Applicant Student ID	Reviewer Notes	Background: - Academic interests and goals stated - Activity and its significance described	Benefits: - Benefits linked to professional growth & development - Benefits linked to career goals	Composition: - Clear, flows logically, reasonable -Technical terms defined	Budget: - Complete, detailed, reasonable, logical - Supporting docs/links verified	Total Points
101724121	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 540 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)? To an extent, could be more thorough Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? To an extent, explanation could be connected to field better Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Somewhat Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Somewhat 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 proposal and budget documents are informational and supportive of the application. While the explanation could be more thorough, this is overall a great opportunity that will contribute to the student's academic career.	15	32	9	30	86
101724121	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (540 words) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: - Yes, includes details on training, dates, and purpose Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, PhD student in Experimental Psychology (Development track) focused on meditative and psychedelic experiences. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, attending the Micro-Phenomenology of Meditation workshop in France, Nov 2–6, to enhance interview and analysis skills for dissertation research. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, directly connected to dissertation work on Dzogchen meditation and long-term goals as a researcher and educator in phenomenological inquiry. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, training will deepen research expertise, refine analytic methods, and establish international connections crucial for dissertation and career development. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? - Indirectly; contributes to advancing qualitative research and consciousness studies within UNM and the broader scientific community.	20	40	10	30	100

101724121	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes (approximately 560 words) Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation included? Yes Anonymity: Maintained 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background Applicant's academic focus and research direction are clearly stated. The professional activity is described in sufficient detail, including what, when, and where. The activity aligns well with the applicant's research and academic goals. Benefits The proposed training directly supports the applicant's dissertation and professional skill development. The activity provides long-term value by strengthening methodological	19	38	10	28	95
101669685	-requesting $600 ~580 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents attached Qualify for Award (Highly Recommended for Full Funding) Why: This is an outstanding PDG proposal that checks every box — it's clearly written, fully compliant, and demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of how conference participation advances both individual and institutional goals. The applicant connects attendance to professional advancement, pedagogical improvement, and contributions to state-level public engagement in archaeology. The inclusion of both academic and public-sector benefits strengthens the justification for GPSA funding	20	39	10	30	99
101669685	Recommendation for Qualification: everything was very explicit and clear. The student's attendance at the conference is directly linked to stated career goals.	20	40	8	30	98
101669685	Not recommended for PDG. Enrolled in 3 credits.	20	40	10	30	100

101796832	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (532) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, proposal fulfills all the requirements Complete and reasonable budget backed with supporting documents. 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 Application was great and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Budget were well researched and includes supporting documents Overall, a very strong application and I recommend this application for	20	40	10	30	100
101796832	1. Amount Requested $600 2. Meets word requirement. Budget and supporting doc attached and reasonable. 3. Academic and professional interest and activity described in detail, and also ties to the applicant's field. The benefit is clearly stated. 4. The application qualifies for PDG because the applicant followed all instructions to make a qualified application.	20	40	10	30	100
101796832	Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail. The composition should be improved.	16	35	8	30	89
101892999	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $830 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 537 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 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, the amount requested from GPSA in the budget was more than the maximum amount provided for the PDG grant. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) The applicant's budget had a total amount request from GPSA in the budget	19	39	8	20	86

101892999	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Possibly not Word count: 480 if schedule of conference is not included, 549 if it is Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal and budget documents are comprehensive and supportive of their application, there is an essential item missing. The application does not have a verified commitment provided, leading to a recommendation for disqualification. The word count is also iffy, as the schedule was likely copied and pasted from another source and doesn't necessarily add anything of substance to the application.	15	35	9	30	89
101892999	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (548 words) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Yes – includes detailed schedule and conference information Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, PhD student in Computer Science specializing in computational biology and simulation-based modeling. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, attending the Society for Women Engineers (SWE) Conference 2025 in New Orleans, Oct 22–25. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, aligns with research in computational modeling and professional goals in academia or industry post-graduation (Fall 2026). Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, includes exposure to new research, skill-building workshops, and professional development relevant to simulation modeling and computing. 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, $600 request for travel and conference expenses Composition	20	40	10	30	100

