

Applicant Student ID	Reviewer Notes	Background: - Academic interests stated - Activity and its significance described in detail	Benefits: - Benefits linked to academic /prof. development - Benefits linked to academic community	Composition: - Clear, flows logically, reasonable - Technical terms defined	Budget: - Complete, detailed, reasonable, logical - Supporting docs/links	Total Points	Total Possible Score	Percent Score
101922963	The applicant should state his/her academic interests with more detail. The composition should be enhanced. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic and professional development should be explained in more detail.	23	28	11	30	92	100	92%
101922963	Reads like a list of items instead of a proposal.	20	25	5	30	80	100	80%
101292799	The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic and professional community should be explained more.	25	26	15	30	96	100	96%
101292799	Good application overall but applicant could have elaborated more on the benefits of the proposed research activity.	20	22	12	26	80	100	80%
101911459	Even though the proposal is fairly good, the applicant indicates that the same project has been funded under nmrg general priority last semester and so I recommend that other persons be given more priority.	20	25	15	22	82	100	82%
101911459	Good application easy	25	30	14	29	98	100	98%

101911459	This work is not been presented at conference.	25	15	14	29	83	100	83%
102005363	Very good. Academic interest and conference clearly stated and described. Benefits of attending clearly linked to academic interests as well as to broader UNM community. Clear and well-written proposal. Budget is clear and supporting documents were verified.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102005363		21	20	11	21	73	100	73%
102005363	technical terms like Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis are not defined for a general audience.	23	29	10	30	92	100	92%
101911628		25	30	13	27	95	100	95%
101845138	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, conference participation (when and where); benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience, good; Budget is finished, and the applicant uses the provided format.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101943375	The proposal is quite good.	22	25	15	30	92	100	92%
101943375	The application is very thorough, well-written, and detailed.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101878983	Applicant name on the supporting document.	24	29	15	30	98	100	98%
101878983	the budget wasn't completely filled; missing amount requested from other sources.	25	30	15	27	97	100	97%
101907106		24	27	14	27	92	100	92%
101907106	This SRG application is thoughtfully prepared. The applicant did not apply for FAFSA or State-Aid form for this academic year.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%

101907106	Applicant's academic interests are explained well and the uniqueness of their research is also described. The benefits to the student's professional development are clear.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102025680	The application was clear and concise	24	29	15	30	98	100	98%
102025680	Proposed activity is to take place over the summer. This is outside the range of the SRG. Recommend disqualification. Additionally this is more appropriate for PDG not SRG.	15	30	15	30	90	100	90%
102025680		23	25	10	22	80	100	80%
101908557	The connection between human and chimpanzee cooperative aggression could be made more explicit. Some sentences are dense and could be streamlined for clarity.	24	29	10	30	93	100	93%
101908557	SRG grant is to cover expenses for a conference a student is presenting in	12	10	14	17	53	100	53%
101908557	Very thorough, detailed, and well-written.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101139514		23	30	13	30	96	100	96%
101139514	The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic and professional community should be explained more.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
101908062	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, current status, research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for research relevant activities; Composition is good, but it can be improved if research is stated to general audience; Budget is well-organized, and the applicant uses the provided format.	25	30	10	30	95	100	95%
102057237	Benefits linked to the applicant's academic and professional development should be explained in more detail.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%

102057237	Good proposal but the date of the conference was not explicit enough and the zip document containing the other supporting documents could not be accessed.	22	21	15	28	86	100	86%
101719954	The application essay is well composed and captures the essence of the SRG's mission to disseminate applicants' research and original work.	24	28	14	29	95	100	95%
101719954		23	25	15	25	88	100	88%
101797791		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101797791	Applicant is requesting funds for travel in the summer, which is outside the grant cycle.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101797791		23	27	13	27	90	100	90%
102056703	The SRG Budget Form (-1) contains a minor mistake. The totals (line item 12, column D) should be \$722. The Total Cost (Column H, line item 7, airfare) should be adjusted to \$326. Also, the applicant did not apply for FAFSA or State-Aid Form for this academic year.	25	30	15	29	99	100	99%
102056703	Student's budget is reasonable and links are verifiable. Potential benefits of field of study on larger community are clear.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102056703	Applicant provided a very detailed budget and application	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102021399		23	20	10	10	63	100	63%
102021399	The writing could be more structured.	18	20	10	20	68	100	68%
102021399	There are no links in the budget document, and its not on the provided Excel sheet.	25	29	14	25	93	100	93%
101984316		21	25	14	28	88	100	88%
101984316	Provided a good background and reasoning, with clearly defined technical terms—links to potential future networking. There are a couple of grammatical errors in the budget.	25	30	15	29	99	100	99%
102018689	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly.	23	30	15	30	98	100	98%

