Applicant Student ID	Reviewer Notes	Background: - Academic interests stated - Activity and its significance described in	Benefits: - Benefits linked to academic/ prof. development - Benefits linked to	Composition: - Clear, flows logically, reasonable - Technical	Budget: - Complete, detailed, reasonable, logical - Supporting
101509277	Recommendation for Qualification: student is presenting original research at the largest NA conference in their field. Student's research is directly related to ABQ, and is at the end of their program.	25	25	15	30
101509277	Not recommended for SRG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket and paper acceptance for presentation.	25	30	15	30
101509277	Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (518), Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) Good proposal, well written proposal and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Applicant will be attending the conference in March 2026, Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be attending a conference but did not provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation Applicant has not made a financial committment towards the conference.	25	30	15	15

101665849	Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (551) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicant qualifies based on meeting requirements Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30
101665849	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced. The applicants didn't provide evidence that their paper had been accepted for presentation in a panel at the AAA meeting. The value in the total cost column should be the sum of the "AMOUNT REQUESTED FROM GPSA" value and the "AMOUNT REQUESTED FROM OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING' value. The links or proofs for the "AMOUNT REQUESTED FROM OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING' for the 1st and 2nd rows should be provided.	19	27	13	15
101665849	Amount Requested: $750 Word Counts: ~590 words (within 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant, a Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology, provides a strong and well-contextualized description of their dissertation and its relevance to the AAA presentation, demonstrating excellent academic alignment and depth. Benefits: The proposal clearly articulates professional and scholarly benefits, including feedback from experts, publication preparation, and contributions to UNM's academic visibility. Composition: The writing is coherent, polished, and academically precise, effectively explaining both research and professional goals. Budget: The budget is reasonable and aligns with SRG guidelines, supported by flight and lodging documentation; however, a more detailed breakdown of incidental expenses could strengthen it further.	25	30	15	29

101709626	Meets word count requirement? Yes – 593 words Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Not all supporting documents highlighted in the budget were provided. •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –No Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance.	25	28	14	29
101709626	The academic interest and the importance of the conference were clearly stated. The benefits were linked to academic and professional development but there was little mentioned on linked to academic community. The application used the budget template and supported it with documents, even though the documents were not enough. Overall, the application were carefully composed.	23	20	14	23
101709626	Meets word count requirement: Yes (598) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Partial, missing acceptance to the conference PhD candidate in Philosophy working on a dissertation focused on Frantz Fanon and the philosophy of violence/nonviolence. present at the Concerned Philosophers for Peace annual conference at Texas State University (San Marcos, TX) on October 17–18, 2025. . the project is an extension of dissertation research and will form a major portion of their third chapter. - Yes, the conference presentation will provide targeted feedback strengthening the dissertation and upcoming publication in Philosophy of Resistance (Awatum Press, 2026). Supports the applicant's preparation for the academic job market. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? N/A Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Missing acceptance to the conference.	25	30	15	25

101723470	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $746.14 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 588 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation; Qualify The applicant completed all of the requirements and clearly stated his academic goals and how the SRG will fulfill them. Additionally, the budget is well explained and the application is overall well rounded. As such, I recommend qualification.	23	28	12	30
101723470	Meets word count requirement: yes (586 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Yes 3.Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? -Yes, doctoral student in Biomedical sciences, fifth year MD/PhD candidate Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? -Yes, investigating the effects of prenatal alcohol exposure in mice, studying excitation of neurons in key cortical regions during behavioral testing, hoping to link these to functional cognitive deficits. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? -Yes ties to dissertation and broader professional and clinical goals Benefits -Yes, partially – the consumables requested are not explicitly explained other than that they are key to completing the research, their specific use is unclear. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes consumable necessary for the research Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? -Partially, well written but hard to follow due to unexplained technical terms Qualification Meets all requirements , necessary for degree completion.	25	30	10	25

101723470	Meets word count requirement? Yes (~580 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes Applicant outlines a clear Ph.D. research project on neural mechanisms in fetal alcohol spectrum disorders. The research purpose and use of funds are well described and directly tied to the dissertation. The activity fits well within biomedical research goals. Benefits to academic and professional development are clear, supporting dissertation progress and technical skill growth. Findings are relevant to the broader biomedical and public health community. Budget is complete, justified, and aligned with SRG guidelines. All expenses directly support research needs. Composition Proposal is well written, structured logically, and concise. 4. Recommendation: Qualify Why: Strong, well-organized proposal with clear objectives, solid justification, and meaningful scientific impact.	24	30	15	30
101724121	Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (560), Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualifies because all requirements have been met Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30

101724121	Word Count: ~580 words Amount Requested: $172.50 (reimbursement for lodging costs) Background Clearly defined — PhD candidate specializing in phenomenology of psychedelic and meditative experiences. Strong detail — poster presentation and conference dates provided. Direct connection to ongoing research and career trajectory. Excellent linkage to consciousness and harm-reduction literature. Benefits High — conference participation expanded network, research presentation skills, and visibility. Strong — knowledge shared with UNM lab members and broader department. Fully aligned with research dissemination and UNM representation. Composition Smooth, logical progression from context → activity → benefits. Polished, accessible to general reviewers, technical terms explained. Excellent; no issues noted. Budget Verified lodging expense ($172.50) with supporting spreadsheet and per-diem data. Fully justified — rate well below GSA per diem for Denver ($165 per night lodging cap). Receipts and conference verification attached; clear itemization.	24	28	15	30
101724121	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced. Applicants didn't provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation. He/she only provided his/her poster.	19	27	13	15
101741846	Academic and professional interests clearly stated – PhD candidate finalizing dissertation on Ancestral Pueblo migration patterns. Activity described in detail – chairing and presenting a session at the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Annual Meeting in San Francisco, Apr 29–May 3 2026. Strong alignment to academic field and career goal (archaeology research and university teaching). Benefits Benefits to professional development clearly stated (chairing session to strengthen leadership and visibility in academic community). Benefits to UNM academic community specific – involvement of two graduate students, a recent PhD, and a faculty discussant from UNM. Demonstrates broader collaborations (U of Arizona, Sonora, Chihuahua) and a plan to publish an edited volume.	24	29	15	29

101741846	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. The benefits of the applicant's work to the academic community should be explained further. The applicant didn't provide evidence that he/she will present his/her PhD dissertation work.	19	27	15	15
101741846	(Word count: ~600) Budget template complete? Travel and lodging needs are implied. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a Ph.D. candidate in their 10th (final) year in Anthropology with an Archaeology concentration, actively writing their dissertation and applying for faculty jobs. Proposal focuses on attendane at the SAA 91st Annual Meeting, April 29 – May 3, 2026, in San Francisco, where the applicant will serve as session chair and presenter. Strong alignment with academic/professional goals: Presenting dissertation research to a targeted expert audience. Gaining experience in academic leadership by chairing a session Organizing a collaborative session with peers and faculty from UNM, Arizona, and Mexico. Applicant demonstrates broad impact: Involves and uplifts other UNM students and faculty. Planning an edited volume to offer publication opportunities for session participants. Highlights role as a community-builder and mentor. Funding justification is clear: other travel needs exist, and this key opportunity enhances both career prospects and institutional visibility. Narrative is well-written, structured, and professional, showing clear planning, initiative, and leadership. Budget is not broken down but is clearly reasonable given location (San Francisco) and event length (6 days). Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This is a strong proposal from a senior Ph.D. candidate entering the job market and engaging in high-impact professional development. The applicant not only presents their own work but also facilitates collaboration, visibility, and scholarly opportunity for other UNM affiliates. Their leadership, organization, and clear goals make them an excellent candidate for GPSA funding.	25	30	15	30

101763188	Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (570) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) With submission of supporting documentation being mandatory, this applicant may be disqualified due to inability to meet this requirement. Applicant provided a quote highlighting cost of items they needed for research	25	30	15	30
101763188	The academic interest and the importance of the research were clearly stated and explained. The research was clearly linked to academic and professional development and the academic community. The application used the budget template and also had a supporting document to support it. Overall, the application were followed a logical composition.	25	29	15	28
101763188	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~595 words (within 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant, a third-year Ph.D. student in Biology, provides a clear and detailed description of their dissertation research on fungal communities in desert ecosystems, including sampling methods and sequencing needs, with supporting documentation confirming sequencing costs from MRDNA. Benefits: The project has strong academic and professional relevance, directly advancing dissertation completion, generating publishable data, and contributing valuable ecological insights on climate impacts on floral microbes.	25	30	15	30

