

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 verified	Total Points
100796643	The academic interest and the significant of the activity were clearly stated and explain. The benefits were linked to professional development and the academic community benefits were minimal. The application were logically composed. The budget template was used and the application was supported by documents.	22	24	12	25	83
100796643	1. Amount Requested: 726\$ 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation) Yes 4. Word Count: 678 words 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: over word count	25	30	10	30	95
100796643		22	25	15	25	87

	The applicant clearly explains their research focus on Latin American literature and women's representation in Mexican literature and cinema. Presenting at the Chicago Graduate Conference supports their academic development and dissertation work. Benefits to teaching and research are mentioned, though they could be explained more clearly. Writing is understandable but has some grammar issues. Budget appears reasonable.					
101380406		21	22	10	25	78
101380406		25	30	15	30	100
	Amount Requested: 750 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 569 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant has an accepted podium presentation at a research conference and the proposal meets SRG requirements.					
101380406		25	30	15	30	100

101645728	1. Amount Requested: \$ 750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: __Yes_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification because applicant meet all the requirement and had supporting documents to back claim.	23	28	13	28	92
101645728	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Sort of 4. Word Count: 569 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because of the strong proposal and detailed budget document. However, there was no specific supporting doc re: paper acceptance.	25	30	15	30	100

101645728	1. Amount Requested: \$744.30 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: 598 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets all requirements except concrete proof of expenses.	25	30	15	15	85
101715668	Benefits: The applicant explains how this research will contribute to their dissertation, conference presentations, and future publications. The proposal also highlights the importance of regional art historical research and expanding scholarly attention to Southwest artistic networks. While the benefits are clear, some statements remain somewhat general. Budget: The applicant provides a complete budget template with supporting documentation for lodging and parking expenses. The costs appear reasonable and within SRG limits. However, the budget contains only one line item and could include more detail regarding overall travel costs. Total Score: 82 / 100	21	25	12	24	82

101715668	Budget: The applicant make use of GPSA budget template. The proposal identifies the key expenses clearly (airfare, hotel, research materials) and the plan to concentrate the work into one efficient week shows good cost awareness. The specific facilities and staff contacts identified suggest real planning and research into costs.	25	29	14	29	97
101715668	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved. Supporting document doesn't include receipts or proof of all costs mentioned in the budget table, e.g., the SECOLAS registration fee.	22	27	12	27	88
101730316	6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualified. Applicant fulfilled all the requirements.)	25	25	15	30	95

	Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The application describes participation in a conference scheduled for May 2026. Because the proposed activity falls outside the eligible funding period outlined in the SRG guidelines, I recommend the applicant for					
101730316	disqualification.	24	28	13	30	95
101730316	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100
	Word count: 515 The applicant clearly explains their research focus and the significance of hosting a panel at the International Congress on Medieval Studies. The proposal demonstrates strong relevance to the applicant's scholarly development and future publication goals, though the narrative could provide slightly more detail on the specific research contribution of the panel.					
101735811		21	26	11	25	83

	1. Amount Requested: \$ 2. Budget template complete? (No) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No) 4. Word Count: __0_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Disqualification. Application incomplete.					
101735811		0	0	0	0	0
101735811	I do not see any letter attached. Hence, the only decision that can be made is to reject.	0	0	0	0	0
101767190	Application is missing proposal and budget. Not much to review really. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?: Disqualify	2	0	0	0	2
101767190	The academic interest was stated and explained. The significance were also explain but not into details. The benefits to the academic community was linked explained. The technical terms were defined. The applicant used the budget template and also provided supporting documents. However, some of them were not supporting the budget directly.	21	22	12	25	80

101767190	Grants Scoring Comment Section – SRG 1. A Amount Requested: \$500 2. B Budget template complete? Yes 3. R Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Partial 4. W Word Count: 599 (500 min, 600 max) 5. A Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. R Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: no proof of acceptance	25	30	15	30	100
101803133	Amount Requested: 742 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 592 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant will present research at a conference and the proposal meets SRG requirements.	25	30	15	30	100

101803133	1. Amount Requested: \$742 2. Budget template complete? (Partial) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Not all) 4. Word Count: _Yes_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) Recommendation for Disqualification because applicant stated that he will be presenting without an email to support claim. Also budget present did not have links provided to help with verifications.	23	25	12	15	75
101803133	1. Amount Requested: \$742 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Sort of 4. Word Count: 592 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because their proposal meets required criteria and specifically mention how their research can benefit UNM. Specific proof of presentation acceptance is not attached.	25	30	15	30	100
101812750	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 574 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets all requirements	25	30	15	30	100

101812750	Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified. The proposal meets all SRG eligibility requirements including appropriate word count, use of the correct budget template, and inclusion of supporting documentation for requested research materials. The requested funds are for pharmaceutical-grade cannabidiol used in behavioral neuroscience experiments, which qualifies as research supplies supporting the development of original research under SRG guidelines.	23	27	13	26	89
-----------	---	----	----	----	----	----

	Background: The applicant clearly explains research interests in how CBD affects learning and memory, describes the study design in detail with specific methods (Morris Water Task, Elevated Plus Maze, LTP recordings), and shows exactly how this work connects to behavioral neuroscience. The project timeline from February 2025 through May 2026 shows careful planning. Benefits: The proposal does an excellent job explaining how the research advances understanding of CBD's dose-dependent effects and contributes to behavioral neuroscience, and it clearly describes benefits to the field by clarifying inconsistencies in the literature and informing future research and clinical applications. The mention of peer-reviewed publications and conference presentations shows strong dissemination plans. Composition: The proposal is well-organized and flows logically from research background to methods to					
101812750		24	29	13	30	96
	The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved.					
101841957		25	27	12	30	94