101844902	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, conference participation (when and where); benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience, very clear; Budget is well-organized and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101844902	Great application overall with very detailed budget and additional supporting documentation.	22	28	14	28	92	100	92%
101910773	The applicant's academic interests aren't stated clearly. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic and professional development should be explained in more detail.	23	28	15	30	96	100	96%
101910773	Good proposal	23	27	15	30	95	100	95%
101910773	The application is very thorough, well-written, and detailed.	25	30	14	30	99	100	99%
101911669	Disqualify because applicant does not use GPSA Budget template. No supporting document attached. Instead the person upload budget twice.	25	30	15	15	85	100	85%
101911669	Did not use required excel budget document.	25	30	15	20	90	100	90%
101910455		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101910455		22	25	13	25	85	100	85%

101910455	This application is well prepared. Some minor notes. The applicant did not apply for FAFSA or State-Aid for this academic year. In the SRG Budget Form, meals for lunch and dinner are allocated as \$70/day. While GPSA expenses do not cover this meal line item, it goes over the typically allowed \$45/day per diem guidelines based on UNM Policy 4030.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102019386	Benefits of presenting at conference clearly described. Proposal was clear and it was helpful to have the abstract included. Budget is reasonable and has good supporting documents.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102019386	The applicant provided a solid application	25	29	15	30	99	100	99%
102019386	Budget and supporting documents are clear. Academic interests are clearly stated though how the conference will allow them to "contribute meaningfully to the field" isn't as clear. Additionally some terms are not clearly defined which may be part of the misunderstanding.	25	25	12	30	92	100	92%
101832459	Composition is very professional	16	19	13	19	67	100	67%
101832459	benefits to the community or some broader benefits are not discussed.	25	24	14	30	93	100	93%
101832459	SRG grant is for students who are attending a conference that will present a research paper in the conference.	11	10	11	15	47	100	47%
101902441	This application is recommended for disqualification because the student has requested grant funding for a conference from June 22-27, 2025.	0	0	0	0	0	100	0%
101902441	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic community should be explained more.	23	28	15	30	96	100	96%
102021293	Well thought out and written application which captures the essence of the SRG.	23	25	14	28	90	100	90%

	The applicant should state his/her academic interests with more detail.							
	Benefits linked to the applicant's academic and professional development should be explained in more detail.							
102021293	The composition should be enhanced.	23	28	13	30	94	100	94%
101071022	Good proposal but the applicant's request is way above the amount GPSA can award	25	28	15	26	94	100	94%
101071022	The applicant didn't mention the date in February he/she will be presenting. Also, the benefits need to be a bit more detailed	22	25	13	30	90	100	90%
101652910		25	30	15	18	88	100	88%
101652910	Nicely written and good supporting documents!	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101652910		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102023400		24	25	13	27	89	100	89%
102023400	Caution is needed for this application. The intended travel for this original research is proposed for July through August. This application will be more suitable for the 2025 SRG summer cycle.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%