101763554	Meets word count requirement: yes (597 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Yes Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? -Yes, doctoral student in the Earth and Planetary Sciences Department. Third year PhD student interested in geomorphology, diversifying the field and studying land of origin Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? -Yes, hoping to share new mexico's unique features and tie this into diversity within the field- studying the evolution of landscape in relation to tectonics and climate. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes ties to Ph.D. program and future career goals Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes covers hotel and registration Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? -Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualification Why: Meets all requirements. Ties to personal goals and benefits diversity	25	30	15	30
101763554	1. Eligibility & StatusAmount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈580 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant clearly states research focus on geomorphology and tectonic processes within New Mexico. The activity—presenting two posters at the 11th International Conference on Geomorphology in New Zealand—is well described, including its academic and personal relevance. The project is strongly connected to the applicant's dissertation and academic trajectory. Clearly articulated academic and professional benefits, including international collaboration, exposure, and networking. Highlights broader academic impact through representation of New Mexico's geological research and advocacy for diversity in geosciences. Detailed and reasonable. Includes airfare, registration, and lodging with appropriate documentation. Costs are economical and justified for an international conference. Well-written, organized, and professional. The narrative flows logically and effectively conveys purpose and need. 4. Recommendation: Qualify Why: Excellent proposal with strong academic merit, clear objectives, and well-supported financial justification. The applicant's research has both scientific and societal impact, making this a highly competitive application.	25	30	15	30
101763554	Recommendation for Qualification: student is presenting two poster presentations at an international conference. Research specifically focuses on New Mexico, which is a region the student says is underrepresented in the international academic community.	20	25	15	30

101827847	Amount Requested: $740 Application Compliance, Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈580 words) Budget template complete? Yes, Required supporting docs included? Yes Anonymity maintained? Yes Background The applicant clearly articulates academic and professional interests in public health, psychiatry, and minority health equity. The project—a systematic review of barriers to mental health access among Muslim, Black, Hispanic, and Asian communities—is well described and directly supports their medical training and research goals. The proposed conference presentation at the AMMSA Convention is appropriate and timely for disseminating findings. The proposal demonstrates strong alignment with the applicant's long-term goals in academic medicine and health equity. Presenting at a national conference will provide valuable professional exposure, scholarly feedback, and networking opportunities with like-minded peers and mentors. The project contributes to ongoing discussions about culturally informed care and public health advocacy. Budget is clear, reasonable, and supported by documentation. Travel and lodging costs are appropriate for the conference's duration and location. Composition The proposal is well written, coherent, and professional in tone. Minor repetition in phrasing, but overall organization and clarity are strong. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify. Why: A well-structured and compelling proposal that aligns closely with SRG goals. It demonstrates academic rigor, professional relevance, and a clear commitment to addressing mental health disparities. The budget is reasonable and complete, making this a strong and fundable application.	24	29	15	30
101827847	Recommendation for Qualification: Attending the conference is directly related to student's academic development. Besides presenting a poster on their research, student was not very specific about what else they will be doing at the conference.	20	25	15	30
101827847	Not recommended for SRG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket or paper acceptance for presentation.	25	30	15	30
101878225	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced.	22	27	13	30
101878225	Meets word count requirement? Yes – 500 words Budget template complete? Yes, Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – No •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes, Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for Qualification	25	30	15	30

101878225	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___664___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (500) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicant qualifies due to meeting requirements Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30
101897684	Academic interest and the significance of the conference were clearly stated and explained. The benefit of the conference to academic and professional development were also explained and linked to the community. The budget template was used and supported with enough supporting documents. Overall, the application was carefully composed.	25	30	14	30

101897684	Yes (Word count: ~600), Budget template complete? Travel dates, purpose, and location are clear; expenses are described. Applicant is a Ph.D. candidate (ABD) in History with a certification in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, currently conducting dissertation research on American women volunteer nurses in the Spanish Civil War. Presenting at the 1st International Congress: Research and Memory of the International Brigades in Barcelona, Spain, October 30–31, 2025. Archival research at NYU's Tamiment Library (Nov 1–7), reviewing the Fredericka Martin Collection and other records related to American women volunteers. The conference offers international scholarly exposure in a highly relevant field of emerging historical study. The applicant will present on a panel focused on women in the International Brigades, contributing to underrepresented narratives in 20th-century European and gender history. The archival work is essential to dissertation completion, providing access to unpublished personal documents and audio interviews, which are not fully digitized. Applicant makes a strong case for both scholarly contribution and field advancement: addressing historical silences, connecting antifascist movements, and spotlighting women's roles in international conflicts. Proposal ties clearly to academic and professional goals, including research advancement, international collaboration, and public scholarship. Financial need is implied (cost of international travel and lodging), and the $600 request is modest and appropriate. Narrative is thoughtful, passionate, and well-structured, demonstrating clear relevance and preparedness. Qualified The applicant presents a compelling dual-purpose travel proposal that supports both the presentation of original scholarship and primary-source archival research central to dissertation completion. The work contributes significantly to the fields of gender history, antifascism, and transnational memory studies. The funding request is justified, and the project is both timely and impactful. An excellent candidate for GPSA support.	25	30	15	30
101897684	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~570 words (within the 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant clearly outlines their dissertation focus, academic stage, and detailed conference and research plans, showing strong alignment with their field. Benefits: The proposal demonstrates clear academic and professional value through conference presentation and archival research, though local institutional benefits could be expanded. Composition: The narrative is clear, coherent, and professionally written, with well-explained terms and logical flow. Budget: The budget is reasonable, well-documented, and includes proof of presentation and travel, with only minor verification details needed.	25	29	15	29
101898021	The academic interest and the significant of the conference were stated and explained. The benefits were also explained. The application used the budget template and also supported it with supporting documents. Overall, the application was clearly composed.	25	30	13	28
101898021	dissertation research related	25	30	15	30

101898021	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~590 words (within 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant clearly outlines their research focus, academic stage, and planned conference presentation, though no supporting proof of acceptance was provided. Benefits: The proposal demonstrates strong academic and professional value, emphasizing dissemination of novel research, but lacks verified evidence of confirmed presentation. Composition: The writing is clear, logical, and professionally structured, with well-explained technical concepts. Budget: The budget is reasonable and aligns with SRG guidelines, though documentation confirming registration or acceptance would strengthen justification.	24	27	15	27
101908217	Meets word count requirement: yes (591 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Yes Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? -Yes finishing Ph.D in electrical engineering, hopes to graduate and start an engineering co-op with researchers from marginalized Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? -Yes, studying degradation of thermoplastics to be used in solar panels to extend the lifetime of panels. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? -Yes, ties to field, program, and future. Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? -Yes, improve their presentation skills, receive feedback, expand own ideas, learn. Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? -Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Necessary testing fees and training to complete degree, meets all requirements, gives back to the community	25	30	15	30
101908217	Qualification for Recommendation: proposal is very clear and specific. There is clear benefits to student's academic career, since this is part of their dissertation, and to the academic community.	25	30	15	30

101908217	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___720___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (591) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicant qualifies based on meeting requirements. For supporting documents section, applicant provides personal conversations with contact that gives quote on cost of using characterization tools	25	30	15	30

101909483	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $546 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 598 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no proof that paper has been accepted 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualified Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is great and the budget supporting documents are comprehensive, the applicant failed to provide proof that their paper has been accepted. He did provide proof of commitment through the hotel booking, however that is not the current policy for the SRG per the grant reviewer instructions. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	23	27	13	30

101909483	Meets word count requirement yes (589) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Partially, no proof of paper acceptance. Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? -Yes, doctoral student in biochem studying cancer detections using gene mapping, in the final year. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? -Yes, hoping to network, learn about latest technologies, and contribute to the international discussion. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? -Yes ties to Ph.D. program and future career goals Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear?, Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes covers flights and hotel. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? -Partially, there is a lot of unexplained technical terminology, but the paper is easy to follow. 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Did not submit proof of paper acceptance to the conference.	25	30	10	20
101909483	Amount Requested: $546 2. Application Compliance, Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈580 words) Budget template complete? Yes, Required supporting docs included? Yes Applicant clearly outlines research in chemical biology and oncology. The conference participation and presentation activity are described in detail. The proposed travel aligns directly with dissertation goals and academic field. Benefits Strong professional and academic benefits, including networking, collaboration, and expert feedback. The work contributes to the broader chemistry and biomedical research community and enhances UNM's visibility. Budget Budget is detailed, well-structured, and reasonable for the proposed activity. Costs are justified and align with standard travel and lodging rates. Composition The proposal is clear, concise, and logically organized with an appropriate academic tone. 4. Recommendation: Qualify Why: The proposal effectively connects research presentation to professional growth and academic advancement. It is well-written, well-supported, and includes a complete and reasonable budget.	25	30	15	30

101911618	Amount Requested: $651.16 Meets word count requirement?Yes (Word count: ~550) Budget template complete? Applicant clearly states need for travel, lodging, and registration reimbursement Applicant is a second-year Ph.D. student in Communication, with research focused on media studies, cultural identity, and political communication. Presented two original research papers at the 75th Annual ICA Conference (June 2025 in Denver)—a top-tier international conference in the field. Participation supports both dissertation development and broader scholarly trajectory; helped sharpen theoretical frameworks and build critical academic relationships. Strong engagement with global conversations around media, fact-checking, civic engagement, and identity; highlights interdisciplinary approaches (textual analysis, ethnography). Describes tangible scholarly benefits: feedback received, journal editor interest, expansion of work, and formation of future collaborations. Emphasizes contribution to the academic community—timely research on media ideology, nationalism, and gendered populism; notes importance of mentoring underrepresented students. Financial request is reasonable and justified, given the cost of travel, lodging, and conference fees at an international conference. Narrative is compelling, well-structured, and shows maturity, clarity, and purpose in academic writing. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This is a strong, thoughtful proposal from a rising scholar engaging with global academic communities at a premier international conference. The research presented is timely, relevant, and aligned with critical interdisciplinary fields. The applicant outlines both short-term academic benefits and long-term professional impact, making a strong case for GPSA funding support.	25	30	15	30
101911618	The academic interest and their significance were clearly explained but not into details. The benefits were clearly linked to academic and professional development. The application was logically composed. The application had enough supporting documents. The application used the budget template and links were verified.	23	30	15	30
101911618	Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (548) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualifies because all requirements have been met Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30