	1. Amount Requested: \$740 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No, proof of acceptance was not submitted) 4. Word Count: _548_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies.					
101841957	Applicants fulfilled all requirements.	25	30	15	30	100
101841957	Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant presented research at the APA–New Mexico Annual State Planning Conference held November 12–15, 2025 in Taos, New Mexico. Because this activity occurs outside the eligible funding period of June 1, 2024 through May 31, 2025, I recommend the applicant for disqualification under the program guidelines. Additionally, the mileage request of 402 miles appears to exceed the approximate round-trip distance of about 270 miles between Albuquerque and Taos, so I recommend the applicant for disqualification under the program guidelines.	24	26	13	15	78
101842780	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	25	95

101842780	Word count: 573 The proposal clearly explains the research project and its relevance to watershed planning and environmental justice in Indigenous communities. The applicant effectively demonstrates how presenting this work contributes to research dissemination and community-engaged planning practice, though eligibility should be confirmed due to prior NMRG funding.	23	28	11	27	89
101842780	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _597_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant shows how this conference is directly tied to their research and future developments in dissertation material.	25	25	15	30	95
101844902	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100

101844902	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _597 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify. Clear application. The abstract has already been accepted and budget is justified. Research has important benefits that could transfer to community and that could have been brought forth a little more though.	25	25	15	30	95
101844902	The applicant academic interest was clearly stated. The significant of the activity was also explained. However, there was minimal linked of the academic benefits to the community. The application was well composed. The applicant used the budget template and supported with documents. However, the document does not justify the budget entirely.	23	20	12	20	75

101852886	Grants Scoring Comment Section – SRG 1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? YES 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Partial 4. Word Count: 504 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: No acceptance to the conference included	25	30	15	25	95
101852886	The proposal clearly explains the applicant's research background and provides strong context for the study. It is well organized, logically written, and clearly connects the project to the applicant's professional development and academic contributions. The budget is reasonable, well justified, and supported with proper documentation.	25	30	14	30	99
101852886	The applicant clearly explains their research on chimpanzee behavior and hormone physiology related to dominance and competition. The project is well connected to dissertation development and field research. Benefits to professional development and broader scientific understanding are clear. Writing is organized and detailed. Budget appears appropriate and supported by documentation.	23	25	13	27	88
101876677		25	30	15	30	100

101876677	Amount Requested: 750 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 589 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Proposal describes an accepted conference presentation and the application satisfies SRG eligibility criteria.	25	30	15	30	100
101876677	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: __Yes_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification because applicant meets all the requirement and also provided supporting documents.	24	27	12	28	91

101876924	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 589 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because their proposal hits all the required info, their budget is complete, and they do have proof that their paper was accepted.	25	30	15	30	100
101876924	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes, except flight tickets 4. Word Count: 500 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets requirements except supporting documentation where it is partially met. Flight tickets are snippets of prices and not proof of purchase.	25	25	15	25	90

101876924	Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified. The proposal meets all SRG eligibility requirements including appropriate word count, use of the correct budget template, and inclusion of supporting documentation verifying travel and lodging costs. The requested funds support research-related travel and data collection for a doctoral dissertation, which qualifies as research development under SRG guidelines.	22	26	13	25	86
101889689	Amount Requested: \$750 Background: The applicant clearly explains their academic background, dissertation focus, and research activities while effectively situating the project within existing Amazonian archaeology scholarship. Budget: Very detailed budget with references and supporting documents and in accordance with GPSA budget template.	25	30	13	30	98

	Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant proposes presenting dissertation research at the Rhetoric Society of America Conference scheduled for May 21–24, 2026 in Portland, Oregon. Because the proposed activity occurs outside the eligible funding period of June 1, 2024 through May 31, 2025, I recommend the applicant for disqualification under the SRG program guidelines.					
101889689		23	27	14	30	94
101889689	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100
	Word count:514 The proposal clearly presents a well-developed dissertation research project and demonstrates strong alignment between the conference presentation and the applicant's scholarly development. Participation in the RSA conference will meaningfully support research dissemination, professional networking, and future publication opportunities.					
101898440		23	28	13	26	90

	1. Amount Requested: \$745 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _594_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes/No) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Application is excessively jargony and difficult to follow, but they make connections between their work and the conference they plan to resent at.					
101898440		20	25	7	30	82
101898440	This is a well-written application. The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100

101908557	1. Amount Requested: \$745 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Partial- Proof of acceptance or commitment to attend not included. Budget support included 4. Word Count: _594 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?: Qualify. Application meets required standards. However, the applicant has not indicated if they have made any commitment towards the trip by either showing that they submitted an abstract or if it has been accepted or bought a flight or hotel. This is why background has 15 points less.	10	30	14	30	84
101908557	The applicant interest was not clearly defined. The benefits were linked but not clearly to the academic community. The benefits to professional development was stated. The application was logically composed. The applicant used the budget template and supported with documents. However, some of the documents does not support the budget.	18	20	14	23	75

101908557	1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? partial 4. Word Count: 578 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: no proof of acceptance submitted	25	30	15	15	85
101911459	The applicant is presenting original research at a conference outside Albuquerque, and the requested expenses fall within the eligible SRG funding categories for research dissemination. However, the applicant is not anonymous in the supporting docs. Therefore, i reject this applicant for the SRG.	18	15	14	20	67
101911459	The document has clearly stated his name. So I recommend disqualifying him for SRG	10	10	15	20	55

101911459	Amount Requested: 750 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 575 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant will present a poster based on original thesis research at a national conference, contributing to dissemination of research findings and professional development within their academic field.	25	30	15	30	100
101912227	1. Amount Requested: \$ 749.36 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: _yes_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification because applicant provide all required documents.	23	27	12	28	90

101912227	1. Amount Requested: \$749.36 2. Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 575 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because of the well-written proposal, clear benefits to the field, and strong supporting documents.	25	30	15	30	100
101912227	6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets requirements except concrete proof of fund use like a purchase.	25	30	15	15	85