101949092	Academic interests stated including previous research. However, proposal does not clearly state what research will be conducted in Ghana. It might be for collecting data for their research but it is not clear. It was not clear to a non-economist what a job market paper was or that it comprises part of the dissertation. This trip might be a benefit to the student in terms of their academic and professional progress but it is a little unclear what will happen on this trip. The budget is incomplete. Their one line item exceeds the amount requested so perhaps they didn't think it was necessary to include all other associated costs. However the link for the airfare did work and is roughly the same price as what was listed in the budget template.	18	20	10	25	73	100	73%
101949092	The background is a lot but some irrelevant.	12	20	10	19	61	100	61%
102057116	Terms like “heritage Spanish” must be briefly defined. The long-term academic goal is not connected to the conference. What is the conference about?	25	28	11	30	94	100	94%
102057116		15	19	8	22	64	100	64%
102057116	Two presentations for the price of one. The budget is well organized. It links well to academic interests and their significance and links to the academic	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101784302		25	27	13	28	93	100	93%
101784302	The benefits of the applicant’s work to the academic and professional community should be explained more.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%

101911453	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is great, including the applicant research interest and research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for research relevant travels, however, it can be improved by stating how it benefit for applicant research, career development and academic community; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience; Budget is good, the applicant uses the provided format, supplementary docs are well-organized and can support the budget.	25	20	15	30	90	100	90%
101911453	Good application essay but proposed research activity is set to take place in June 2025 which is outside of the current grant cycle.	24	24	12	24	84	100	84%
102022328	The applicant should state his/her academic interests with more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail.	23	28	15	30	96	100	96%
102022328	The proposal is quite good	22	26	14	30	92	100	92%
101889689	The application is good but the benefits need to be a bit detailed.	25	27	14	29	95	100	95%
101830265		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101830265	Applicant is applying for funds for an event in June 2025, which is outside the grant cycle.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101388710	Great, Academic and professional interests clearly stated and linked to the benefits of attending conference. Well written proposal. Budget documents support the budget form though there appears to be an error	25	30	15	10	80	100	80%
101388710		21	20	10	21	72	100	72%
101669077		17	20	5	19	61	100	61%
101669077		25	26	15	27	93	100	93%

101912161	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic and professional community should be explained more.	23	28	15	30	96	100	96%
102022540	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, current status, research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference presentation in Detroit; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience; Budget is well-organized and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101938746	The proposal is very good	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101938746	The application essay is well composed, capturing the essence of the SRG for disseminating applicants' research and original work.	25	30	14	28	97	100	97%
101702399	The amount on the budget is a little on the high side.	23	28	13	22	86	100	86%
101702399	NOTE: Personal Information should not be included in supporting document.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101980906		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101980906		22	27	13	27	89	100	89%
102057622	The students' academic interests are clear, and the conference's benefits for their professional development are well-described. However, there is not much focus on how their research benefits the academic community.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
102057622	Great application by applicant	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101818570		16	19	10	19	64	100	64%
101818570	how attending will contribute directly to UNM's academic community. Some parts are slightly repetitive.	25	27	12	30	94	100	94%

101818570		21	25	8	22	76	100	76%
101956362	The budget could have been a bit easier to follow and detail, but the data is there. Technical terms are defined and linked to professional interests. Also links to work to the academic community.	25	30	15	29	99	100	99%
101956362	There is no enough information (date and place) about the meeting in the proposal.	20	26	13	27	86	100	86%
101956362	The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic community should be explained more.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary documents. Background is good, including the applicant current status and research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for the conference participation and presentation; Budget is good and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101938580	Thoughtful and detailed application.	21	27	13	28	89	100	89%
101938580	The applicant should state his/her academic interests with more detail. The composition should be enhanced. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic and professional development should be explained in more detail.	23	28	13	30	94	100	94%
102002464	Good proposal	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
102002464	The benefits need to be a bit detailed.	25	25	13	30	93	100	93%
101745231	Disqualify because the proposal does not meet the word count limit. The proposal contain 259 word count.							
101745231	There is also name on the supporting document.	22	29	14	23	88	100	88%
101745231	NOTE: Personal Information should not be included in supporting document.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101745231	More details about the conference could be provided.	23	30	15	30	98	100	98%