102017333	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (~590) Budget template: Complete Supporting documents: Included and appropriate 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: Applicant's academic goals and research interests are clearly defined. The described activity is relevant and well aligned with their field in anthropology. Benefits: Demonstrates clear professional value through networking, skill development, and exposure to current research. Strong connection to long-term academic and career objectives. Budget: Well-detailed, reasonable, and supported with proper documentation. Composition: Organized, clearly written, and easy to follow. Recommendation: Qualify. The proposal effectively connects the planned activity to professional growth and meets all PDG requirements.	19	39	10	28	96
102017333	-requesting $600 ~585 words (within limit) -Required documents submitted *Qualify for Award Why: The applicant provides a clear, engaging narrative demonstrating how attending the AABA conference directly supports professional development goals relevant to their academic stage. The proposal meets PDG requirements (word count, eligibility, activity type). Assuming a proper budget submission, the application is strong and well-written, with clear benefits to the applicant's growth and field engagement. Suggested Minor Improvement: Explicitly list specific workshops or professional sessions to enhance the "Benefits" section and strengthen justification for conference attendance.	18	36	10	30	94
102017333	Recommendation for Qualification: student explains research in-depth and mostly for a lay audience. Hotel room has been paid, showing intent to attend event.	20	40	8	30	98
101784302	Not recommended for PDG. No future date for attending the conference. The applicant attended the conference on July 23 and 24.	20	39	8	25	92

101784302	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (519) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, proposal fulfills all the requirements Complete and reasonable budget backed with supporting documents. Conference happened on 23-24th July, 2025 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 Application was strong and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals Budget was well researched and included supporting documents Overall, a very strong application and I recommend this application for	20	40	10	30	100
101784302	1. Amount requested $600 2. Meets word count with complete budget and support docs. 3. Academic & professional interest and activity explained clearly, and it is tied to the applicant's field.	20	40	10	30	100
101912227	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $548 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 576 Budget template complete? No; filled out but item is not related to proposal Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no verified commitment related to proposal 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? No; unsure why amount was requested, missing key documentation to support budget Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal is informational and thorough, this application is incomplete and missing key information. There is no correlation between the supporting documents, the budget template, and the proposal. As such, I recommend disqualification.	17	35	9	0	61

101912227	Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (555) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Partially, no commitment made Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes, 3rd-year PhD student in Electrical and Computer Engineering researching efficient wireless communication and network optimization using AI and machine learning. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, attending Decoding Science Communication: A Workshop for DREAM Center Researchers at NMSU in Las Cruces, NM, September 15–16. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, directly connected to the research focus and the long-term goal of becoming a professor in computer engineering. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, workshop attendance will expand knowledge, provide exposure to cutting-edge AI and wireless communication research, and support professional growth. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? N/A Does the budget seem reasonable, well-researched, and justified? Yes, $600 request for travel to Las Cruces and attendance expenses is reasonable and justified by clear academic relevance.	20	40	10	25	95
101912227	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $548 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (~550) Budget template: Complete Supporting documents: Included and appropriate 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: The applicant clearly presents their academic interests in computer engineering and outlines the purpose and scope of the professional development activity. The description of the "Decoding Science Communication" workshop is specific, relevant, and well connected to their research and teaching trajectory. Benefits: The proposal effectively demonstrates how participation will strengthen professional communication, collaboration, and presentation skills, which are critical for success in both academia and industry. The applicant highlights how this workshop will enhance their capacity to convey technical information to broader audiences—an increasingly important skill in engineering research. Budget: The requested funds are reasonable, well-documented, and justified for travel and registration expenses. Costs are consistent with university policy and proportional to the benefit of the activity. Composition: The proposal is coherent, concise, and written in a professional tone. The structure follows a logical progression and is free of errors or unnecessary jargon. Recommendation: Qualify. A strong and well-organized application that clearly connects the proposed activity to the applicant's professional development goals and contributes meaningfully to their career	19	38	10	28	95