	\$750 (within SRG \$750 limit) Budget Template Complete? Yes — the template includes item descriptions, cost verification links, requested amount, and other funding columns. Supporting Documentation Provided? Yes — a hotel booking screenshot for lodging in Gallup, NM is included to verify accommodation costs for field visits to the Church Rock area. Word Count: ~535 words (within 500–600 requirement) Travel Outside Albuquerque? Yes — the proposal requests funding for travel between Albuquerque and Church Rock, New Mexico to conduct fieldwork and oral history collection. Disqualification Issues: None Anonymity maintained? Yes (The proposal does not reveal the applicant’s name or identifying personal details.) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?					
101912228	Qualified.	22	25	13	25	85

101912228	Benefits: The proposal demonstrates strong benefits by supporting dissertation fieldwork while also contributing to community-based research, preservation of institutional knowledge, and advocacy for uranium-impacted communities. Composition: The proposal is well organized and clearly written, though some sections are slightly repetitive and could be more concise for clarity. Budget: Detailed and follows, GPSA budget template.	24	29	13	30	96
101912228	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved. The budget table is not accurately completed, e.g., the Airbnb cost is \$478, while in the table, it is mentioned as \$274.	22	27	12	27	88
101917422		23	27	12	29	91

	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _598_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)					
101917422		25	25	15	30	95
101917422	Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant proposes presenting research at the American College of Sports Medicine Annual Meeting scheduled for May 26–30, 2026 in Salt Lake City, Utah. Because the proposed activity occurs outside the eligible funding period of June 1, 2024 through May 31, 2025, I recommend the applicant for disqualification under the SRG program guidelines.	23	28	14	30	95
101921187	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100

101921187	Word count:599 The applicant clearly presents a well-defined research project on muscle recovery in elite athletes and demonstrates strong alignment between the conference presentation and their academic and professional goals. Presenting at the ACSM Annual Meeting will meaningfully support research dissemination, professional networking, and the applicant's development as a sports science researcher.	22	27	12	24	85
101921187	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _528_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant demonstrates how attending their proposed conference is directly in-line with their professional goals and research interests.	25	30	15	30	100

101940734	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100
101940734	1. Amount Requested: \$750/ \$1,113.05 in budget template 2. Budget template complete? (Partial) - GPSA budget items exceed \$750 in the sheet 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Partly: No proof of acceptance to present research nor commitment to attend using payment of attendance fee, flight or hotel cost. Budget support documents included. 4. Word Count: __523__ 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify -Due to no evidence of commitment to attend the event e.g. accepted abstract, payment of registration, flight or hotel cost background, which is otherwise great, has 15 points deducted.	10	30	15	28	83
101940734	The applicant interest and the significant of the activity was clearly stated. The benefit to professional development was stated and also linked to academic community. The application was logically composed. The applicant used the budget template and also supported with documents.	22	25	13	26	86

101944542	1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? yes 4. Word Count: 586 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Qualification: no barriers	25	30	15	30	100
101944542	1. Amount Requested: \$740.39 2. Budget template complete? Partial 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: __553_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification because applicant was completed even though the budget template was partial completed. Applicant meet all minimum requirements.	23	27	13	20	83
101944542	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. The applicant's work benefits linked to the academic and professional development, and the academic community should be further explained. The composition should be improved.	19	24	12	30	85

101945845		22	25	13	29	89
	1. Amount Requested: \$552.23 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _516_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (No) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application does not qualify because the applicant did not redact her name)					
101945845		25	30	15	30	100

	Amount Requested: \$750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (537) Required supporting docs included? 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 Budget template complete? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant proposes attending a series of Japanese woodblock printmaking					
101945845		24	28	13	30	95
101953688	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100
101953688	Word count:537 The applicant explains the relevance of attending the Japanese woodblock printmaking workshops to their artistic practice and professional development. The proposal demonstrates clear enthusiasm for preserving and learning this specialized technique, though the research outcomes and broader academic impact could be described in greater detail.	18	23	10	22	73

101953688	6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Disqualification. Applicant doesn't demonstrate a strong need to attend conference nor makes connections of how it will directly benefit their research or academic development. Applicant didn't use GPSA budget template, but created their own. Applicant did include proper documentation. Applicant also discusses the benefits of attending their proposed conference, but they don't note whether or not they plan to present at the conference. Applicant says that their academic interests are "centered on developing strong research skills".	10	20	15	20	65
101956362	The applicant seems to attend a conference and listen to scholarly presenters, but does not present themselves. So, I do not recommend the SRG fund at this time. However, the need for GSF and PDG seems genuine, as the applicant shows they have a substantial amount of tuition remaining in their bursar account and want to attend a job fair and interview with potential employers. The research and professional benefits are clearly stated. Hence, I recommend that the GSF and PDG funds be granted.	25	28	14	29	96

101956362	1. Amount Requested: \$ 750 2. Budget template complete? Partial - Used a word table instead which was still clear though 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: _540 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Disqualify - the application was for the wrong category. They're going to participate and not present at the conference and did not really meet the budget requirements. Background is good, but 15 points deducted from not having proof of acceptance for presentation or commitment towards attendance by purchase of flight, hotel or registration	10	30	15	10	65
101956362	The academic interest and the significant of the activity was also stated. The benefit were linked to applicant professional development, however, there was minimal mentioned of the benefit link to the academic community. The application was fairly composed. The applicant did not use the budget template well. There were also not enough supporting documents to support the application	23	20	10	10	63

	1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? partial 4. Word Count: 502 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: no proof of acceptance					
101960404		25	30	10	15	80
101960404		25	30	15	30	100
	The applicant clearly describes their MD/PhD research on pediatric appendicitis and microbiome analysis. Presenting at an international pediatric surgery conference strongly supports professional development and research dissemination. The proposal connects the project to clinical impact and global health relevance. Writing is clear and well organized. Budget request appears appropriate.					
101960404		24	27	14	27	92
101969728		25	30	15	30	100