101912514	Word count: ~520), Budget template complete?, Lodging, flights, and transportation are discussed clearly. Applicant is a Ph.D. Candidate in American Studies, with an April 2026 graduation date, conducting dissertation research on Asian American embodiment during COVID-19. Research bridges American Studies, Border Studies, and Gender Studies, focusing on how state response to COVID-19 shaped perceptions of racialized bodies—an important, underexplored topic. The applicant has been accepted to two panels at the American Studies Association (ASA) Conference, the flagship conference for the field: Chairing a panel on kinship and state violence (with another UNM student and other scholars). Presenting a paper based on their dissertation, which is under review for inclusion in a forthcoming anthology on anti-Asian violence. These opportunities are directly tied to the applicant's dissertation, publication plans, and job market preparation. Panel chairing and networking with co-panelists/editors are framed as critical professional development steps Applicant outlines a clear, cost-conscious travel plan (shared accommodations, use of Uber, no assistantship). Proposal is well-structured and articulates strong academic, professional, and collaborative benefits Narrative also shows initiative, community-building, and interdisciplinary relevance, which enhance its strength. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This is a strong and compelling proposal from a Ph.D. candidate in the final stages of their degree. The applicant is both chairing and presenting at the most prestigious conference in their field. Their participation will support publication, professional relationships, dissertation development, and job market success. The funding request is justified and cost-effective. An excellent candidate for support.	25	30	15	30
101912514	Meets word count requirement? Yes—522 wordsBudget template complete? , Yes, Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – Yes •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? , Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)?, Yes the research project described in the application is detailed •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals?, Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? – Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -No, the amount requested in the budget was more than the maximum amount for the SRG grant Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance. The budget requested amount is $965, which is above the maximum SRG amount	23	24	14	15

101912514	1. Amount requested from the budget is $969, but $750 on the application page. 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached but a support doc showing the acceptance of paper or conference registration was not attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tie to applicant's field. Benefit to academic development was stated, but benefit to the academic community was not clear. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation.	25	25	15	30
101920342	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 applicant didn’t provide evidence that he/she will have a presentation on a panel at the 2026 American Historical Association annual conference.	22	27	13	15

101920342	Amount Requested: $750 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~585) Budget template complete? Budget details are explained registration already paid, requesting reimbursement for hotel and flight Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is on the verge of advancing to Ph.D. candidacy and attending their first major conference as a candidate—marking a significant milestone. Request is for support to attend the American Historical Association (AHA) Annual Conference, January 8–11, 2026, in Chicago—a premier event in the historical profession. The applicant is presenting on a panel titled “Prosopographical Approaches to Premodern Women’s History,” alongside well-known scholars—an honor and key networking opportunity. Their paper explores the role of maternal lineage in medieval chronicles, with compelling primary source examples (e.g., Cartuliare des Guilhem de Montpellier, Liber Floridus), showcasing strong dissertation integration. The panel and research contribute to medieval gender history, lineage studies, and textual analysis, adding disciplinary relevance and intellectual significance. Applicant outlines broader goals: networking across historical fields, gaining exposure to interdisciplinary panels, and expanding their professional toolkit. Demonstrates clear financial need: registration and hotel already paid out-of-pocket; seeking help with travel and lodging expenses; departmental funds uncertain. Narrative is well-organized, reflective, and professionally written, conveying a strong sense of purpose and preparation. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This is a highly focused and articulate proposal from an emerging Ph.D. candidate engaging in a prestigious academic venue. The research is clearly tied to dissertation goals, and the conference offers exceptional professional development, networking, and publication potential. Financial justification is reasonable, and the request supports a timely, meaningful academic opportunity.	25	30	15	30

101920342	Meets word count requirement? Yes– 587 words Budget template complete? , Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – Yes •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes the research project described in the application is detailed •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? – No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance.	24	24	13	30
101943373	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 597 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Somewhat Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Somewhat, could be more in depth Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Unsure, based off of template yes but unsure due to lack of supporting docs Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Qualify Reason (2–3 sentences): The applicant completed all of the requirements and clearly stated their academic goals and how the SRG will fulfill them. Additionally, the budget is well explained and the application is overall well rounded. As such, I recommend qualification.	21	25	12	28

101943373	Full name mentioned in the proposal 1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $720, 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: yes (600 words), Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Partial, some physical materials have receipts, lodging for the retreat has a receipt but no supporting docs verifying the retreat dates/location/purpose. Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated?, Yes finishing MFA focusing on wind ecology and wildfire soundscapes. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? , Yes, culmination of works for final thesis which will be a showcase. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, ties to field and goals of presenting the showcase Benefits Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Partially, physical materials justified, artists retreat unclear and without a lot of support Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Retreat is missing supporting documentation proving that it is supporting the student's academic or professional goals.	25	25	15	20
101943373	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes Budget template complete: Yes Required supporting docs included: Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background: Applicant's academic interests and project scope are clearly defined. Activities are well described and appropriately tied to their MFA thesis goals. Benefits: Strong articulation of how the project advances artistic practice and ecological awareness; minor room to highlight broader dissemination. Budget: Logical, transparent, and well-justified for proposed equipment and fieldwork. Composition: Well-written and cohesive; easy to follow and professional. Recommendation: Qualify Why: Proposal demonstrates clear academic and creative merit, with a well-structured plan and justified budget supporting impactful interdisciplinary research.	25	28	14	29
101944182	Recommended for SRG. Applicant meets funding criteria.	25	30	15	30

101944182	Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (600), Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, well written proposal and application was great and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Technical terms well defined and explained Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification Applicant will be attending a conference and provided evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation Budget was well research and supporting documents were verified Overall, this is an excellent application and I recommend this application for qualification.	25	30	15	30
101944182		25	30	12	30
101944767	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced.	22	27	13	30

101944767	Yes (Word count: ~550) Budget template complete? Expenses (airfare, lodging, registration, transportation) are outlined and total estimated at ~$4,500 Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a Ph.D. candidate in Physics & Astronomy, researching dark matter models (SIDM, WDM, CDM) using Milky Way satellite galaxies. Attended and presented at the Valencia Workshop (June 2025, Spain)—a prestigious, topic-specific international event. Research involves building a semi-analytic forward model to test dark matter theories using telescope data—cutting-edge, computational, and theory-driven. The talk titled: "Probing the abundance and internal structure of low-mass DM halos with MW satellites in WDM & SIDM scenarios" aligns directly with the workshop theme. Academic benefits are clearly described: Received constructive expert feedback Learned new cross-disciplinary techniques (e.g., lensing, stellar streams) Gained insight into next steps for dissertation development Also shows departmental/community impact: Shared insights with peers and mentees Enhanced UNM's visibility at an international scientific event Financial need is well-explained—international student status, fixed stipend, and high cost (~$4.5K total). A reimbursement from SRG would provide essential retroactive support. Proposal is clear, articulate, and professionally written, showing strong academic maturity and mission alignment. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This proposal presents a well-justified request for retroactive funding support of a highly relevant international workshop, where the applicant made a scholarly contribution on an advanced topic in astrophysics. The academic, professional, and community benefits are clearly demonstrated, and the funding need is genuine. A strong example of the kind of global research engagement SRG aims to support.	25	30	15	30
101944767	Meets word count requirement? Yes – 564 words Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – Yes •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for qualification	25	29	15	30

101945240	Recommendation for Qualification: student has applied to other sources of funding and has no received anything. The student is leading a workshop that is relevant to their field of study and directly benefits the academic community. The budget looks weird. Their portion of the hotel is greater than the amount they are requesting, but I think that is to stay within the max SRG amount.	25	30	15	20
101945240	Recommended for SRG. Meets funding criteria.	25	30	15	30
101945240	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (531) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, proposal was well written and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be attending a conference but did not provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation	25	30	15	15
101945434	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__750___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (596) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualifies because all requirements have been met Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30

101945434	The applicant’s academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant’s academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced.	19	27	13	30
101945434		20	25	15	30
101948533	Recommendation for Disqualification: Proposal isn't anonymous. The student has only a portion of the costs on the budget that equals the amount given by SRG, not the total costs. The proposal looks good overall.	25	30	15	15
101948533	Recommended for SRG. Applicant meets SRG criteria.	25	30	15	30
101948533	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (564) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great, well written proposal and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Technical terms well defined and explained Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant’s field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant’s academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be attending a conference but did not provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation	25	30	15	15

101970521	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 587 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Qualify Reason (2–3 sentences): The applicant has met all of the requirements for the application and has highlighted how the SRG will contribute to their academic success. As such, I recommend that they qualify.	23	27	14	30
101970521	Meets word count requirement: yes (545 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Yes Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? -Yes, second year doctoral student in English department with a focus on British and Irish studies. Studying two texts related to the intersection of violence and acceptability, intersections with social anxiety and disability studies. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? -Yes, conference in Washington D.C. to present work which will provide opportunities to learn outside of field, learn about teaching, and receive feedback Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals?, Yes ties to dissertation and broader professional goals Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -Yes, housing and travel Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? -Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualification Why: Meets all requirements, helpful to advance career and research.	25	30	15	30

	Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈560 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes Anonymity maintained? Yes The applicant clearly states their academic focus as a Ph.D. student in English specializing in British and Irish Gothic regionalism. The proposed activity—presenting a paper at the North American Victorian Studies Association conference—is described in detail and directly connected to their dissertation research on Gothic literature and historical perceptions of violence. The proposal effectively outlines how presenting at a national conference will provide critical professional exposure and scholarly feedback. It highlights opportunities for academic networking, pedagogical development, and engagement with current disciplinary conversations, all of which enhance research and teaching skills. Budget The budget is well prepared and supported by appropriate documentation. Conference travel and lodging costs are reasonable and justified, aligning with the SRG funding purpose. Composition The proposal is clearly written and organized, with a professional and accessible tone. Minor issues with flow and concision, but overall presentation is strong and persuasive.	24	29	15	29
101983944	1. The amount requested from the budget is $776, but $750 is on the application page. 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached, but a support doc showing the acceptance of paper or conference registration was not attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and the community was stated 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation.	25	30	15	28

101983944	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 501 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; proof that paper has been accepted is missing 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is great and the budget supporting documents are comprehensive, the applicant failed to provide proof that their paper has been accepted. He did provide proof of commitment through the hotel booking, however that is not the current policy for the SRG per the grant reviewer instructions. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	24	27	13	30

101983944	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: yes (502 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Partially, missing confirmation of acceptance for presenting. 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes final year student in MPA. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, conference in Atlanta to present accepted paper to refine for publication. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes ties to field and program. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes, housing and travel Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualification Why: No supporting document of acceptance to present.	25	15	15	15
102005363	Recommendation for Disqualification: proposal is not anonymous. The proposal does a great job explain the student's research interests, and explains how attending the conference is helpful to their research, but doesn't address how their research benefits the larger academic community.	25	15	15	30
102005363	Recommended for SRG. Applicant meets SRG criteria.	25	30	15	30

102005363	Amount Requested: $412.16 Meets word count requirement? Yes – 578 words Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes, however, some links could not be verified Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for qualification	24	26	13	28
102020828	Not recommended for SRG. No substantial evidence of the purchase of airline ticket or paper acceptance for presentation.	25	30	15	26

102020828	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $724.36 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (594) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, proposal was well written and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Supporting documents were blurry Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, however, when the activity will occur wasn't stated. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be attending a conference but did not provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation	24	30	14	15
102020828		25	30	15	30

102021435	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___750___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (518) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicant may not qualify due to supporting documentation being a general quote on how much travel may cost. Not confirmatory Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	25
102021435	Academic interest and importance of the research were clearly explained. Benefits to both academic and professional development were explained. The budget template was used. However, there were no supporting documents to support the application. The applicant uploaded the the same budget template in the supporting document section. Above all, the application were clearly composed.	25	28	15	15
102021435	very strong recommendation letter included	25	30	15	30
102022470	Recommendation for Qualification: The student directly shows how presenting and attending the conference will benefit their academics. Budget looks great.	25	20	15	30
102022470	Not recommended for SRG. No evidence of paper acceptance for presentation.	25	30	15	28

102022470	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (562) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Proposal did not flow logically as applicant used terms like Su Sin Fair I wasn't familiar with Details of the conference (where and when) was not stated in the proposal Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? No Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be attending a conference but did not provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation	20	30	13	15
102024676	1. Amount Requested $750 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc. 3. Activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and community was stated. The applicant did not clearly state his academic interests. 4 This application qualifies for the SRG because the applicant submitted all the required materials and documents to make a qualified SRG application	22	30	15	30

102024676	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 560 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Somewhat Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Somewhat Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Qualify Reason (2–3 sentences): The applicant completed all of the requirements and clearly stated their academic goals and how the SRG will fulfill them. Additionally, the budget is well explained and the application is overall well rounded. As such, I recommend qualification.	20	23	11	30

102024676	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $720 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (564) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, MFA in Sculpture program, preparing for thesis exhibition in March 2026 at 6th Street Studio in Albuquerque. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, Travel to Colorado between October 17–20, 2025, to harvest and process beeswax for sculptural work used in the thesis exhibition. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, the project directly supports the thesis research and aligns with the applicant's long-term goal of being a professional artist Benefits Yes, the research directly informs the thesis exhibit, artist talk, and contributes to the applicant's development as an artist. Yes, the project enriches the university's art community by exploring the connection between ecology and material art, amplifying non-human perspectives within artistic discourse. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes, Travel and material processing (beeswax and silicon mold fabrication). The purpose is clearly connected to the thesis and exhibition preparation. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification (State clearly); Qualification Why: Strong, well-articulated proposal that directly supports completion of the MFA thesis and aligns with professional artistic goals.	25	30	15	30

102025046	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (576) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, well written proposal and application was great and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Technical terms well defined and explained Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification Applicant will be attending a conference and provided evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation Budget was well research and supporting documents were verified Overall, this is an excellent application and I recommend this application for qualification.	25	30	15	30

102025046	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___750___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (576) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicant qualifies based on meeting requirements. Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30
102025046	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced.	22	27	13	30

102026958	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes Budget template complete: Yes Required supporting docs included: Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background: The applicant presents a clear and detailed description of their research interests in public administration, focusing on AI integration in financial management. The proposal establishes a strong connection between the project and broader issues of transparency and efficiency in government operations. The context and objectives are well defined and demonstrate a solid understanding of the field. Benefits: The professional and academic benefits are well articulated. The proposal shows how participation in the conference will enhance the applicant's research skills, expand professional networks, and contribute to ongoing policy discussions in public finance. It also highlights the potential for sharing outcomes with peers and the wider UNM community, reinforcing the project's relevance. Budget: The budget is complete, transparent, and justified, with realistic travel and registration expenses that align with the activity's scope and goals. Composition: The writing is clear, logical, and concise, effectively communicating the project's significance and expected outcomes while maintaining professional tone. Recommendation: Qualify Why: The proposal demonstrates strong academic value and professional relevance, with a well-articulated research focus and justifiable funding request. The activity directly supports the applicant's development as a public administration professional and contributes meaningfully to scholarly dialogue on AI-driven fiscal management.	25	29	15	29
102026958	Recommendation for Qualification: Student shows how their research is both timely, relevant to the conference, and specific to NM. The budget only includes the cost that the student would use, not their entire cost, but the supportive documents look good.	25	30	15	20
102026958	Recommended for SRG. Applicant meets SRG criteria.	25	30	15	30
102030258	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced. The applicant didn't provide evidence that their research had been accepted for presentation.	19	27	13	15

102030258	Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~586) Budget template complete? Travel details and purposes are clearly described (Wichita, KS and Miami, FL). Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a second-year Ph.D. student in Linguistics, studying under a prestigious Fulbright doctoral fellowship and transitioning from a professional career in HR to academic research. Proposing travel for two major academic conferences:SSO 2025 (Oct 9–11, Wichita, Kansas) – presenting two papers (one solo, one co-authored) FACON 25 Fulbright Conference (Oct 24–26, Miami, Florida) – invited to present work in a Round Table Discussion Thematic alignment: LASSO: “Language Without Borders” — matched by applicant’s cross-cultural and digital discourse studies Fulbright: “United We Stand” — applicant’s work reflects global collaboration and sociopolitical discourse Research topics: Solo study on online discourse surrounding a women’s rights march in Pakistan Co-authored study on ideological discourse during a labor strike Clear relevance to linguistics, gender studies, media discourse, and cultural analysis—also touches on sociology and communication studies Proposal emphasizes:	25	30	15	30

102030258	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 586 words Budget template complete? No, amounts for some items were not provided. Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? No, the applicant did not provide supporting documentation for the paper acceptance 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - No, the applicant did not provide some amounts for items listed in the budget Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance.	25	29	15	21

102054507	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈580 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes Anonymity maintained? Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background The applicant clearly articulates their academic trajectory and thesis focus within the Geography M.S. program. The proposed research on rural identity, land use, and ownership transitions in Northern New Mexico is well structured and methodologically sound. The project demonstrates strong academic preparation and direct alignment with professional goals in land management and policy. Benefits The proposal effectively links the fieldwork to the applicant's degree progress and future career path. It highlights how the qualitative perspective adds depth to existing quantitative research on land management, addressing an important gap in the literature. The outcomes will provide meaningful contributions to both local understanding and broader academic discussions of rural change. Budget Budget is complete, well justified, and supported with detailed documentation. Expenses for travel, lodging, and research software are clearly explained and adhere to UNM reimbursement policies.	24	28	15	29
102054507	The academic interest and the benefits of the research were clearly stated and explained. The The application used the budget template. There were also supporting documents to support the budget. The application were logically composed.	25	27	13	28

102054507	2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 598 words Budget template complete? No, amounts for some items were not provided. Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? No, the applicant did not provide supporting documentation for the paper acceptance •Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes •Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail •Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? -No, the applicant did not provide some amounts for items such as $350 for lodging was listed in the budget Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended disqualification because the applicant did not show any commitment to research.	24	28	13	20
102057590	The academic interest and importance of trip were stated and explained. Benefits to academic and professional development were also explained an the benefits were linked to unm community. The application used the budget template and also supported it with documents. Overall, the application were carefully composed.	24	28	14	28