101967721	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $775 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (547) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicants didn't show at least one verified commitment (purchased flight, conference registration and hotel booking). 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? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant didn't show any verified commitment pertaining to the conference	20	40	10	15	85
101967721	1. Amount requested from the budget is $775 2. Meet word count. The budget is partial as the link or support document for Uber transportation was not included. Some required support documents were submitted and are justifiable. 3. Academic, professional interest, and activity are explained clearly and are tied to the applicant's field. The applicant stated a graduation date of May 2025, which is not logical given the conference date. 4. Application is qualified for PDG as the requirements needed to make a qualified application were followed.	20	40	6	27	93
101967721	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail. The composition should be improved. The applicant didn't provide at least one verified commitment. Airfare and conference registration are not finalized and confirmed.	16	35	8	15	74
102026423	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~540) Budget template complete? Costs are explained—membership, exam fees, study materials Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a first-year Ph.D. student in Exercise Science with a strong academic record, including a recent master's degree and Outstanding Student recognition. The proposed professional development activity is pursuing the NSCA CPSS certification between October 2025 and April 2026. Strong alignment with academic and career goals in sports science research and university teaching, particularly in elite athletic performance and recovery. Clearly explains the significance and uniqueness of the CPSS credential, particularly its relevance in professional sports, research, and high-performance training settings. Benefits are well-articulated: enhances current research on percussion therapy, builds competencies in athlete monitoring and data analytics, and improves career competitiveness.	20	40	10	30	100

102026423	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 545 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 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 links to the budget does to show the exact links and amounts of the stated amount in the budget Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes	18	38	9	20	85
102026423	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 543 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no verified commitment related to proposal 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 informational and thorough, this application is incomplete and missing a key element. There is no verified commitment related to the proposal. As such, I recommend disqualification.	19	40	9	30	98
102010961	Recommendation for Qualification: while the proposal is not written for a lay audience, the benefits of the conference on the student's work is clear and well-linked.	15	40	5	30	90
102010961	Not recommended for PDG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket.	17	36	8	26	87

102010961	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (582) Budget template complete? (Yes) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Great proposal, grant proposal fulfills all the requirements Complete and reasonable budget backed with supporting documents (hotel booking). Conference is taking place on January 29 - February 1 2026 Some abbreviations (PAS, ITS, qPCR) were not defined 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 Application was great and benefits were linked to applicants long-term and short-term goals	20	40	8	30	98
102014272	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 597 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 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 some of the links in the budget were not verifiable Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes	20	36	9	25	90

102014272	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 597 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no verified commitment related to proposal 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 informational and thorough, this application is incomplete and missing a key element. There is no verified commitment related to the proposal. As such, I recommend disqualification.	18	36	9	25	88
102014272	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (597) Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: Partial, no commitment to conference Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, third-year PhD student in History at UNM researching 20th-century Latin American women's history, focusing on Uruguay and Argentina. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, attending the American Historical Association Annual Meeting in Chicago, Jan 8–11, 2026, with specific panels and workshops listed. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, strongly aligned with dissertation development and long-term goals in teaching and publishing within Latin American and gender history. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, attending workshops on AI in archival research, Cold War and Gender panels, and publishing strategies directly supports dissertation research and professional advancement. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes, the applicant plans to apply conference learning to improve teaching at UNM and raise the institution's scholarly profile through publications. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified?	20	40	10	25	95