101969728	Amount Requested: \$750 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 586 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant plans to present master’s research at a professional fisheries conference, contributing to dissemination of conservation genetics research and engagement with the scientific community.	25	30	15	30	100
101969728	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Partial) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No) 4. Word Count: _588_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Disqualification because the applicant had no proof to show for him presenting at the conference.	23	27	13	20	83

101978604	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Sort of 4. Word Count: 586 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I am not sure if this application qualifies because it seems like the presentation portion is more informal. The proposal format is also inconsistent and a little distracting (-5).	25	30	10	30	95
101978604	6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets requirements except concrete proof of funds usage such as proof of purchase	25	30	15	15	85

101978604	Benefits: The proposal explains how funding would support the completion of studio-based research and capstone work. While the connection between artistic production and research is described, the proposal could better articulate broader scholarly outcomes and contributions to the academic community. . Budget: The budget provides a detailed list of art materials with vendor links verifying prices. The requested amount is within the SRG funding limit and aligns with the applicant's studio-based research. However, the proposal could more clearly explain how specific materials directly support the research methodology.	18	22	10	22	72
-----------	--	----	----	----	----	----

101983054	Amount Requested: \$600 Background: The applicant explains their academic program and research focus, but the background could more clearly articulate the specific research activity. Benefits: The proposal explains how the funding would support the completion of the capstone research project and exhibition, though the broader scholarly or community impact is less clearly developed. Composition: The proposal communicates the main ideas. Budget: Compliance with GPSA budget template and provided a detail break-down of the associated costs.	23	27	14	30	94
101983054	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved. Supporting document doesn't include receipts or proof of all costs mentioned in the budget table, e.g.,	22	27	12	30	91
101983054	Benefits for one's research and community are too general, need to be more specific	20	24	11	28	83

	1. Amount Requested: \$509.25 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No proof of acceptance to present research was submitted) 4. Word Count: _556_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)					
101984316		25	25	15	30	95
101984316	Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant proposes presenting research at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting scheduled for April 7–12, 2026 in Los Angeles, California. Because the proposed activity occurs outside the eligible funding period of June 1, 2024 through May 31, 2025, I recommend the applicant for disqualification under the SRG program guidelines.	24	29	15	30	98
101984316	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100

101984326	Word count:512 The applicant clearly outlines a well-defined research presentation and demonstrates strong alignment between the project and their scholarly focus on equity-driven teacher education research. Presenting at the AERA Annual Meeting will support research dissemination, professional networking, and the applicant's development as an emerging scholar in the field.	22	27	12	26	87
101984326	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _530_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant expertly explains their research, their connection to the conference, and benefits to themselves and the academic community.	25	30	15	30	100
101984326	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100

102007480	1. Amount Requested: \$ 750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: __529 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify . Clear application meeting the requirements. It would have been nice to see how the presentation fit into the applicant's professional goal beyond their research interests though	25	25	15	30	95
102007480	Applicant academic interest and the benefit of the activity was stated. The applicant clearly stated the benefits linked to professional development. However, there was minimal mentioned or link to the academic community. The application is logically composed. The applicant used the budget template and also provided supporting documents.	21	24	13	26	84
102007480	1. Amount Requested: 735\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? yes 4. Word Count: 550 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Qualification: no barriers	25	30	15	30	100
102012389		22	25	14	25	86

	The applicant presents research on ancient Maya women's textile production at Copán and has an accepted poster at the Society for American Archaeology meeting. The project contributes to archaeological knowledge and cultural heritage research. Benefits to academic development and representation are clear. Writing is understandable but could be more concise. Budget appears reasonable.					
102012389		23	25	12	26	86
102012389		25	30	15	30	100
	Amount Requested: 750 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 598 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant will present research at a major political science conference and also co-author another presentation, supporting dissemination of original research and professional engagement in the field.					
102017333		25	30	15	30	100

102017333	1. AAmount Requested: \$750 2. BBudget template complete? (Yes) 3. RRequired supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. WWord Count: ____ (500 min, 600 max) 5. AAnonymity maintained? No 6. RRecommendation for Disqualification because applicant had not met the requirement of anonymity throughout. His document to show for proof of presentation had the name on it.	23	28	14	27	92
102017333	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 598 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? No 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Unfortunately, I must recommend this application for disqualification because the applicant's name is on their supporting document.	25	30	15	30	100
102021743	1. AAmount Requested: \$600 2. BBudget template complete? Yes 3. RRequired supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. WWord Count: 590 (500 min, 600 max) 5. AAnonymity maintained? Yes 6. RRecommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets requirements	25	30	15	30	100

102021743	Benefits: The applicant explains how presenting at a national conference contributes to professional development and interdisciplinary engagement. The proposal demonstrates the value of sharing research within the field, although the academic outcomes could be described in greater detail. Composition: The proposal is generally well organized and readable. Minor grammatical errors and some dense phrasing are present but do not significantly limit understanding. Budget: The budget provides clear documentation for conference registration, membership, and transportation expenses. Costs are reasonable and supported by receipts. However, the proposal could more clearly explain the full scope of travel expenses associated with the conference.	20	24	11	25	80
-----------	--	----	----	----	----	----

102021743	Amount Requested: \$248 Background: The applicant clearly explains the conference presentation and research topic while linking it to their academic interests, though the broader disciplinary significance could be more explicitly articulated. Benefits: The proposal effectively describes professional development benefits such as presenting at the Society for Social Work and Research conference and networking with scholars, but it provides limited detail on the broader impact of the work on the field. Composition: The proposal is generally well organized and coherent, but dense terminology and minor proofreading issues reduce clarity for a general academic audience. Budget: Compliance with GPSA template. Detailed with supporting documents.	23	29	14	30	96
102022328	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. The applicant's work benefits to the professional development and academic community should be further explained. The composition should be improved. The budget table is not accurately completed, e.g., the hotel cost for 3 nights is about \$352, while the applicant requested \$750 from GPSA, and in the table, the total hotel fee is \$1100.	19	27	12	25	83

