •Although the applicant indicates to be currently in training and envisions publication within the next year' there is no clear timeline for which the funds are requested and would be used. •Proposal concisely states that research is the applicant's PhD dissertation in Earth and Planetary Sciences and their career through material training skill development. The career itself is not specified although applicant is a member of research team as a PhD student. •The proposal highlights the benefit the research would have to UNM's research strengths and collaborations but could explicitly explain benefits to the broader New Mexico community, if any. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? •Budget is justified with Nanomaterials lab rates attached as support Composition •Well-written proposal. Research question, background, methodology, are clearly explained, and the narrative flows logically. The proposal leans on the technical side. A brief plain-language summary of key concepts or the broader significance of the research would make the proposal more accessible to a wider review audience without reducing its scientific rigor. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) •I recommend disqualification. Great proposal. However, the proposal includes the applicant's name and is therefore not anonymized, which goes against the guidelines. This is the reason for the disqualification recommendation.	23	24	8	30	10			

101671896	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $3000 2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (705) Excluding references Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) 3.Evaluation of Narrative Budget was not well research and includes analytical costs to use TEM instrument for training and sample analysis ($150/hr training, $100/hr post training) but doesn't state the number of hours per training. SRG amount 750 was stated on the NMRG Budget template The writing was not clear and proposal was difficult to comprehend. The applicantion doesn't meet the required word count. Total word count was 1293 including references and word count excluding references was 705 Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? No Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? No Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? No 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Application exceeds required word count.	25	20	8	15	10			
101671896	Grants Scoring Comment Section 1.Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__3000____ 2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (Number= 705) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) 3.Evaluation of Narrative The applicant clearly explained his background and his professional interest. The activity was not clearly stated with details of the where and when. Applicant also states the benefits of the research clearly by stressing on how this will also benefit future UNM research 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualifies because it meets all the basic requirement which require the applicant to have budget template completed and needed supplementary documents attached as well.	18	20	7	20	10			
101652910	Recommendation for Disqualification: in-complete application, no faculty recommendation letter. The proposal looks good, but I have some questions about the budget. The student has included Grammarly Pro as part of their budget. I'm not certain of its relevance. Everything else looks good.	20	25	10	20	0			

101652910	Amount Requested: $ 3000 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 626 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality: Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation; Disqualify ; Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal and budget documents are comprehensive and supportive of their application, there are some essential items missing. The application does not have a UNM faculty recommendation or a letter of support from an external NM-based organization, leading to disqualification.	23	24	9	30	0			
101652910		25	25	10	30	10			
101617457	Recommendation for Disqualification: application is not anonymous and the proposal is over the word count maximum of 700 words. Other than these barriers, the student's application looks perfect and would definitely benefit from GPSA's support.	25	25	8	30	10			
101617457	There research background and description were clearly explained. The professional goals and development were stated and explained and the interest linked to unm and NM community. There are no supporting document. The application indicated that "This document is uploaded as a placeholder. I currently have no supporting documentation for my proposed budget." The recommendation letter from the faculty was very strong. However, the applicant wrote her name on the application. Overall, the application were clearly composed.	24	24	10	15	10			
101617457		25	25	10	30	10			
100774530	Recommendation for Qualification: student explains the research proposal well. It is both for a dissertation and is directly related to New Mexico and UNM. The faculty letter isn't the strongest. It supports the research being done, but doesn't talk much about the student.	25	20	10	30	7			
100774530	Eligibility & Status, Amount Requested: $3000 2.Application Compliance, Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (636) Budget template complete? (Yes), Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes) 3.Evaluation of Narrative, Activities were not linked to the larger New Mexico community Budget was not well researched and not reasonable Link for Amazon Merchandise Card or Visa Gift Card stated in the budget couldn't be verified Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? No Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? No Budget, Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification Application fulfilled all requirements Background and research description was clearly stated Technical terms were defined and proposal flows logically.	25	20	10	15	10			

100774530	Eligibility & Status, Amount Requested: $3,000 Application Compliance, Meets word count requirement: Yes Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes, doctoral candidate in Educational Psychology focusing on formative feedback and motivation. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, study with nursing students at UNM and CNM during Spring and Summer 2026. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes, directly supports dissertation research and academic goals. Benefits. Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Applicant does not meet the eligibility requirement of being enrolled in 6 credit hours.	25	25	10	30	10			