102060052	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (~590) Budget template: Complete Supporting documents: Included and verified 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: The applicant clearly articulates their academic interests in Francophone African literature and postcolonial theory. The proposed participation at the RMMLA conference is well described, timely, and directly connected to their master's research and stage of study. Benefits: Attending the conference will significantly enhance the applicant's professional development by providing opportunities to connect with scholars in related disciplines, exchange ideas, and receive feedback that can strengthen their thesis work. Exposure to new research perspectives will deepen their theoretical understanding, while participation will build confidence and improve communication and networking skills crucial for an academic career. Budget: Well-organized, justified, and supported by receipts. The expenses are appropriate and consistent with UNM travel policy. Composition: The proposal is concise, well-written, logically structured, and accessible to a general academic audience. Recommendation: Qualify. A strong and focused proposal that effectively links the professional development activity to both immediate academic	20	39	10	29	98
102060052	-requesting $600 ~580 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents attached Qualify for Award (Highly Recommended for Full Funding) Why: This is an exemplary PDG application. The student demonstrates strong alignment between academic and professional goals, provides detailed justification for the professional relevance of the activity, and submits all required materials. The proposal flows logically, is well-written, and clearly articulates how the conference will enhance their development as a scholar and educator. There are no disqualifying or weak elements — this proposal should rank at the top of PDG submissions.	20	39	10	30	99
102060052	Recommendation of Disqualification: Budget seems incomplete and is confusing. The student's essay sometimes talks very generally about what a conference is and how it helps students. Its just very odd. The student does point out which panels they plan to attend and how it will help their dissertation. I'm also confused on the student's program. In the HTML fill-out, it states that they are pursuing an MA, but the proposal says that they are a third semester PhD student. I'm overall very confused, and am inclined to reject this application.	10	40	10	15	75
102023524	Not recommended for PDG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket.	16	34	7	23	80

102023524	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600.06 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (595) Budget template complete? (No) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicants didn't show at least one verified commitment (purchased flight and conference registration). Conference will take place from 8-11 January, 2026 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? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant didn't show any verified commitment pertaining to the conference	20	40	10	15	85
102023524	1. Amount Requested $600 2. Meets word count. Complete budget with support doc, 3. Academic & professional interest and activity explained and ties to the applicant's field.	20	40	10	30	100
101791935	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 525 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no verified commitment related to proposal 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, but could be more thorough Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Yes, but could be more thorough 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 informational and thorough, this application is incomplete and missing a key element. There is no verified commitment related to the proposal. As such, I recommend disqualification.	16	32	9	30	87

101791935	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: No, no supporting docs except a picture of the conference flyer and no commitment to attending Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes, master's student in Educational Psychology and practicing educational diagnostician focused on assessment, special education law, and equitable learning support. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes, attending NASP 2026 Annual Convention in Chicago, Feb 24–27, 2026, with detailed travel and registration information. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes, directly linked to professional development in psychoeducational assessment and advancement toward leadership in educational psychology. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes, enhances expertise in assessment, legal frameworks, and culturally responsive practice; provides access to leading research and networking opportunities. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes, new skills and knowledge will directly improve evaluation quality and	20	40	10	10	80
101791935	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (~570) Budget template: Complete Supporting documents: Included and verified 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: The applicant clearly explains their academic and professional focus in educational psychology and their role as an educational diagnostician. The NASP 2026 Convention is described in detail, with clear logistics and relevance to their field. Benefits: The proposal strongly connects conference participation to professional growth, emphasizing updated knowledge in psychoeducational assessment, special education law, and culturally responsive practices. The applicant effectively demonstrates how this training will enhance current practice, support future certification goals, and directly benefit students in New Mexico through improved evaluation methods. Budget: Comprehensive, well-documented, and appropriate for the scope of travel and attendance. All costs are justified and align with UNM travel guidelines. Composition: The writing is clear, concise, and professionally structured, with logical flow and minimal jargon. Recommendation: Qualify. Excellent proposal that aligns with PDG objectives by linking a well-defined professional activity to immediate and long-term career development in educational psychology.	18	38	10	29	95
102090028	-requesting $600 ~575 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents attached Qualify for Award (Highest Recommendation for Full Funding) Why: This is a model PDG proposal. The applicant demonstrates a clear and compelling connection between professional goals and the funded activity, includes a complete budget and documentation, and articulates an exceptionally strong understanding of how conference participation and membership will advance their professional trajectory. It exemplifies every scoring criterion: detailed background, measurable benefits, perfect compliance, and strong writing.	20	40	10	30	100