102022328	1. Amount Requested: \$750					
	2. Budget template complete? (Yes)					
	3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes)					
	4. Word Count: 525___ (500 min, 600 max)					
	5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)					
	6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)	25	30	15	30	100

	Amount Requested: \$690 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (595) Required supporting docs included? 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 Budget template complete? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant presents a community-based research project that evaluates the					
102022328		17	27	13	30	87
102023192	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100
102023192	Word count: 580 The proposal presents a clearly defined community-based research project examining the effects of self-defense training on immigrant women's well-being. The applicant effectively connects the research to broader questions of community resilience and participatory action research, though additional clarity on the methodological outcomes and dissemination of findings would strengthen the proposal.	21	26	12	25	84

	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _599_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant explains their research field well, and demonstrates the professional and academic need to attend their proposed conference.					
102023192		25	30	15	30	100
102023400	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100

102023400	1. Amount Requested: \$ 750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Partial - no proof accepted abstract but support for budget presented 4. Word Count: _599 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes/No) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify. Application is clear and is for the right category of grants. However, there is no support for the claim that an abstract has been accepted nor commitment to attend via payment of registration fees, hotel of flight. Because of that, the background has 10 points less	15	30	15	30	90
102023400	The applicant stated the academic interest and significant of the activity was explained. Benefits were linked to professional development and was also linked to the academic community. The research was interesting and logically composed. The applicant used the budget template and also supported with documents.	23	26	13	26	88
102023476	Strong interdisciplinary proposal from a first-year Geography PhD student, building on proven creek project success with compelling Pecos River fieldwork for creative, place-based research. I recommend SRG for student's unique research travel.	23	27	14	25	89

	The proposal presents a creative research project exploring the Pecos River through field observation and interdisciplinary methods. The topic is interesting and connected to environmental geography and community engagement. However, the research methods and academic outcomes could be explained more clearly. Writing is strong and reflective.					
102023476	Budget appears reasonable.	21	22	13	25	81
102023476		25	30	15	30	100
	Amount Requested: 310					
	Budget template complete? Yes					
	Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes					
	Word Count: 515 (500 min, 600 max)					
	Anonymity maintained? No					
	Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?					
	Disqualification recommended – Applicant includes their name, which violates anonymity requirements.					
102023661		25	30	15	30	100

102023661	1. Amount Requested: \$310 2. Budget template complete? (Partial) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes/No) 4. Word Count: __515_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (No) 6. Recommendation for Disqualification because applicant directly mention his name is the proposal and also did not provide supporting document to proof he will be presenting.	22	27	13	15	77
102023661	1. Amount Requested: \$310 2. Budget template complete? One link does not work 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: 515 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? No 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for disqualification due to lack of anonymity (student's name is on their supporting doc and in their proposal). No proof of acceptance was included, either.	25	25	15	25	90

102024766	1. Amount Requested: \$675 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: 537 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets requirements except concrete proof of fund usage.	25	30	15	15	85
102024766	Benefits: The proposal highlights the potential impact of the research across multiple scientific disciplines by improving the reliability and usability of DLS analysis. While the broader scientific significance is well described, the proposal could more clearly connect the project to specific academic outcomes such as dissertation development or publications. Budget: The budget provides a clear breakdown of the nanoparticle standards required for experimental validation and includes vendor verification for pricing. The materials are directly related to the research objectives. However, additional explanation of the experimental role of each particle size could strengthen the justification. Total Score: 87 / 100	22	26	12	27	87

	Amount Requested: \$675 Background: The applicant clearly explains their research focus on improving computational analysis of Dynamic Light Scattering and justifies the need for nanoparticle standards to validate their method with experimental data. Benefits: The proposal effectively outlines the broader scientific impact by highlighting how improved PSD analysis could benefit researchers across multiple disciplines that rely on Dynamic Light Scattering for particle characterization. Composition: The proposal is well organized and generally clear for a broad audience, though some technical sections describing optimization methods and computational limitations could be simplified for non-specialist reviewers. Budget: Clearly and detailed. Compliance with GPSA budget template.					
102024766		24	29	14	30	97
	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic community and professional development should be further explained. The composition should be improved. The supporting document doesn't include receipts or proof of all costs mentioned in the budget table.					
102025523		22	24	12	25	83
102025523		22	24	13	30	89

102025523	1. Amount Requested: \$400 2. Budget template complete? (Partial) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No. It was not a conference.) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)	25	30	15	25	95
102025680	Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Somewhat Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant proposes a well-defined research project investigating the effects of environmental microplastics on the gastrointestinal epithelium and clearly explains the academic and professional benefits of the work. However, supporting documentation to verify the requested budget items was not included and the budget template was not filled out completely, so I recommend review of the request to ensure the expenses can be properly verified.	25	28	12	20	85
102025680	Not recommended for SRG. Funding source request not well articulated in the budget.	20	28	14	26	88

102025680	Word count: 593 The proposal presents a well-defined biomedical research project examining the effects of microplastics on intestinal epithelial barrier function using human organoid models. The applicant clearly articulates the scientific significance and potential broader impacts of the research. The request for funding to support specific experimental materials is appropriate, though additional detail connecting the requested supplies to the proposed experimental timeline would further strengthen the proposal.	23	26	13	27	89
102026423	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _595_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant explains their research and the research they plan to present well. Applicant also demonstrates professional development benefits.	20	30	15	30	95