101944767	Caution is needed for this SRG application. The word count for this SRG proposal is 460 words, not meeting the requirement of 500-600 words (-1). Also, the applicant's name is disclosed in all of the file names and in the SRG Budget Supporting Documentation (-1). Importantly, the workshop will be held in June. This application will be suitable for the 2025 SRG Summer cycle.	25	30	14	29	98	100	98%
101944767	Student's budget is reasonable and supported by docs. The potential benefits of presenting at the conference are well-described. I would have liked to have more of an explanation of student's field of study in layman's terms.	25	30	12	30	97	100	97%
101937859	Great application provided by the applicant	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
101937859	Applicant's academic interests and activity are clearly stated. Benefits are plenty but feel abstract.	17	20	11	19	67	100	67%
101759758	A slight deduction is made as the proposal could briefly discuss how these contributions might extend beyond UNM	24	28	14	30	96	100	96%
101759758	I graded this based on GSF and not SRG is for conference the student is presenting a paper outside Albuquerque.	11	20	8	19	58	100	58%
101759758	Just a note: I am curious how manipulating 16mm film would further impact research and film. I think this argument could have been a bit stronger.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102023528	The student detailed about the paper and the conference, but lacked sufficient background explanation of academic interests	20	25	12	30	87	100	87%

102023528	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic and professional community should be explained more.	23	28	15	30	96	100	96%
102064379	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is good, including the applicant research interest and research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference presentation; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience; Budget is good, the applicant uses the provided format, supplementary docs are well-organized and can support the budget.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101891219	The budget doesn't include all links to verify	25	30	14	25	94	100	94%
101891219		21	30	15	30	96	100	96%
102022324		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102022324		25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102022324		23	29	12	25	89	100	89%
101935271	Proposal is very short and lacks detail. Academic interest is broadly stated as nonfiction. No additional details provided. Benefits are stated but not clear how they articulate specifically with interests in nonfiction. Budget is complete with supporting documents attached.	18	20	12	30	80	100	80%
101935271	Proposal is only about 250 words	13	16	9	18	56	100	56%
101935271	It's a very short background. Not much information is given about the dissertation topic and what benefits will be achieved by this.	22	25	14	30	91	100	91%
101948279	The benefits of the applicant's work to the professional development should be explained more.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%

101943334	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, conference participation (when and where); benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience, very clear; Budget is well-organized and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101943334	Well thought out application package but date of conference is July 2025 which falls outside of the current grant cycle. Although the supporting documentation shows the conference dates were changed, it does not provide the original scheduled dates of the conference, making it hard to discern how much applicant has been impacted by the date change.	22	28	12	25	87	100	87%
102004304	The applicant should state his/her academic interests with more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic and professional development should be explained in more detail.	23	28	15	30	96	100	96%
102004304	The proposal is fairly okay but the request for the money is not explicit. This is because the applicant is requesting funding for an expense that occurred even as far as October 2024.	20	22	12	20	74	100	74%
102004304	The application essay is well composed, capturing the essence of the SRG for the dissemination of applicants' research and original work.	24	28	14	30	96	100	96%
102025666	Disqualify because the proposal is below the word limit. 274 word count.	20	20	11	30	81	100	81%
102025666	Overall great, could of said a bit more on the significance to overall academic goals. Budget is really well done and supporting documents were perfect.	23	30	15	30	98	100	98%

101940734	Budget form is not filled appropriately; information is not provided under the right columns and links can't be verified.	25	30	15	25	95	100	95%
101940734		22	28	14	27	91	100	91%
	<p>Score for Background (22/25)</p> <p>(a) Academic/professional interests and stage in degree program (8/10): The applicant clearly states their focus on Tibetan cultural representation in education and the use of digital tools for heritage language learning. Their stage as a doctoral candidate in the dissertation phase is mentioned, but more details about their specific contributions to the field or prior achievements would strengthen this section.</p> <p>(b) Description of the activity (7/10): The proposal outlines attendance at the 2025 AERA Annual Meeting to present their research. While the event's importance is noted, there is limited detail about how the conference aligns with their overall academic trajectory beyond general benefits.</p> <p>(c) Context of the activity in the academic field (7/10): The applicant links their research to broader discussions on inclusive language education and equity. However, the proposal could provide more explicit examples of how their presentation fills a gap in the current academic discourse or advances the field.</p> <p>Score for Benefits (24/30)</p>							
101719954	(a) Benefits linked to professional interests (12/15):	22	24	12	26	84	100	84%