102090028	Recommendation for Qualification: the proposal is well-written, but doesn't explain their research for a lay audience. Everything looks clear and linked to the student's career goals.	20	40	7	30	97
102090028	Not recommended for PDG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket.	18	36	8	26	88
101979375	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (Yes) (520) Budget template complete? (No) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicants didn't show at least one verified commitment (purchased flight and conference registration). 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? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant didn't show any verified commitment pertaining to the conference	20	40	10	15	85
101979375	1. Amount Requested $1000 2. Meets word count and has a complete and reasonable budget. 3. Academic & professional interest stated. The activity was explained, and the benefit was tied to the applicant's field. 4. The application qualifies for PDG because it followed all the instructions to make a qualified application.	20	40	10	30	100
101979375	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail. Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail. The applicant didn't provide at least one verified commitment. Airfare and conference registration are not finalized and confirmed. The link provided in the budget table for a round-trip flight ticket is a link to the 1st page on the Southwest website. An accurate link must be provided.	16	30	10	15	71

101982666	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~530) Budget template complete? Narrative mentions financial need due to commitments to other major conferences. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a Ph.D. student in Medieval Studies with a strong academic record, entering the dissertation-writing stage. Proposal centers on attendance at the “Medievalists Design Games” workshop at the University of Chicago, Dec 5–7, 2025. Activity is both scholarly and creative, blending academic research, public outreach, and game design—clearly aligned with both academic and professional goals. Applicant articulates three concrete benefits: Networking with scholars and designers Advancing freelance game design work Developing scholarly outreach skills through public-facing work	20	40	10	30	100
101982666	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $ 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? No – 529 words Budget template complete? No 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 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 Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes	19	39	9	30	97

101982666	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 527 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No; no verified commitment related to proposal 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, linkage to benefits could be clearer and strengthened 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 informational and thorough, this application is incomplete and missing a key element. There is no verified commitment related to the proposal. As such, I recommend disqualification.	17	35	8	30	90
102021067	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes (596) Budget template complete: Yes Required supporting docs: Yes, but no commitment Evaluation of Narrative Background - Third-year PhD student in Economics, entering research phase, Attending SEA Conference in Tampa, FL, Nov 22–24, 2025 Connection to goals: - Link to research focus on environmental change, resource management, and development economics Benefits Academic/professional development: - Yes, provides exposure to methods, debates, and networks shaping dissertation work Benefits to the community: - Indirect; research aligns with issues relevant to NM and broader climate and development contexts Budget Reasonable and justified; Supports travel and participation, supplemented by $500 departmental funding Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification Qualification Why: Missing commitment to the conference	20	40	10	25	95

102021067	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (~580) Budget template: Complete Supporting documents: Included and verified 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: The applicant clearly outlines their academic trajectory and professional focus in environmental and development economics. The SEA Conference is well described with details on timing, purpose, and direct connection to their current dissertation stage. Benefits: Strong justification for attendance. The proposal emphasizes networking, exposure to new research methods, and engagement with professional development workshops. The applicant effectively explains how this experience will refine their dissertation focus, improve presentation skills, and expand career opportunities in academia. Budget: Reasonable, well-documented, and consistent with UNM travel policies. Composition: Concise, coherent, and professional in tone; proposal reads smoothly and is easy to follow. Recommendation: Qualify. A well-structured, relevant, and professionally aligned proposal that demonstrates clear academic and career impact.	19	38	10	29	96
102021067	-requesting $600 ~590 words (within range) -Completed budget template, supporting documents attached Qualify for Award (Highly Recommended for Full Funding) Why: This is a top-tier PDG submission. It meets every criterion with clarity and depth — strong academic alignment, clear articulation of professional development outcomes, complete documentation, and responsible budgeting. The applicant convincingly explains how this conference directly supports both current research and long-term career goals. It also demonstrates thoughtful engagement with professional norms and discipline-specific growth opportunities, which exemplifies what the PDG program is designed to support.	20	39	10	30	99
102025697	1. Amount Requested $599 2. Application meets word count. The budget template is complete with a support document. 3. Academic & professional interest was clearly stated. The applicant was not specific about the conference date and location. Support doc and link to hotel booking shows a date of 22-25 October, which does not match the conference date (22-24 November. Activity is tied to the applicant's field 4 Application qualifies for PDG as all instructions were followed	16	40	10	20	86
102025697	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail. The composition should be improved. The applicant didn't provide at least one verified commitment. The hotel booking, airfare, and registration are not finalized and confirmed.	16	35	8	15	74