102026423	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100
102026423	1. Amount Requested: \$749.88 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: __595 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - Clear application with all requirements met and supporting documents provided. Benefits to the community beyond the applicant could have been made clearer though	23	22	15	30	90
102026635	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Partial 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 582 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because of the strong proposal and the supporting document does show the airfare costs that the student is SRG funds to cover.	25	30	15	30	100

102026635	The applicant academic interest and the significant of the activity was stated. The benefits were also clearly stated. However, the activity time 1st to July 30th, 2026, does not fall withing the grant period. According to the grant code, a year refers to the period between June 1 and May 31. Therefore, per your the activity date, it falls withing the next grant cycle. The application fairly composed. The applicant used the budget template and supporting documents.	15	10	10	19	54
102026635	1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? yes 4. Word Count: 586 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) 7. Qualification: no barriers	25	30	15	30	100
102028355		25	30	15	30	100

102028355	Amount Requested: 750 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes Word Count: 592 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? No Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant has an accepted paper presentation at an international philosophy conference, contributing to scholarly discussion and dissemination of original research in their field.	25	30	15	30	100
102028355	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: __Yes_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification because applicant has proven that the funds requested for is justified and has meet the requirements.	24	28	13	27	92

102032871	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Links not very specific 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 592 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? no 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for disqualification because anonymity was not maintained. Their proposal is also very dense and the benefits are only loosely touched upon.	25	25	10	25	85
102032871	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 564 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets requirements	25	30	15	30	100

102032871	\$750 (within SRG \$750 limit) Budget Template Complete? Yes — the template includes line items for airfare, lodging, and registration along with verification links. Supporting Documentation Provided? Yes — supporting documents include proof of flight purchase, lodging reservation, and conference registration. For example, the flight itinerary and receipt confirm airfare totaling \$700.78, and lodging and registration receipts are also included. Word Count: ~560 words (within 500–600 requirement) Travel Outside Albuquerque? Yes — Cleveland, Ohio Disqualification Issues: None Anonymity maintained? Yes — the proposal text does not reveal the applicant’s name or identifying personal details. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification Qualified. The proposal meets all administrative requirements for the Student Research	22	26	13	26	87
-----------	---	----	----	----	----	----

102043845	Amount Requested: \$750 Background: The applicant clearly explains their research focus on language politics and AI in writing education and provides a well-defined description of the planned research presentation at the Conference on College Composition and Communication Research Network Forum. Benefits: The proposal effectively highlights professional development, networking, and broader academic benefits by connecting the research to ongoing discussions about AI, linguistic diversity, and writing pedagogy. Composition: The proposal is well structured, accessible, and clearly written for a general academic audience, with only minor areas where repetition slightly reduces conciseness. Budget: Compliance with GPSA template and detail and specific breakdown with supporting document- air ticket.	23	30	14	30	97
102043845	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic community and professional development should be further explained. The composition should be improved. Supporting documents are not uploaded.	22	24	12	20	78

102043845	1. Amount Requested: \$460 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No, the activity is not a conference, so there is no need for proof of acceptant.) 4. Word Count: 514__ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)	25	30	15	30	100
-----------	--	----	----	----	----	-----

	Amount Requested: \$750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (570) Required supporting docs included? 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 Budget template complete? Missing some lines Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Unsure; missing lines Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)					
102052343		23	29	14	20	86
102052343	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100
102052343	Word count: 578 The proposal presents a clear research topic focused on heritage Spanish, identity formation, and community engagement in the New Mexican classroom. The applicant effectively connects the conference presentation to both scholarly development and teaching practice. Additional clarification on the specific research methods or data informing the presentation would further strengthen the proposal.	23	26	12	16	77

102053622	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _591_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant's proposal is difficult to understand since it is technical-term dense, but the applicant shows how this is important to their Master's thesis and has wider connections to their field.	25	25	5	30	85
102053622	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. However, how the fund will be spent is not clearly discussed. It is clear that the budget will be spent on the applicant's research-related activity, but the location of the research is not specified, as they mentioned two locations. We can only fund research projects outside of Albuquerque. If it is taking place at UNM, we unfortunately cannot fund it. Hence, I recommend that the fund not be granted this time.	25	30	15	25	95

102053622	1. Amount Requested: \$ 750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _591 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - Application meets requirements for creation of research. However, I found it too technical for the intelligent but uninitiated reader. Could also have used a balance of the research proposal and the applicant's interest and goals and how it'd benefit their goals.	20	20	10	30	80
102056778	The applicant is not anonymous and applicant doesn't look like a serious candidate. didn't even follow the requirement properly as the PHD student.	15	20	10	15	60
102056778	The applicant proposes presenting a paper at an international conference related to modernist and oceanic literary studies. The activity supports dissertation development and scholarly networking. The proposal connects the conference to the applicant's research focus, though some sections could be clearer. Writing is generally good. Budget request appears reasonable and appropriate.	22	24	12	26	84
102056778	Has name stated on the document.	10	20	10	20	60

102057431	Amount Requested: 750 Budget template complete? No Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No Word Count: 599 (500 min, 600 max) Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Disqualification recommended – Budget template not completed using the required SRG template, and supporting documentation is incomplete (only an Excel file with estimated costs; no proof of acceptance to present research).	25	30	15	30	100
102057431	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: _Yes_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Disqualification because applicant did not have any supporting documents attached and also the right budget is missing with no prove of email confirming proposal acceptance for conference.	23	24	13	0	60

102057431	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: 598 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for disqualification because the budget does not match the regular template and is missing links. There is no proof of acceptance attached, either, and the supporting document is just a PDF of their proposal.	25	30	15	15	85
102057622	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic community and professional development should be further explained. The composition should be improved.	22	24	12	30	88
102057622	Flows are easy to follow and they seem logical	20	24	14	29	87

	1. Amount Requested: \$740 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No, no proof of acceptance was submitted.) 4. Word Count: _519_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies.					
102057622	The applicants fulfilled all requirements.)	25	25	15	30	95