102057590	Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~600) Budget template complete? Expenses (airfare, ground transportation, anthology copy, lodging) are outlined Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a graduate student in Visual Art with a clear interdisciplinary research focus that blends poetry, regional identity, and the politics of language—with a deep connection to Central Appalachia. Funding request supports a research and professional development trip to Roanoke and Blacksburg, Virginia in November 2025, tied to: A poetry reading and launch event for Had I a Dove anthology (Redhawk Publications) Presentation of original poetry grounded in regional and cultural analysis Ethnographic observation and scholarly engagement with Appalachian writers Research focuses on how marginalized communities in Appalachia use language to articulate lived experiences and resist systemic erasure—well-aligned with cultural studies, creative writing, and minority discourse analysis. The proposal articulates multiple benefits: Creative dissemination of original, research-informed work Networking with regional scholars and writers Deepening understanding of Appalachian poetics and resistance narratives Bringing insights back to the UNM academic community via creative and scholarly outputs Strong reflection on the intersection of art, identity, and regional politics Demonstrates professional growth, publication impact, and potential for future presentations/publications Budget is clearly tied to essential travel costs, though not formally itemized Narrative is thoughtful, lyrical, and grounded in lived experience, reflecting maturity and clear purpose Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This is a compelling and original proposal that blends creative work, academic research, and lived regional identity. The applicant presents a strong case for how this experience supports their professional development and scholarly contribution to marginalized literary discourse. The work is deeply interdisciplinary, timely, and culturally rooted, making it an excellent fit for SRG funding.	25	30	15	30
102057590	Amount Requested: $576.0; Word Count: ~600 words (within the 500-600 limit) Background: The applicant provides a strong academic and creative rationale, but lacks official confirmation of acceptance to present. Benefits: The professional and academic benefits are clearly articulated, though unverified participation slightly weakens dissemination justification. Composition: The writing is cohesive, professional, and well-organized. Budget: The budget is appropriate and supported by travel receipts but could include more detailed justification for costs.	24	28	15	28
102058482	1. Amount Requested $750 2. Application meets word count with a budget and support doc attached, but a support doc showing the acceptance of the paper was not attached. The daily cost of meals was more than the UNM per diem. The flight link did not provide enough details. 3. Activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and community was stated, but the applicant's academic interest was not clearly stated. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation.	23	26	15	25

102058482	Meets word count? Yes Word count: 599 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is great and the budget supporting documents are complete, the applicant failed to provide proof that their paper has been accepted. They did provide proof of commitment through a conference membership and registration receipt, however that is not the current policy for the SRG per the grant reviewer instructions. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	20	25	11	23
102058482	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__750____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number= 598) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs included? (Yes) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant was able to state clearly the background of the research and also explained how this will help his or her academic and professional development. I applicant made mention of presenting is paper as well.	23	28	14	27
102062777	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced. The applicant didn't provide evidence that their research had been accepted for presentation.	19	27	13	15
102062777	The academic interest and the significant of this meeting were clearly stated and explained. The benefits to both academics and UNM community were also explained. The application used the budget template and clearly indicate the items and their prices. There were also supporting documents to support the budget items listed in the template. Overall, the application was fairly composed.	25	30	14	29

102062777	Amount Requested: $700 Word Count: ~560 words (within 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant, a first-year PhD student in Exercise Science, clearly outlines their research on resistance training and type 2 diabetes and its alignment with the SWACSM conference. However, while they mention being selected to represent their program and potentially present, no supporting document confirming acceptance or presentation was provided Benefits: The proposal effectively links the conference participation to professional growth and university representation but lacks verified evidence of confirmed presentation, which slightly weakens the justification for full dissemination funding. Composition: The narrative is well-written, organized, and clearly communicates the applicant's goals, though slightly repetitive in emphasizing personal development. Budget: The budget is reasonable and supported by documentation for travel and lodging, though clarification on additional costs (e.g., registration, meals) would strengthen transparency.	23	27	14	27
102096366	1. Amount Requested $536.48 2. Meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached, but a support doc showing the acceptance of paper or conference registration was not attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and community were stated. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation. Also, the Conference is to take place in April-May 2026, which I think the applicant could have waited to apply for the grant in spring 2026.	25	15	15	30

102096366	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $536.48 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 573 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; missing proof that project has been accepted for conference 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is great and the budget supporting documents are complete, the applicant failed to provide proof that their project has been accepted. They did provide proof of commitment through a registration receipt , however that is not the current policy for the SRG per the grant reviewer instructions. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	23	25	11	23
102096366	Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈580 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant clearly presents academic and professional background in archaeology and explains how the project fits into their master's trajectory. The proposed activity—presentation at the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) annual meeting—is well described and relevant to their current research focus. The project is tied directly to the applicant's field of cultural resource management and digital preservation. Clearly identifies both personal and academic benefits, including technical training, professional networking, and feedback from experts. Broader impact through contributions to archaeological methodology and preservation of historical mining sites. Detailed and reasonable with justified expenses for travel and conference participation. Supporting documentation is complete and consistent with requested amount. Proposal is clear, cohesive, and written in a professional, accessible tone. 4. Recommendation: Qualify Why: Excellent proposal that demonstrates strong research relevance, academic merit, and professional benefit. The budget and documentation are complete and align with the grant's objectives.	24	30	15	30
	Disqualification				

101129669	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes– 566 words Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – No 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes the research project described in the application is detailed • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? – Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes, however, the amount requested in the budget was less than the amount requested in the application. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance.	25	30	15	20
101129669	1. The amount requested on the application page is $750, but $658 on the budget 2. Application meets the word count with a complete budget. Support doc for budget was submitted, but the one showing the acceptance of the paper for presentation was not attached. 3. Academic & professional interests and research are explained and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to the academic community is presented. The applicant did not explain the SCGPT stated in the essay. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation.	25	30	13	27

101129669	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__658___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) No (735) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualifies because all requirements have been met except the word count Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	30
101617457	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (571) Budget template complete? (No) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The where of the proposal was not stated and specific timelines of the project was not stated There was no link to verify the budget item for participant compensation. NMRG details were included in the budget Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, partially Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be undertaking a research but did not provide verfied evidence of their research paper	23	28	15	15

101617457	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__750____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (571) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) No Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) With submission of supporting documentation being mandatory, this applicant may be disqualified due to inability to meet this requirement.	25	30	15	30
101617457	Budget: Supporting docs cant be verified (no docs uploaded)	25	30	12	20
101620817	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes Budget template complete: Yes Required supporting docs included: Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background: The applicant presents an innovative and well-contextualized study examining the relationship between depopulation, ecology, and emotional geography. The project goals are specific, the methodology is rigorous, and the location is thoughtfully chosen to support the research question. Benefits: Strong articulation of academic and broader impacts, highlighting contributions to visual methodologies and cultural geography while engaging with global issues like climate resilience and migration. Clear potential for meaningful insights and academic dissemination. Budget: Well justified and appropriate to project needs. Costs directly relate to essential research tools and services. Composition: The proposal is well-structured, eloquently written, and demonstrates excellent command of research communication. Recommendation: Qualify Why: This is a strong, original, and well-developed proposal that demonstrates clear academic value, social relevance, and methodological innovation. The project is feasible, intellectually grounded, and aligns perfectly with the SRG's objectives.	25	29	15	29
101620817	Recommendation for Qualification: student explains their research project well and its academic links. However, the student does not go in-depth about how this contributes to their academic development or how this fits into the larger academic community. Their budget is missing their supporting documentation.	25	15	15	20

101620817	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~585 words (within) Background: The applicant, a second-year Geography master's student, clearly defines their research focus, site location (Ojika-jima, Japan), and methods, demonstrating a strong understanding of spatial and visual methodologies relevant to their field. Benefits: The project effectively connects to the applicant's academic development and contributes valuable insight to global discussions on depopulation, resilience, and ecological identity, though the community-level academic benefit could be expanded slightly. Composition: The proposal is coherent, logically structured, and written in clear academic language with well-defined technical and theoretical concepts. Budget: The budget is appropriate and reasonable for field research, aligning with allowable SRG expenses, though it would benefit from additional clarity on itemized translation and equipment costs.	25	28	15	27
101671896	Yes (Word count: ~600) Budget template complete? The requested budget is clearly justified (5 hours of TEM at $150/hr = $750) Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a 5th-year Ph.D. student in Earth and Planetary Sciences, conducting dissertation research on amorphous and microcrystalline silicate materials on Mars. Longstanding involvement in NASA's MSL Curiosity rover mission as a science team collaborator and ChemCam operator adds significant research credibility and professional experience. Proposal is focused on analyzing Martian analog materials using Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) at UNM's Nanomaterials Characterization Facility, with a clear goal to: Characterize silicate samples at high resolution Improve LIBS (laser spectroscopy) interpretation of amorphous phases on Mars The study addresses a critical limitation in current rover instrumentation: the inability of LIBS to accurately quantify amorphous phases, despite their frequent detection. The scientific relevance is high—results have implications for Martian geochemical history, mineralogical transitions, and environmental conditions. The proposal clearly identifies how this instrument training is both a research necessity and a professional development opportunity, preparing the applicant for a career in planetary science. Outcome will be submission to peer-reviewed journals (e.g., Icarus, JGR Planets), enhancing scholarly output and visibility. Budget request is modest and well-justified, strictly tied to direct research needs (instrument time and training at $150/hour). Narrative is clear, highly technical, and appropriate for a scientific research grant, demonstrating strong command of the topic and methods. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualified This is an outstanding research-focused proposal with strong academic merit, clear alignment with the applicant's dissertation goals, and broader scientific impact. The budget is appropriate, the project is timely, and the funding supports both research progress and technical skill development. The applicant's direct involvement with the NASA MSL mission adds further weight and credibility. A highly recommended candidate	25	30	15	30