102025697	Amount Requested: $599 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~580) Budget template complete? Funding need is clearly articulated (conference attendance, travel. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a second-year Ph.D. student in Economics, having passed qualifying exams and entering the field paper stage. Strong academic and professional focus on environmental and development economics, with a regional focus on South Asia and pollution-related trade-offs. Funding is requested for attendance at the Southern Economic Association (SEA) Annual Meeting in November. Narrative demonstrates deep engagement with current methodological debates (e.g., causal inference, TWFE models, synthetic controls), showing a clear plan to leverage the conference for dissertation development. Benefits are thoroughly articulated: Exposure to relevant sessions (air pollution, environmental compliance, econometrics, development, gender).	20	40	10	30	100
101914862	Recommendation for Disqualification: PDF essay is less than the minimum of 500 words. Other than the wordcount, this application meets all other criteria.	20	40	10	30	100
101914862	Not recommended for PDG. The screenshot of airline ticket and hotel reservation does not substantially proof the purchase of real airline ticket and hotel reservation.	20	39	9	24	92
101914862	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (435) Budget template complete? (No) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicants didn't show at least one verified commitment (purchased flight and hotel booking). Applicant wrote providing acceptance letter in the proposal 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? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification Applicant didn't show any verified commitment pertaining to the conference Applicants proposal was less than five hundred (500) words	20	40	10	15	85
102009745	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail. The applicant didn't provide at least one verified commitment. The applicant should use the GPSA budget template. The applicant's budget table doesn't have "LINK TO VERIFY BUDGET ITEMS AND COSTS", "LINK TO VERIFY OTHER SOURCE OF FUNDING", and "total cost" columns.	16	35	10	15	76

102009745	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? No (Word count: ~700) Budget template complete? The narrative explains the purpose and need—registration, travel, lodging. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a graduate student focused on healthcare quality improvement, patient safety, and equity-driven system reform. The proposed activity is attendance at the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) Forum 2025, December 7–10 in Anaheim, CA—an internationally recognized conference in the applicant's field. Strong and clear alignment with academic focus and long-term career goal of becoming a healthcare improvement leader working at the intersection of research, policy, and operational leadership. Specific sessions and tools (PDSA, Lean Six Sigma, equity-focused care, leadership) are described, linking directly to current research. Applicant is engaged in an active research project under faculty mentorship, studying QI implementation in community health settings. Clear benefit to academic development, future career planning, and the broader UNM community via applied research and knowledge-sharing.	20	40	10	30	100
102009745	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 594 words Budget template complete? No 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 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? No, the applicant failed to use the provided budget template to accurate show the budget for the grant proposal. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)	18	39	9	10	76

101652910	Justification for disqualification: Did not submit a PDG proposal, submitted additional GSF proposal. Disqualify (Not Eligible for PDG Funding) Why: While the applicant is articulate and demonstrates clear academic and career goals, the funding request is ineligible under PDG because it supports tuition, textbooks, and fees rather than professional development activities such as conferences, workshops, or trainings. Additionally, the narrative falls slightly below the 500-word minimum and does not describe a qualifying event or activity. Score justification: Suggested Revision (to make it PDG-eligible): If the student reframed the proposal around attending a professional planning conference (e.g., APA National Conference), completing a specialized GIS or transportation safety workshop, or participating in a training relevant to transportation planning, it could then qualify as a strong PDG submission	10	10	10	10	40
101652910	Recommendation of Disqualification: Proposal is less than the word minimum of 500 words. Student submitted wrong essay. They have uploaded a GSF application for the PDG grant. Student states that they have been enrolled in graduate program for more than 1 semester, yet their proposal states that they are a first-year graduate student. Budget is confusing. Says meals only cost $40.44, but a page below has meals and incidentals listed as $280. Perhaps because of the constraining nature of the PDG max amount of $600, the student only put costs that add up to $600?	10	0	7	15	32
101652910	Not recommended for PDG. No substantial proof of purchase for airline ticket.	17	35	8	27	87
100894207	The significance of the activity should be described in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail. Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail. The composition should be improved. Applicant's proposal has 249 words (fewer than 500 words).	16	30	5	30	81
100894207	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~250) Budget template complete? Costs are described (conference attendance, travel) Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a Teacher for Students with Visual Impairments enrolled in the UNM POLLEN Ed.D. program, with a dual focus on Indigenous education and visual impairment support. Activity proposed is attending the National Indian Education Association (NIEA) Conference, October 7–12, 2025, in Spokane, WA. Conference is highly aligned with applicant's professional and academic goals—focus areas include Special Education, Early Childhood, Indigenous student support, and visual impairments. Proposal reflects clear intent to engage with relevant sessions, observe poster presentations, and develop professional skills in research dissemination. Applicant demonstrates strong professional motivation and explains the financial strain of current tuition payments, making the request timely and justified.	20	40	10	30	100