101943334	Research interest well articulated. The applicant did a good job in attaching the change of dates notice to his application. However, the link attached to the budget is not available for verification. So the proposed budget for the couldn't be verified.	20	25	15	10	70	100	70%
101943375	<p>Background Score (23/25)</p> <p>(a) Academic/professional interests and stage in degree program (10 points): The applicant effectively articulates their Ph.D. focus on GIS and environmental health and identifies their stage in the program (final year). This section is strong and deserves full points.</p> <p>(b) Activity description (7 points): The description of the AAG Annual Meeting activities is clear and relevant, but it could better elaborate on how specific conference sessions contribute to their dissertation progress.</p> <p>(c) Context in academic field (6): While the applicant connects their research to the broader GIS and health equity field, the explanation of how their work addresses specific gaps or unique contributions could be stronger.</p> <p>Score for Benefits (28/30)</p> <p>(a) Benefits to professional interests (14/15): The applicant convincingly links the conference to professional growth, detailing opportunities for research visibility, skill enhancement, and career development. The narrative could improve by stating</p>	23	28	13	26	90	100	90%

101922963	The academic interest and its significance were not clearly stated and explored. You only stated that you are doing a research on theoretical cosmetology but you did not made good connections to your interest. The composition and articulation are not really connecting and flowing. "What your research topic that you are presenting? They were not clearly stated. The budget link attached keeps changing and does not give a clear estimate of the budget. However, the attached flight document was good.	10	20	10	20	60	100	60%
101702399	The room reservation was made for two people but you indicated that in the budget that it was for three people. And the per diem meal is a little above the UNM policy. But in all, great application.	25	30	15	20	90	100	90%
101674320	The figures presented as supportive document does not correspond with figures on the budget template. There were also no links attached to verify these cost estimates. However, this is a great application.	25	30	15	20	90	100	90%
101889689	This applicant indicated that they have received SRG, PDG and GSF grant funding in this current year, and they still applied for the three grants. I recommend other applicant that have not received any GPSA grant funding for this cycle to be considered instead. They can still apply for the next cycle and be considered. According to SRG disqualification Criteria: Applicant has already received the maximum allowed funds for the SRG as noted in [Article IX. Section 1.D.8].	0	0	0	0	0	100	0%
101292799	Very good research focus, however, there were not supporting documents to support this application. The budget does not list all spending related to the research.	25	15	15	10	65	100	65%

	<p>Background Score (20/25)</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The applicant's academic interests and stage in their PhD program are clearly outlined. The activity is well-described, detailing what the applicant will do (hypoxia and bone health research), and the research location and timeline are provided.</p> <p>The context of the study within exercise science and bone health is adequately explained, but a stronger connection between the research and the applicant's long-term academic and professional goals would enhance clarity.</p> <p>Benefits Score (25/30)</p> <p>Reasons;</p> <p>The applicant clearly shows the potential benefits of the study, linking them to their professional interests in exercise physiology. And the benefits to the academic community are well stated, with a focus on understanding bone metabolism in hypoxic conditions and its relevance to broader fields like wilderness medicine and exercise science.</p> <p>However, more detailed discussion on how the findings might impact future research or clinical applications would strengthen the argument.</p>							
101948279		20	25	12	23	80	100	80%
101844902	This is a good application. Your interest and benefits are well articulated and supported with good materials.	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%

101911669	<p>This applicant did not use the GPSA provided budget template for their budget. They created their own template for the budget.</p> <p>According to the SRG Disqualification Criteria: States; Applications where the budget was not completed using the GPSA budget template provided to the applicants. Should be disqualified.</p>	0	0	0	0	0	100	0%
102022540	<p>This is a good application. You've articulated yourself well and supported it with the necessary documents.</p>	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101845138	<p>Background Score (23/25) Reasons: The applicant's academic and professional interests are clearly stated, emphasizing their dedication to statistical methodologies in clinical trials and precision medicine. The activity is described in detail, including their research focus on Bayesian hierarchical modeling for cervical dystonia treatments, and it is well contextualized within their academic field of biostatistics and clinical trial design. While the description is strong, providing more specific examples of past accomplishments related to the research would further enhance the clarity of their qualifications.</p> <p>Benefits score (28/30) Reasons: The applicant convincingly articulates how attending and presenting at the ASA and ENAR Spring Meeting will benefit their academic and professional growth, particularly by networking with industry leaders and refining their research. The potential contributions to the academic community and the practical applications of their work are well-</p>	23	28	14	24	89	100	89%
101845138	Your supporting documents are great. They really suppo	10	25	15	30	80	100	80%