101671896	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___750___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number= 606) Budget template complete? (Partial) Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant clearly stated his professional goals and how it aligns with his academic growth. He also emphasis the benefit of the project to greater university community. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I recommend disqualification because the applicants supplementary documents does not clear shows how it supports the budget.	23	28	14	15
101671896	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $____750____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) No (606 without references) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) No 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by performing research. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) With submission of strong supporting documentation being mandatory, this applicant may be disqualified due to inability to meet this requirement. Applicant provided a quote highlighting cost of tools needed for research. Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	25

101689648	1, Amount requested $724 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached, but a support doc showing the acceptance of paper or conference registration was not attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tie to applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and community was clearly stated. Budget is reasonable. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation.	25	30	15	30
101689648	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $724 2. Application Check Meets word count? No Word count: 327 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no proof that paper has been submitted or accepted 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant’s field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant’s development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? To an extent Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? It is very brief and lacks depth on some key issues 4. Recommendation Disqualified Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is interesting and the budget supporting documents are comprehensive, the applicant failed to provide proof that their work has been submitted and accepted for the conference. Additionally, this proposal does not meet the word count and there is not a verified commitment. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	15	21	10	27

101689648	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___724___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (Number=352) Budget template complete? Partial Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant was able to explain the benefit of the conference well and also had provided a good background for his academic and professional interest. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I recommend the applicant application be disqualified for this grant circle because the initial date for the conference falls in the next grant circle and also within the budget section the link that was inserted for flight ticket booking shows as an error search. Again the application failed to meet the minimum word count of 500	22	25	12	18
101865423	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? No Word count: 664 Budget template complete? No; link does not work and no specifics Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no proof that paper has been accepted 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? To an extent Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualified Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is interesting, the applicant failed to provide proof that their work has been accepted for the conference and the budget template is incomplete, leading to unverifiable information and costs. Additionally, this proposal exceeds the word count and there is not a verified commitment. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	22	25	12	5

101865423	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__995___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) No (687) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) No Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) No 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) With submission of supporting documentation being mandatory, this applicant may be disqualified due to inability to meet this requirement. The word count limit was exceeded as well Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	10
101865423	Recommendation for Disqualification: proposal is over the word maximum of 600 words, budget is not correctly filled out, and student is asking for more than the SRG max award.	20	20	10	10

101902441	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2.Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (588) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (SRG) 3.Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, proposal was well written and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant will be attending a conference but did not provide evidence of their research paper being accepted for presentation	25	30	14	15
101902441	The academic interest and the importance of the research were stated and explained. The benefits to academic and professional were explained and linked to the unm community. The application used the budget template and supported it with clear documents. The applicant added her name to the proposal. Overall, the application was carefully composed.	25	29	14	30
101902441	the research project should be stated more explicitly and outcomes should be more specific	22	29	13	30

101906819	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (457) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant stated in the proposal that "the grant will directly advance my research while also supporting my professional development" Applicant is confused with PDG and SRG and is requesting $600 Applicant didn't give a detailed description of the activity and it's significance The buget items couldn't be verified Applicant attached interview consent form as supporting document Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? No Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant's proposal was less than 500 words.	23	27	14	10
101906819	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___600___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number=457) Budget template complete? (Partial) Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant gives a clear explanation of his or her academic background where he goes into details to state the how and why the research is important. Applicant had a partially completed budget with no links for verifications. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I recommend the application be disqualified on the grounds that the budget was very uncompleted with no links for verifications and an inaccurate budget submitted.	24	28	11	10
101906819		25	30	15	30

101912227	Amount Requested: $750 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~570) Budget template complete? Clearly describes use of funds (travel, lodging, poster dissemination) Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a third-year Ph.D. student in Electrical and Computer Engineering conducting research on AI-driven wireless network optimization, especially using UAVs and reinforcement learning for emergency connectivity. Proposal focuses on past participation at the NSF-funded AERPAW Community Workshop (ACW25) at NC State (May 27–30, 2025), where the applicant presented a poster on UAV-assisted 5G network optimization. Activity aligns well with SRG mission—supports research dissemination at a national-level venue, and the work is technically and socially impactful. Applicant received direct research benefits from expert feedback and networking, especially regarding transitioning from simulations to real-world testbed experiments—critical for dissertation advancement. Demonstrates strong plans for knowledge sharing at UNM: ECE department seminar	25	30	15	30

101912227	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 586 words Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant is requesting a grant outside the academic cycle, specifically, May 2025.	20	20	10	15
101912227	1. Amount Requested $750 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached, but a support doc showing the acceptance of paper or conference registration was not attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and community was stated. 4. * This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation. * The conference presentation took place in May 2025, which is not included in this funding season	25	30	15	30

101914862	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? No– 435 words Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – No 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research project described in the application is detailed; however, the applicant mixed the PDG application with the SRG application. • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? – No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance. The applicant also failed to meet the word count and show any supporting documentation.	23	28	13	23
101914862	1. The Amount Requested from the budget is $750, but $600 was mentioned in the essay 2. Application does not meet word count. The budget was complete, but an essay was submitted as a budget support document. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and the community was stated. The budget is reasonable. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation. The applicant submitted an essay for PDG for SRG. The applicant also submitted an SRG essay as the budget support documentation. Also, because the word count is 435 words.	25	30	13	20
101914862	The application uploaded the wrong proposal at the SRG proposal section. The application was making references to PDG instead of SRG. - However, interest and benefits were clearly stated and explained in the application. And the application was logically composed. The application used the budget template, however, it failed to add supporting documents to support it. The applicant upload the proposal at the supporting document session.	15	15	14	15
101940734	Not recommended for SRG. SRG proposal exceeds 600 words, thus 638 words.	25	30	15	27

101940734	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $_750____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number= 620) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant clear stated his/ her academic background and made relevant connections to his professional interest. Also there was enough details of the when and where the conference was hoping and the role applicant will be playing with prove of the applicants research being accepted for presentation. The applicant made mention of making commitments like booking of flight and conference registration but there was no prove of it though. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Application qualifies for funding because applicant was able to proof that he or she will be presenting during the conference with his attachment of the confirmation letter in the supporting document area of the application.	23	28	13	25
101940734		25	30	15	30
101943600	Not recommended for SRG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket and paper acceptance for presentation.	25	30	15	28
101943600	The academic interest and the significant of the activity were clearly explained. The benefits to academic and professional development were also explained and linked to academic community. The application used the budget template and also supported it with supporting documents.	24	28	14	28

101943600	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___800___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) No (487) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicant may not qualify due to supporting documentation not being confirmatory Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	25	30	15	15
101978604	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced. didn't provide evidence that he/she will have a poster presentation.	22	27	13	15
101978604	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $_745.36____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number=568) Budget template complete? (Partial) Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant does a great job by stating his academic and professional interest. She also clear states the benefit of the conference to her academic growth and development. The Budget was partially completed because some of the supplementary documents where not added. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualified because even though the budget was completed it was not too reasonable. Applicants could not provide corresponding documents that support the budget submitted.	23	25	13	15

101978604	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $745.36 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (approximately 600 words) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes – clear justification for travel, conference purpose, and relevance to doctoral training Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes, fourth-year doctoral student in psychology working on comprehensive exams and clinical hours, hopes for tenure track professor. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, present a poster on November 23 at the 59th annual Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (ABCT) conference based on master's thesis of ptsd and sexual assault in Latina women. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, the project aligns directly with the applicant's focus and supports their long-term goal of becoming a tenure-track professor. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, critical exposure, professional networking opportunities, and valuable feedback, presenting is a requirement of the program. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes, the research expands understanding of cultural factors in sexual assault prevention, offering insights that can enhance inclusivity and effectiveness of clinical and prevention practices across diverse populations. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification (State clearly) disqualification Why: Missing supporting documentation of acceptance to present	25	30	15	25
101982821	Academic interest and importance of the conference were clearly explained. Benefits to academic and professional development were clearly explained but not linked to academic community. The application were clearly composed. The application used the budget template well. However, it failed to add supporting documents to support the application. It only added the same budget template in the supporting document section.	25	28	15	15