100894207	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $1528.91 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? No – 249 words Budget template complete? No 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 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? No, the budget is not complete and justified. The total amount from GPSA was more than the total amount for the grant and some fields were not completed. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) I am recommending this application for disqualification because the budget	15	25	7	15	62
102085677	Recommendation for Disqualification: proposal is less than the minimum of 500 words. The student is studying remotely, and has earned prior permission from GPSA to apply to PGD. The student has shown financial need.	10	30	8	30	78
102085677	Not recommended for PDG. No substantial evidence for the purchase of airline ticket.	15	30	6	23	74
102085677	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? (No) (347) Budget template complete? (No) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? (No) Letters of support are not needed for this application (PDG) 3. Evaluation of Narrative Applicants didn't show at least one verified commitment (purchased flight and hotel booking). Conference will take place from February, 2026. The exact duration of the conference was not stated Academic interests and goals stated were not stated Benefits linked to professional growth & development and career goals were not stated Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? No Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? No 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? No Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for disqualification	10	20	10	15	55

101890849	The applicant didn't provide at least one verified commitment. The hotel booking receipt doesn't have confirmation and lacks any indication that it is confirmed and finalized. The applicant is a PhD candidate. Therefore, he/she needs to pay the student fee, which is $ 1,200. He/she expected to receive $2500 from the School of Engineering scholarship and his/her advisor. Why does he/she still need to apply for PDG? The provided information by the applicant in his/her proposal, budget, and cost file is confusing.	20	40	10	10	80
101890849	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~625) Budget template complete? Partial (Proposal includes cost estimates and mentions partial funding from advisor) Required supporting docs (letters of support) included? Yes Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a Ph.D. candidate in final semester; clearly states academic focus in advanced nuclear reactor systems. The proposed activity is attending the SCALE/ORIGEN workshop at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), October 6–10, 2025. Directly aligned with the applicant's research in reactor modeling and career goals in national labs. Benefits include skill development in SCALE/ORIGEN software, fuel cycle analysis, and enhanced job competitiveness. While the proposal focuses primarily on personal academic development, broader impacts include contributions to national/international nuclear research communities.	20	40	10	30	100
101890849	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 55 6words Budget template complete? No - However the amount stated in the budget does not seem accurate or consistent. 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 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? The budget appears inconsistent, as the requested amount does not match the total amount. There are no additional funds or line items shown that would explain the difference or make the totals align. Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes	20	40	9	24	93

100128065	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~620) Budget template complete? Partial (Costs are implied—conference attendance, travel) Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a doctoral student in Communication and Journalism, with a clear focus on health communication in diverse populations. The proposed activity is attendance at the National Communication Association (NCA) Conference, November 20–23, 2025, in Denver, Colorado. Conference content is highly relevant to the applicant's dissertation and research interests—especially in identity-centered, qualitative, and community-engaged health communication. Professional development benefits are clearly described: exposure to national scholars, new methodologies, and career pathways. Broader impacts include improving community-informed health communication and strengthening local applications in New Mexico through knowledge gained. Budget is generally reasonable (for a national conference), though more	20	40	10	30	100
100128065	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count requirement? Yes – 528 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 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 the budget seems reasonable and well researched and justified Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? - yes	19	39	10	30	98