	<p>Background Score (19/25)</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The applicant identifies their academic stage and the context of their research in Geography and Environmental Studies, focusing on the impact of wildfires on stream health and water quality. The activity description includes details about the conference, presentation date, and their research focus. While the research topic is important and well-aligned with the conference theme, the proposal lacks in-depth discussion of how the activity ties to the broader academic field or the applicant's long-term academic or professional goals.</p> <p>Benefits Score (23/30)</p> <p>Reasons: The applicant highlights the benefits of presenting their research, including receiving feedback, improving presentation skills, and networking with peers and experts. The discussion of how the conference will inform their thesis and potential career pathways is promising but lacks specific examples of how the conference aligns with their immediate</p>							
102025666		19	23	12	20	74	100	74%
102022328	This is a good application. However, the applicant failed	15	30	15	30	90	100	90%
101908062	Most of the technical terms are not defined.	25	27	10	30	92	100	92%
101911453		12	15	6	10	43	100	43%
101891219	They may benefit from stating what year they are in. Ac	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
102064379	Air ticket fee link has not included in the Budget.	25	27	12	20	84	100	84%
102018689	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, sup	25	30	15	20	90	100	90%
102002464		22	26	13	26	87	100	87%

101071022	<p>Background Score (19/25) Reason: The applicant provides a clear narrative of their academic journey and aspirations, emphasizing their eagerness to learn and their previous research experience. The activity description focuses on presenting at the 32nd AHRD International Research Conference, but the connection to their academic field and how the research contributes to the broader body of knowledge is underdeveloped. The proposal lacks detail about the specific methodologies or implications of their current research, which weakens the contextual relevance.</p> <p>Benefits Score (24/30) Reason: The applicant articulates the potential benefits of attending the conference, including exposure to the latest research, networking opportunities, and insights for their PhD dissertation. The emphasis on professional development and integrating feedback to improve their research is strong, but the benefits to the academic community are not sufficiently detailed. The discussion of personal financial constraints adds context but does not fully connect to how the grant would amplify the academic or professional impact of their participation.</p>	20	24	13	25	82	100	82%
101889689	Amount requested from GPSA is more than the max amount. Also the budget is inconsistent	24	28	13	20	85	100	85%

101949092	The importance of the applicant's research to the larger academic community is clear. Their budget is reasonable, but their supporting document is the same as their budget doc. However, their proposal was quite dense and had more detail than was necessary to explain student's area of interest.	25	30	12	28	95	100	95%
101902441	Solid application provided by applicant	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101845138	Good application which outlines the requisite details for the SRG.	23	28	13	26	90	100	90%
102023400	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is good, including the applicant research interest, current status, research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for research project data collection in Bolivia; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience; Budget is well-organized and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format, supplementary docs are well-organized and can support the budget	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
101878983	terms like microscopy control are not defined for general readers from other fields. no links to verify in the budget document are provided.	24	30	12	22	88	100	88%
101912161	Academic interests clearly stated, benefits of conference attendance stated and linked broadly to academic interests. Budget clear and consise. Supporting documents were verified and linked to	25	28	12	30	95	100	95%
101937859	Background and academic interests were not stated by applicant. Benefits linked to academic/ professional development were not stated. The links in the budget and supporting documents doesn't show payment of flight and hotel but rather show flight and hotel reservations.	13	15	14	15	57	100	57%