	Amount Requested: \$750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (520) Required supporting docs included? 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 Budget template complete? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant proposes presenting					
102057633	research at the Rocky Mountain Council	23	27	13	30	93
102057633	Recommended for SRG.	25	30	15	30	100

102057633	Word count:519 The proposal clearly describes the applicant's research focus on nationalism and state-building in Latin America and explains the relevance of presenting this work at the Rocky Mountain Council for Latin American Studies conference. Participation in the conference will provide valuable opportunities for scholarly engagement and professional development. The proposal would benefit from a clearer explanation of the specific research methods and how the conference presentation contributes to the broader research project.	21	24	12	25	82
102058499	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (Yes) 4. Word Count: _517_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant shows the necessity of attending their proposed conference to present on their current research and to make connections to other professionals in their field.	25	30	10	30	95

102058499	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their research and professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	25	30	15	30	100
102058499	1. Amount Requested: \$ 750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (partial- Budget support included, proof of acceptance of abstract not included) 4. Word Count: _516 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - Clear application. Though background is mostly clear, 15 points have been deducted as the application has not provided any support that their abstract was accepted as a poster presentation for the conference and have not committed to attending by showing evidence of either paying registration fee, flight or hotel	10	30	14	30	84
102060052	The applicant stated the academic interest and the significant of the activity. The benefits were linked to professional development and the academic community. There was minimal evidence on acceptance to carry this guide of activity. It is an interesting research and clearly composed. The applicant used the budget template and supporting documents but was few.	20	23	12	20	75

102060052	1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? yes 4. Word Count: 566 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Qualification: no barriers	25	30	15	30	100
102060052	The proposal describes presenting and evaluating a blockchain platform at the Solana Accelerate event. The project connects decentralized systems with engineering innovation and user interaction research. However, the research methods and academic outcomes could be explained more clearly. Writing is understandable. Budget request appears reasonable and documented.	25	30	15	30	100
102061329		25	30	15	30	100
102061329	The applicant clearly explains their research on AI governance and policy in U.S. hospitals. Presenting at the ASPA conference strongly supports professional development and research dissemination. The proposal connects well to health policy, cybersecurity, and project management. Writing is clear and organized. Budget appears reasonable and supported by documentation.	25	30	15	30	100

102061329	The applicant explains their research interests in strategic and health communication and their accepted presentation at the WSCA conference. Presenting research and networking with scholars supports academic and professional development. The proposal connects the activity to future research and collaboration. Writing is understandable but could be clearer. Budget appears reasonable.	25	30	15	30	100
102090292	The applicant presents a research interest in humanoid robotics and reinforcement learning. Attending the AUTOMATE conference would provide valuable feedback, networking, and exposure to current developments in robotics. The proposal connects the conference to research development, though details about presenting work or specific research outcomes could be clearer. Budget appears reasonable.	25	30	15	30	100
102090292	I recommend this applicant for scholarship	25	25	13	30	93
102090292	The candidate deserves SRG. Supporting Documentation are solid.	25	30	15	30	100
102091532	great fit for SRG since it covers presenting at an out-of-town conference and networking with industry pros. I'd recommend funding the full \$750; it clearly supports dissemination, builds their career, and puts UNM on the map in transportation geomatics	25	30	15	30	100
102091532	Clearly seems like a motivated candidate to level up his robotics field. I strongly suggest the candidate for SRG scholarships.	25	30	15	30	100
102091532		25	30	15	30	100

102091624	Grants Scoring Comment Section – SRG 1. Amount Requested: 740\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? yes 4. Word Count: 580 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: For a previously completed activity (fall semester), inappropriate use of funds	15	15	5	15	50
102091624	1. Amount Requested: 750\$ 2. Budget template complete? yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? partial 4. Word Count: 576 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: no proof of acceptance	25	30	15	15	85

	Background: The applicant clearly explains research interests in migration literature and describes the conference in detail with specific dates, location, and sessions attended. However, the proposal focuses heavily on professional development and networking rather than on developing or disseminating the applicant's own research—SRG is meant to fund actual research work and presenting findings, and most activities described here are about building connections and exam preparation. Benefits: The proposal explains how the conference strengthened exam preparation and professional goals, and mentions sharing insights with fellow students in the department. The connection to benefiting the academic community is somewhat limited, as most of the benefits described are personal professional development rather than advancing or disseminating the applicant's research contributions.					
102091624	Composition: The proposal is well-written	20	20	15	30	85

102092885	Restrict Amount Requested to \$750 Background: The applicant clearly describes their research interests, conference activity, and relevance to accounting scholarship, though the proposal could more explicitly highlight the applicant's stage in their graduate program. Benefits: The proposal explains meaningful professional and academic benefits, including research dissemination, scholarly feedback, and contribution to ESG and sustainability accounting discussions. Composition: The proposal is well structured and professional, though it is somewhat dense and could be more concise for a general interdisciplinary review audience.	24	30	13	30	97
-----------	---	----	----	----	----	----

102092885	Amount Requested: \$750 Background: The applicant clearly describes their research focus, training stage, and the purpose of presenting at the Collaborative Perspectives on Addiction Conference, though the specific research methods and findings could be explained more concisely. Benefits: The proposal strongly articulates professional, institutional, and societal benefits. Composition: The proposal is well organized, clearly written for a broad academic audience, and effectively connects the applicant's research, training goals, and the value of conference participation. Budget: Compliance with GPSA budget template and also provided a break-down.	24	30	15	28	97
102092885	The applicant's work benefits to the academic community should be further explained. The composition should be improved. The budget table is not accurately completed. The values in the table differ from those in the supporting document.	25	27	12	27	91
102092909	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved.	22	27	12	30	91
102092909	Benefits for their research are too broad. Need to be more specifically related	18	22	10	30	80
102092909		24	29	13	29	95