101982821	Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) Yes (570) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) No Applicant was concise in stating research background and benefits that would be obtained by attending the conference. The amount was exactly what was needed by the applicant. Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4.Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) With submission of supporting documentation being mandatory, this applicant may be disqualified due to inability to meet this requirement.	25	24	15	25
101982821	Amount Requested: $723 Word Count: ~560 words (Within 500-600 word limits) Background: The applicant clearly outlines their research focus and conference details, demonstrating strong academic relevance, though presentation verification is missing. Benefits: The proposal highlights meaningful professional and academic growth opportunities but lacks evidence of confirmed presentation to fully justify dissemination benefits. Composition : The narrative is well-structured, coherent, and written in clear academic language suitable for a general audience. Budget: The budget is reasonable and aligns with allowable SRG expenses, but supporting proof of presentation is needed to fully validate travel justification. NO EVIDENCE OF PRESENTING IN THE CONFERENCE	22	25	13	25

102000446	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈550 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes Anonymity maintained? Yes Evaluation of Narrative Background Clearly explains academic interests and research focus within the LLSS Ph.D. program. The conference presentation is well described and directly supports the applicant's dissertation goals. Benefits Shows strong professional and academic value through research dissemination and networking. Highlights contributions to the understanding of Black Student Unions and education equity. Budget Detailed, reasonable, and supported by valid documentation. Composition Well written, clear, and accessible to a general audience. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify.	23	27	15	29

102000446	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? No – 441 words Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? – Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended for disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance. The applicant also failed to meet the word count	25	29	13	25
102000446		25	30	15	30

102023569	The applicant submitted his/her paper abstract instead of submitting a proposal. There is no evidence that the applicant's research had been accepted for presentation. It is not clear that he/she wants to only attend the conference or he/she wants to present his/her research.	0	0	0	15

102023569	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__750____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (Number=318) Budget template complete? (Partial) Required supporting docs included? (Yes) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant narrative was basically explaining his / her research work but i did not see the applicant build connections to his/her professional and academic goals. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly I recommend disqualification because in the applicants budget some of the links where not accessible and the word count is below the recommend word count.	18	15	14	15
102023569	Recommendation for Disqualification: proposal is less than the word minimum of 500 words. I believe the student has submitted their conference abstract instead of a proposal.	15	0	15	30
102026423	1. Amount requested $ 580 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached, but a support doc showing the acceptance of the paper was not attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development and the community was stated. The composition was perfectly written but the applicant did not explain the and the budget was very reasonable. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because there was nothing to prove that the applicant's paper was accepted for presentation.	25	30	13	30

102026423	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $580 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 598 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? Yes 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is great and the budget supporting documents are complete, the applicant failed to provide proof that their paper has been accepted. They did provide proof of commitment through the hotel and airline light booking, however that is not the current policy for the SRG per the grant reviewer instructions. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	23	26	14	30
102026423	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__580____ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number=599) Budget template complete? (Partial) Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant did a great job by stating his/her academic interest very well and also made sure to elaborate on how this will benefit him going forward in his/her academic and professional development. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Applicants application is recommended to be disqualifies because the applicant failed to complete his budget. Some of the links for verifications were missing.	22	27	13	10

102026635 1. Eligibility & Status

Amount Requested: $747

2. Application Compliance

Meets word count requirement: yes (581 words)

Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes

Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Partially, missing confirmation of acceptance for presenting.

3. Evaluation of Narrative

Background

Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated?

- Yes third year Ph.D. student in applied mathematics, at the career stage of developing research path and expanding dissertation work.

Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)?

- Yes, conference on mathematics and applied ai, wants to present published work

Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals?

- Yes, ties to field and program.

Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified?

- Yes, housing and travel

Composition

Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon?

- Yes

4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)

Disqualification

Why:

No supporting document of acceptance to present.

25 30 15 25

102026635	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $747 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (~580 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background Applicant, a Ph.D. student in Mathematics, clearly connects research on numerical modeling and PDEs to the proposed conference activity. The research and conference participation are well tied to dissertation goals and professional growth. Benefits Conference attendance will enhance research presentation skills, provide networking opportunities, and allow for valuable academic feedback. Strong alignment between research activity and academic development. Budget Budget is clear, appropriate, and justified for travel expenses. All items are within SRG guidelines. Composition The proposal is concise, organized, and well written. 4. Recommendation: Qualify Why: A strong, focused proposal demonstrating clear academic relevance, well-structured narrative, and justified expenses.				
		25	30	15	30
102026635	Recommendation for Disqualification: The budget and supporting documents are confusing. The budget says that the airfare is $340, but the supporting documents show its only $147. Also, the supporting documents have a second airfare ticket for January, but the conference they are planning to attend is in October. They are also missing their hotel cost in the supporting documents.				
		25	25	15	10
102041374	1. Amount Requested $750 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget and support doc attached, but I cannot tell if a support doc showing the acceptance of the paper was attached because the file appeared too large, and I was unable to open it. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefits to academic development and the community were stated. 4. Since the large nature of the file for support documentation did not allow me to view it, I cannot recommend this application for either a qualification or disqualification.				
		25	30	15	24

102041374	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 517 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; proof that paper has been accepted is missing and the required supporting documentation is not viewable (attempted to download but file seems to be corrupt) 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Unsure, based off of template yes but unsure due to lack of supporting docs Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is inspirational, the applicant failed to provide proof that their paper was accepted and uploaded an unviewable file for the required supporting documentation. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	21	25	12	15
102041374	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~575 words Background: The applicant clearly outlines their research focus, academic stage, and detailed conference participation, demonstrating strong alignment with their field of clinical psychology. Benefits : The proposal highlights substantial academic and professional growth through presenting award-winning research and contributing to culturally inclusive psychological scholarship. Composition: The narrative is well-organized, concise, and written in clear, professional language with defined technical terms. Budget: The budget is reasonable and well-supported by documentation, with minor clarification needed on specific expense breakdowns.	25	30	15	29

102052343	(Word count: ~510) Budget template complete? no formal itemized budget is attached. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is conducting computational research aimed at improving the analysis of Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) data, specifically to better resolve complex, multi-peak particle size distributions (PSDs). Emphasizes DLS as a low-cost, widely-used tool in biology, chemistry, and materials science, often preferred over time-consuming, expensive techniques like electron microscopy. Current software tools are limited to simple, monodisperse distributions, which restricts real-world applicability; the applicant's work seeks to address this by developing more accurate and interpretable models. So far, synthetic (simulated) results outperform existing methods—funding is now needed for empirical validation using real materials (latex nanoparticle standards). Long-term goal is to build open-source, user-friendly software that extends DLS usability, helping researchers across disciplines interpret complex samples without expensive alternative methods. Strong case made for cross-disciplinary impact, lowering experimental barriers and saving time for practitioners in multiple scientific fields. Proposal is technically rigorous yet clearly explained, demonstrating both innovation and practical relevance. Budget justification is clear and modest—funds go directly toward materials essential for validating current research results and moving toward publication and application. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?; qualified This is a strong, well-articulated proposal that aligns perfectly with the mission of the Student Research Grant. The research is technically sound, with clear benefits to both the academic and broader research community. Funding will enable the crucial next step—empirical validation—and support the development of tools that could democratize advanced DLS analysis across fields.	25	30	15	30
102052343	1. Amount Requested $675 2. Application meets word count with a complete budget, but submitted the SRG proposal in place of support documentation. Also, the link provided in the budget did not provide any price information. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development was not clearly stated. The benefit to the academic community was mentioned . 4. This application qualifies for SRG because all requirements needed to make a qualified application were followed	25	27	15	20
102052343	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___675__ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number=537) Budget template complete? (No) Required supporting docs included? (No) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant did a great job describing the background of the research in details but did not really touch on how the research builds on his /her academic and professional development.	22	20	12	5
102058469	The academic interest and the significance of the conference were clearly stated and explained. The benefit were linked to academic and professional development. However, there was little on the benefits linked to the academic community. The application used the budget template and supported it with documents. The application was carefully composed.	24	27	14	28

102058469	Yes (Word count: ~450) Budget template complete? Travel purpose and location are clearly stated (Oklahoma City, Sept 21–24) Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a third-semester master's student in Literary Studies & Teaching, maintaining a 4.0 GPA, and currently serving as instructor of record for two undergraduate composition courses. Research focuses on liberatory practices for marginalized communities in the Americas, with emphasis on Afro-Methodologies, including: Black Feminist Hauntology Afro-Gothic Afro-Futurism Afro-Pessimism Request is to present the paper "Afro-Gothic Afterlives: Liberatory Monstrosity in Toni Morrison's Paradise and Ryan Coogler's Sinners" at the Western Literature Association Conference in Oklahoma City (Sept 21–24, 2025). The proposal ties the research directly to the overarching goals of critical race theory, American literary studies, and cultural historiography, while addressing gaps in scholarship related to African American contributions to the 19th-century canon. Highlights how the research: Bridges historical and contemporary social justice issues Aligns with interdisciplinary and DEI-focused academic trends Connects to postdoctoral opportunities, such as the Mellon Fellowship at Cornell Applicant also has strong non-academic impact: DEI work, workshops for young writers of color, and community facilitation. Proposal is well-written, analytically strong, and demonstrates leadership, originality, and relevance to contemporary academic conversations. Budget is reasonable for a domestic conference, though not itemized.	25	30	15	30
102058469	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~580 words (within 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant clearly outlines their academic standing, research focus, and confirmed conference presentation, demonstrating strong alignment with their graduate studies and SRG objectives. Benefits: The proposal effectively shows how presenting at WLA enhances the applicant's professional growth, visibility, and contribution to Afro-diasporic and literary scholarship. Composition: The writing is clear, professional, and well-organized, with thoughtful framing of research significance. Budget: The budget is reasonable and appropriate for conference participation, though a more detailed cost breakdown could improve transparency.	25	30	15	28

