GSA Grant Review Checklist

Academic Year: _______________  
Application Number: ___________

Grant Cycle:  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4
Grant Type:   ☐ Conference Presentation  
              ☐ Conference Attendance  
              ☐ Research Grant

Reviewer: ____________________  
Bear Number: _____________________

Decision:  
Funded   ☐  
Not-Funded ☐

I. Eligibility
☐ Completed more than 18 credit hours, enrolled in minimum 1 credit hour.
☐ Completed less than 18 credit hours, enrolled in a minimum of 6 credit hours.
☐ Not eligible for funding

II. Conference or research occurs during the funding timeframe:
☐ Yes  
☐ No

III. Application Includes
For Attendees:  
☐ Course Schedule  
☐ Conference Info  
☐ Expense Budget
For Presenters:  
☐ Course Schedule  
☐ Conference Info  
☐ Expense Budget
For Research:  
☐ Course Schedule  
☐ IRB Approval or Statement  
☐ Detailed Budget  
☐ Presentation Confirmation

IV. Expenses
☐ Requests include allowed expenses (travel, lodging, registration fee, mileage, parking)  
☐ Request includes prohibited expenses

V. Narrative Questions

Question 1: How will funding/conducting this research contribute to your education?

Approval: ☐ Provided a sufficient explanation, including following application instructions of at least 4 sentences. The answer clearly draws connections from your area of study and the conference being attended or research conducted. The reviewers were able to get a clear picture of how this conference or research will benefit your education, not simply what the conference or research is about.

Denial: ☐ Does not provide a sufficient explanation. The answer is vague and generalized. The grammatical, spelling, or format errors caused the meaning of the answer to be lost.

Question 2: How this funding/conducting this research will contribute to your future career?

Approval: ☐ Provided a sufficient explanation, including following application instructions of at least 4 sentences. The answer shows developmental purpose and future applications. There are specific examples and reasons given. The answer does more than broadly referencing, “networking opportunities and professional connections” in the case of a conference.

Denial: ☐ Does not provide a sufficient explanation. The answer is vague and generalized. The grammatical, spelling, or format errors caused the meaning of the answer to be lost.

Question 3: How this funding/conducting this research will contribute to the betterment of UNC?

Approval: ☐ Provided a sufficient explanation, including following application instructions of at least 4 sentences. The answer describes specific applications to the UNC campus. This can include, but is not limited to, new knowledge brought back from the conference or the expansion of UNC works to the greater academic community in the case of conferences. The information is specific to the individual and provides detailed information.

Denial: ☐ Does not provide a sufficient explanation. The answer is vague and generalized. The grammatical, spelling, or format errors caused the meaning of the answer to be lost.