102093273	e. The oral presentation at the AASHTO GIS-T Symposium strengthens the application considerably	25	25	13	29	92
102093273	the research activity is described more as an opportunity to seek feedback and direction than as a clearly defined dissemination of completed research.	17	20	10	22	69
102093273	The benefits are framed as more for startup momentum and entrepreneurial ecosystem but not quite close-tight to academic program	16	20	11	29	76
102094104	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No, no proof of acceptance was submitted) 4. Word Count: _580_ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)	25	30	15	30	100

102094104	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? (Partial) 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? (No, no proof of acceptance was submitted) 4. Word Count: 540___ (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)	25	30	15	27	97
102094104	The applicant clearly explains their research in numerical analysis, PDEs, and computational methods. Presenting a published paper at the Finite Element Circus conference strongly supports research development and professional growth. Benefits to networking and future collaboration are well described. Writing is clear and organized. Budget appears reasonable and supported by documentation.	25	30	15	30	100
102095033	Here is a **short, professional rejection-style note**: The proposal is clearly written and explains the importance of attending the conference. However, the requested funds are mainly for conference travel rather than directly supporting the conduct of research itself, which makes it less competitive compared to proposals requesting support for research activities.	25	30	15	30	100
102095033		25	25	15	30	95

102095033	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? No 4. Word Count: 578 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets all requirements except concrete proof of expenses.	25	30	15	15	85
102095486	1. Amount Requested: \$686 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Yes 4. Word Count: 548 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Applicant meets all requirements	25	30	15	30	100

102095486	The proposal clearly describes the applicant's research interests and conference presentation topic. The applicant effectively connects the paper to emerging dissertation research. However, the research objectives and broader scholarly contribution could be more clearly articulated. Benefits: The applicant explains how participation in the conference will support intellectual exchange, networking, and the development of early-stage dissertation research. While the benefits are clear, the proposal could provide more specific details regarding how the conference will advance the research project. Budget: The budget requests funding for lodging associated with conference attendance and provides supporting documentation showing estimated hotel costs near the conference venue. However, the budget relies on estimated costs and could provide a more detailed breakdown of anticipated travel expenses. Total Score: 81 / 100	21	25	12	23	81
-----------	--	----	----	----	----	----


102095486	The proposal clearly explains the applicant's thesis research on prehistoric sandal technologies and the importance of examining collections at the Arizona State Museum. Additional detail regarding research methods and analytical framework would strengthen this section. Benefits: The proposal demonstrates how visiting the museum collections will improve the quality of the applicant's thesis research. The opportunity to collaborate with specialists and analyze artifacts directly supports the research objectives. Composition: The proposal is understandable and logically structured. Some grammatical errors and repetitive phrasing appear but do not significantly affect clarity. Budget: The budget provides clear cost estimates and verification links for travel, lodging, meals, and parking. However, the requested funding amount exceeds the estimated budget total, which should be clarified. Total Score: 78 / 100	21	24	11	22	78
102096389	The research goal in the essay is nicely explained. The conference presentation is relevant and significant to the student's research and professional future. The budget is also clear and concrete. So, I recommend that the applicant be considered for the SRG fund.	25	30	15	30	100


102096389	The applicant presents a well-defined and mechanistically focused research plan that builds directly on preliminary single-cell RNA sequencing data and addresses an important question in mucosal immunology. The proposed experiments are feasible, clearly aligned with the applicant's dissertation goals, and the requested funds are specifically justified to enable critical functional validation of epithelial-neutrophil interactions. Given the strong scientific rationale, clear training benefits, and potential impact on understanding immune-epithelial regulation in gastrointestinal disease, this application merits funding.	25	30	15	30	100
102096389	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The applicant's work benefits to the academic community and professional development should be further explained. The composition should be improved. The budget table is not accurately completed, e.g., the total prices for airfare and hotel are different from the attached supporting documents.	22	24	12	27	85
102098795	The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved. The budget table is not accurately completed, e.g., the costs of airfare and hotel in the table are different from the supporting documents.	25	27	12	24	88


102098795	The significance of the activity should be described more. The applicant's work benefits to the academic community and professional development should be further explained. The composition should be improved.	22	24	12	30	88
102098795	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described more. The applicant's work benefits to the academic and professional community should be further explained. The composition should be improved.	19	27	12	30	88
102101820	1. Amount Requested: \$726 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Sort of 4. Word Count: 678 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) While the proposal was interesting to read and covered all required bases, it is above the maximum word count (~678 words), so I must recommend this application for disqualification. No proof of paper acceptance was submitted, either.	25	30	12	30	97


102101820	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Sort of 4. Word Count: 504 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) While the student did not submit proof of their paper's acceptance, the details about their panel date and time could be verifiable. The rest of their application meets the requirements, so I would recommend this application for qualification.	25	30	15	30	100
102101820	1. Amount Requested: \$750 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation included (proof of acceptance to present research, budget supporting documentation)? Sort of 4. Word Count: 562 (500 min, 600 max) 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Student did not submit proof of paper acceptance and some technical terms are not defined (-2), but they did submit receipts that show they did attend the conference. I would recommend for qualification.	25	30	13	30	98


Percent Score
83%
95%
87%


















































94%
100%
90%















85%


96%
88%
91%















	95%
	100%
	73%





80%
100%
92%
100%









72%


94%
91%
83%








95%
84%
100%
86%

	86%
	100%
	100%











	87%
	100%
	84%






	81%
	100%
	100%







97%
83%
89%

95%
85%
88%







54%
100%
100%







87%






	86%
	100%
	77%










85%
88%
87%










100%
100%
100%
100%

100%
100%
93%
100%
100%
100%
100%




85%


97%


97%
91%
91%
80%
95%


92%
69%
76%
100%

97%
100%
100%
95%









88%
88%
97%

100%
98%