102058476	1. Amount Requested $725.94 2. Application does not meet the word count (603 words). The budget was complete, but some prices in the budget did not match those on the website line attached. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity described and tied to the applicant's field. The benefit to academic development was stated, but the applicant's academic interest and benefit to the academic community were not clear. 4. This application does not qualify for the SRG because the word count is 3 words over the required word count.	25	27	15	25
102058476	The interest were clearly stated and explained. The benefits were also explained. The application used the budget template. There were however no supporting documents to support the application. Overall, the application were logically composed.	25	30	15	15
102058476	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___725.94___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number=600) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs included? (No) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant tried explaining the background clearly but did not try to tie is with how this is benefiting the UNM community and also was not able to state how this will help his professional development. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I recommend disqualification based on the reason that the applicant failed to provide supporting documents even though he had a very detailed out budget.	23	20	14	15

102068066	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $742 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (511) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application 3. Evaluation of Narrative Amount requested from GPSA in the budget ($742) doesn't match with amount amount requested from SRG ($750) The language for supporting documents was spanish and so I couldn't understand Conference occured in the summer from July 30 to August 3. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant attended a conference but did not provide evidence of their invitation to participate in a tribute concert or evidence of performance being accepted for the conference.	25	30	15	15

102068066	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___742___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) No (465) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes but not confirmatory 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant did not exactly describe benefits of attending conference/workshopt to himself/herself/academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? No Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? No Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? No Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? No 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) With submission of strong supporting documentation being mandatory, this applicant may be disqualified due to inability to meet this requirement. Applicant provided a quote highlighting cost of flight needed to attend workshop though. Also, proposal did not clearly state academic interests and how attending the workshop would benefit these interests Why: (2–3 sentences explaining the main reason for qualification or disqualification)	15	15	8	20
102068066	Not recommended for SRG. No substantial evidence of airline ticket purchased for trip to Mexico. SRG proposal emphasizes past trips with no substantial evidence for future trip.	20	25	14	24

102095486	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 543 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; missing proof that project has been accepted for conference 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is great and the budget supporting documents are complete, the applicant failed to provide proof that their project has been accepted. They did provide proof of commitment through an airbnb and airline booking, however that is not the current policy for the SRG per the grant reviewer instructions. As such, I must recommend disqualification.	22	26	14	20

102095486	Grants Scoring Comment Section 1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: yes (539 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Partial, no proof of acceptance 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, doctoral student in British and Irish literary studies, studying feminist political themes in Irish literature and folklore Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, hoping to attend a conference in Portland Oregon on Irish studies to disseminate work in her field in November. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes ties to Ph.D. program and future career goals, will be first conference presentation. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes covers hotel Airbnb and flight. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Missing proof of acceptance to present.	25	30	15	15

102095486	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 545 words Budget template complete? No, amounts for some items were not provided. Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? No, the applicant did not provide supporting documentation for the paper acceptance 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Background • Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes • Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, the research is described in detail • Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? – Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? –No Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - No, the applicant did not provide some amounts for items listed in the budget Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Recommended disqualification because the applicant did not provide supporting documentation to show conference paper acceptance.	25	29	14	24
101889689	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $__750___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (Number=413) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs included? (Yes) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant clearly described the background of the study by explaining what the research seeks to achieve and also how it will help in his professional development. 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I recommend disqualification because did not meet the word count requirement and also applicant failed to provided enough supporting documents for the proposal.	23	28	13	17

101889689 Amount Requested:
$750

Meets word count requirement?
Yes (Word count: ~413)

Budget template complete?
Expenses are clearly described (CBD purchase, animal care, testing supplies)

Evaluation of Narrative

Applicant is a second-year Ph.D. student in Psychology (Cognition, Brain, and Behavior) conducting a research project on CBD's dose-dependent effects on learning, memory, anxiety, and synaptic plasticity.

Study integrates behavioral models (Morris Water Task, Elevated Plus Maze) with in-vivo electrophysiology to explore how CBD affects hippocampal function and cognition.

Research fills a key gap in the field by focusing on acute, dose-dependent effects in adult models—an area underexplored in cannabinoid studies.

Clearly outlines the academic and clinical relevance of the work: links to both therapeutic potential and public health policy.

Project timeline is well-structured:

Testing: Feb–Nov

Data analysis and manuscript prep: Aug–Dec

		25	30	15	30
101889689		25	30	15	30

101890849	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: 750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement yes (486) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Yes, but no proof of paper acceptance. 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, doctoral student in nuclear engineering hoping to present dissertation at conference to improve and help with finding post doc positions. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, stage IV nuclear reactors presenting in DC in November to participate and contribute to the discussion Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes ties to Ph.D. program and future career goals Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes covers flights and hotel. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Disqualification Why: Did not submit proof of paper acceptance to the conference	25	30	15	15
101890849	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (≈570 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs included? Yes Applicant clearly states academic focus in nuclear reactor design and fuel cycle evaluation. The activity—presentation at the 2025 ANS Winter Meeting—is detailed with time, location, and content. Strong connection between the conference presentation and dissertation research. Clear professional benefits: networking, exposure, and expert feedback. Broader academic value: dissemination of UNM research in nuclear engineering at an international level. Budget is complete, well-structured, and realistic for conference travel. Registration cost waived, showing pursuit of alternate funding and cost efficiency. Composition Proposal flows clearly, uses professional and accessible language, and is free of jargon. 4. Recommendation: Qualify Why: Excellent proposal linking dissertation research to professional development. The activity is highly relevant to the applicant's field and well justified by a clear, economical budget.	24	29	15	30

101890849	Recommendation for Qualification: student has received some funding from the conference in exchange for professional work that also benefits the student. The conference is top-tier and the student is finishing their dissertation this spring. Everything is well-explained.	25	30	12	30
101911106	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___718___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes/No) (Number?) No (465) Budget template complete? (Yes/Partial/No) Yes Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (Yes/No) Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative (Use bullets or short sentences – 2-3) Applicant was clear in stating interests and how attending this conference would benefit these interests, as well as the academic community. Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Applicant qualifies based on meeting requirements	25	30	15	30
101911106	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to the applicant's academic community should be explained in more detail. The composition should be enhanced.	22	27	13	30
101911106	Amount Requested: $718 Word Count: ~585 words (within 500–600 limit) Background: The applicant, a Ph.D. candidate in Economics, clearly describes her dissertation focus and provides verified proof of presentation acceptance at the Southern Economic Association (SEA) 95th Annual Meeting in Tampa, Florida. . The research is well-aligned with academic and professional trajectory. Benefits: The proposal strongly demonstrates both personal and academic value—supporting dissertation advancement, job market preparation, and contributions to the UNM learning community.	25	30	15	29

101943806	Amount Requested: $750 Word Count: ~630 words, within limit Background Academic stage and research focus clearly defined; presentation directly tied to dissertation on New Mexico's carceral history and environmental justice. Demonstrates strong field relevance. Benefits Excellent articulation of academic and professional benefits. Advances applicant's visibility in national scholarly networks and highlights UNM research. Institutional and community impacts clearly stated. Budget Well-justified and reasonable expenses (lodging, registration, airfare). Documentation complete and supports partial funding request. Demonstrates financial responsibility. Composition Proposal is clear, logically organized, and professional in tone. Only minor stylistic edits suggested.	24	29	14	27
101943806	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $___750___ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes Number= 555) Budget template complete? Partial Required supporting docs included? (Yes) 3. Evaluation of Narrative The applicant was able to successful talk about his or her academic interest and also attached on his professional interest. The applicant also made sure to provide details on the where and when of the conference where he is a presenter. The applicant in the budget section failed to attached the needed verification links even though there where enough proof from the supporting document. Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The application qualifies for the funding based on the grounds that the applicant have provided enough proof with his attached supporting documents showing his paper being accepted and also making arrangements like conference registration and hotel bookings.	24	28	14	20

101943806	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $750 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: yes (544 words) Budget template complete activity budget and supporting docs? Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, doctoral student in American studies with a paper focusing on incarceration and geology Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, hoping to network and share research at an asa conference in Puerto Rico Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes ties to Ph.D. program and future career goals Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? - N/A. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes covers hotel and registration Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Qualification	25	25	15	30
102055776	Not recommended for SRG. No evidence of paper acceptance for presentation.	25	30	15	27

102055776	Eligibility & Status				
	Amount Requested: $750				
	2. Application Compliance				
	Meets word count requirement? (No) (467)				
	Budget template complete? (Yes)				
	Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application				
	3. Evaluation of Narrative				
	Great proposal, proposal was well written and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals				
	Airbnd receipt was in spanish so I couln't understand				
	Background				
	Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes				
	Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes				
	Is it clearly tied to the applicant’s field and/or goals? Yes				
	Benefits				
	Are the benefits to the applicant’s academic/professional development clear? Yes				
	Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes				
	Budget				
	Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes				
	Composition				
	Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes				
	4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?				
	Recommendation for disqualification				
	Applicant's proposal was less than 500 words	23	27	15	30
102055776	Plans are clearly stated	25	30	15	30