101830265	Disqualification. Applicant is requesting for funds for a conference that will occur during the last week of June which falls outside the grant cycle dates.	0	0	0	0	0	100	0%
101938580	There were grammatical errors in the composition and the composition didn't flow logically. The applicant didn't give enough details on the benefits linked to academic community. Academic interest and significance of the research lacked detail and clarity. Supporting documents show flight and hotel reservations and not payment of flight and hotel	22	26	12	20	80	100	80%
101984316	Links like meals per diem and transportation fares couldn't be verified. Supporting document showed payment of registration fee and lodging and flight	25	30	14	28	97	100	97%
101674320	Benefits linked to academic or professional development was not clear. Benefits of applicant's research was linked to the conference and not the applicant's academic or professional development. Supporting documents show flight and hotel reservations and not payment of flight and hotel.	24	27	14	15	80	100	80%
102022540	Benefits linked to academic or professional development lacks depth Composition does not flow logically at some point. Hotel reservation was not in English which made it difficult for me to interpret Supporting documents show flight and hotel reservations and not payment of flight and hotel	24	28	12	15	79	100	79%
101980906	Budget and supporting documents show flight, hotel reservations and amount for conference fee and not payment of these three items. The amount applicant is requesting for the SRG Grant (757) is higher than the actual amount given for SRG	25	30	15	20	90	100	90%

101944767	Disqualification. Applicant is requesting for funds for a conference that will occur on 9th-20th June, 2025 which falls outside the grant cycle dates.	0	0	0	0	0	100	0%
102057622	Academic interests clearly stated. Benefits are broadly linked to academic interest though maybe a little overstated. Overall proposal well-written. Budget is clear and supporting documents were verified.	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%
102064379	<p>Background Score (23/25) Reasons: The applicant clearly outlines their academic stage as a first-year PhD student and describes their research on occupational heat exposure and hydration status in construction workers. The activity and its relevance to their academic and professional goals are well-articulated, particularly highlighting the importance of field research and its real-world applicability. However, the proposal could further detail the specific scientific contributions of the project to the broader field of Exercise Science to enhance the context.</p> <p>Benefits score (27/30) Reasons: The applicant provides a strong case for the benefits of attending the ACSM annual meeting, emphasizing networking, professional development, and the opportunity to refine their presentation skills. They effectively link the conference's relevance to their future academic and career trajectory, including potential collaborations and advancing research in heat stress and health. Although, more specific examples of how conference interactions might directly inform their ongoing research would strengthen the benefits section.</p>	23	27	14	26	90	100	90%

102057237	Disqualification. Applicant is requesting for funds for a conference that will occur in June, 2025 which falls outside the grant cycle dates.	0	0	0	0	0	100	0%
101388710	The applicant should state his/her academic interests with more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced.	23	28	13	30	94	100	94%
101139514	Applicants composition was not quite clear. I couldn't connect the various themes of the applicants essay	24	29	14	30	97	100	97%
101911628	Budget does shows reservation and not payment of flight. Budget also shows a zero invoice which means applicants hotel has already been paid for by someone else. Links for meals and transportation could not be	25	30	15	20	90	100	90%
101938746	I couldn't connect the various themes for the application's SRG proposal. Supporting documents show flight and hotel reservations and not payment of flight and hotel	25	30	14	15	84	100	84%
101908062	Supporting documents and budget is not well researched. Supporting documents shows prices of items and not payment of items.	25	28	14	20	87	100	87%
102043845	Applicant provided a solid application	25	30	15	29	99	100	99%
102025046	Applicant had an excellent application	24	29	15	30	98	100	98%
102026958	Applicant provided a clear and concise application with sufficient supporting documentation	24	29	15	30	98	100	98%
101943829	Great submission. I had to deduct two points because applicant did not clearly state how attending the conference is going to benefit the UNM academic community	25	28	15	30	98	100	98%

102026958	Great application. Had to deduct 1 point because the applicant's supporting document for the hotel reservation for one person changed from \$1074 on the receipt to \$422 in the budget without explanation.	25	30	15	29	99	100	99%
102043845	Good application overall. I had to deduct 3 points because the applicant's composition was hard to read because of the flow. Also, the applicant did not describe the conference in detail, but did well in describing the benefits he/she is getting from attending.	23	30	14	30	97	100	97%
102058648	I deducted 3 points because the applicant did not submit any supporting documents.	25	30	15	27	97	100	97%
102023418	Perfect application overall. The applicant failed to submit the supporting document for the airfare therefore a deduction of 2 points.	25	30	15	28	98	100	98%
102056538	Great application. I deducted 2 points because the applicant did not clearly state the benefit to the UNM academic community. The applicant also did not state what the conference is about.	24	29	15	30	98	100	98%
101943829	Your research focus is an interesting one. And your courage to present is a commendable effort. Your application is well composed and organised. You have clearly articulated your academic interest and how this can support your professional development. Your budget and supporting documents are well presented. However, you did not indicate how you were going to cater for the rest of the budget.	25	30	15	27	97	100	97%
102023418	Indigenous narratives are very crucial in placed based identities. Your interest and focus on these research areas indicates your commitments towards the language pedagogy. Your application and supporting documents are solid.	25	30	15	27	97	100	97%

102025046	This is a very well organized application. Academic interest and benefits very well articulated. Your budget is clearly presented and overall application is well composed. Your supporting documents made a great impact	25	30	15	30	100	100	100%
102056538	Your research focus on drug addiction is a sensitive area and your passion to find a way to address it is a brave effort. Your application is well composed and your interest and benefits are clearly stated. your budget and supporting documents were on point.	24	30	15	28	97	100	97%

102026958	<p>Background Score (24/25) Reason: The applicant clearly outlines their academic focus in public finance and leadership, specifically how AI intersects with financial decision-making in the public sector. Their research is linked to their degree program in Public Administration with a concentration in public finance, and they are currently in their second year, which is an appropriate stage to present research at an academic conference. They explain how AI is being utilized in state government financial processes, aligning their research with current trends in the field.</p> <p>Benefits Score (29/30) Reasons: The applicant clearly states that attending and presenting at the conference will directly support their professional development, aligning with their career goals of working in financial policy and government budgeting. Engaging with experts in the field will contribute significantly to refining their research and advancing their career.</p> <p>The applicant's focus on learning from experts and refining their research is clear, and their involvement in cutting-edge studies at the conference will expand their knowledge base.</p>	24	29	15	29	97	100	97%
-----------	--	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----

102058648	<p>Background Score (24/25)</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates their academic focus on health-seeking behaviors, healthcare access, and health interventions in underserved populations. They are a Master of Health Administration (MHA) student, which gives context to their research and its relevance. This aligns with their professional interests. The proposed activity fits perfectly into the academic field of public health administration. The applicant's focus on healthcare policy and health-seeking behaviors is relevant and well-contextualized within the scope of the conference.</p>							
	<p>Benefits Score (29/30)</p> <p>Reasons: The proposal strongly links the activity to the applicant's professional interests in public health research and healthcare policy. Presenting their research at the ASPA Conference allows the applicant to deepen their engagement with the field while pursuing their long-term career goals.</p> <p>The applicant outlines how their participation benefits the academic community. By representing the university at the conference, they contribute to UNM's visibility in public health research and administration. Additionally, sharing insights with peers and faculty</p>	24	29	15	29	97	100	97%

102023418	<p>Background Score (24/25)</p> <p>Reasons: The applicant provides a clear overview of their academic focus on Brazilian literature, Latin American studies, and language pedagogy, and their stage in the dual master's degree program is well-stated. The activity (attending and presenting at the Latin American Studies Association Conference) is described in detail, including its theme and alignment with their academic interests.</p> <p>The proposal thoroughly contextualizes the conference in the applicant's field, but a slightly stronger connection to their long-term professional goals would enhance this section.</p> <p>Benefits Score (29/30)</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>The applicant effectively highlights the benefits of presenting their research on Afro-Brazilian cultural stereotypes, which aligns with the conference's theme and contributes to critical discussions in Latin American literature. The networking opportunities and the potential to gain insights into methodologies and trends are well-articulated.</p> <p>The benefits to the broader academic community and the university's reputation are mentioned, but they</p>	24	29	15	29	97	100	97%
-----------	---	----	----	----	----	----	-----	-----