100128065	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Check Meets word count? Yes Word count: 527 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting docs (e.g. letters of support) included? No 3. Narrative Evaluation Background Are academic/professional interests and degree stage clear? Yes Is the project/activity described (what, when, where)? Yes Is it clearly connected to the applicant's field or goals? Yes Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's development clear? Yes Are community or academic benefits explained (if applicable)? Somewhat Budget Is the budget reasonable and well justified? Yes Writing Quality Is it well-written, organized, and free of jargon? Yes 4. Recommendation Disqualify Reason (2–3 sentences): While the proposal and budget documents are comprehensive and supportive of their application, there is an essential item missing. The application does not have a verified commitment provided, leading to a recommendation for disqualification.	14	30	9	25	78
101171207	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance Meets word count requirement: Yes Budget template complete (activity budget and supporting docs): Yes Required supporting docs and letters of collaboration (letters of support) included: partial, no commitment made Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, doctoral candidate in Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education focused on community schools and educational justice. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, attending the 2026 National Community Schools and Family Engagement Conference in Long Beach, CA, May 2026. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, directly related to dissertation and long-term goal of preparing and supporting educators in New Mexico. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, attending will refine dissertation design, connect theory with practice, and strengthen research relevance. Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? - Yes, focuses on improving educator preparation and advancing educational justice in New Mexico. Budget Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? - Yes, request for travel and attendance expenses is appropriate and	20	40	10	25	95

101171207	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count? Yes (~580) Budget complete? Yes Supporting docs? Yes 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: Goals and academic context clearly stated; activity well described and tied to degree field. Benefits: Strong link to professional development and community engagement. Budget: Reasonable and well supported. Composition: Clear and professional writing. 4. Recommendation Qualify. Proposal is concise, relevant, and well aligned with PDG goals. Budget and documentation meet requirements.	19	38	10	28	95
101171207	Justification for disqualification: Proposal is only 466 words, minimum of 500 words.	20	40	10	30	100
101957597	1. Amount Requested $599 2. Application is 23 words over the word count and verbose. Complete budget template attached with support document. 3. Degree, academic and professional interest clearly stated. The activity was well explained and tied to the applicant's field. The SHPE acronym was not explained. 4. This application does not qualify for PDG because the applicant went over the word count.	20	40	5	30	95
101957597	Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail. The composition should be improved. The applicant didn't provide at least one verified commitment. The hotel booking receipt doesn't have confirmation and lacks any indication that it is confirmed and finalized.	16	35	8	20	79
101957597	Amount Requested: $599 Meets word count requirement? Yes (Word count: ~600) Budget template complete? The proposal explains need for funding for travel and lodging. Evaluation of Narrative Applicant has recently completed a Master's in Electrical Engineering, is currently pursuing a second Master's in Project Management, and plans further coursework in Cybersecurity—clearly showing an academic and professional development path. Proposal details attendance at the 2025 SHPE National Convention (Oct 29–Nov 1 in Philadelphia), including targeted tracks (SHPETech, SHPEtinas, Graduate Expo). Direct relevance to applicant's career goals in technical leadership, engineering innovation, and mentorship. Professional development benefits are clearly outlined: technical and leadership workshops, internship networking, doctoral pathway exploration, and exposure to 200+ employers. Broader community benefits are included: applicant mentors others via PNMGC and plans to bring insights back to UNM students, potentially creating new connections for future collaborations and student	20	40	10	30	100

101906819	Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 Application Compliance 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 commitment. Evaluation of Narrative Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? - Yes, PhD student researching social justice, migration, and care economies through a transnational feminist lens. Is the activity/research/project described in detail (what, when, where)? - Yes, plans to attend the Sociological Association of Ireland Annual Conference in Belfast, May 7–8, 2026. Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? - Yes, directly aligned with the dissertation on transnational caregiving and mobility regimes and long-term goal of advancing community-engaged research. Benefits Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? - Yes, attending supports international engagement, exposure to global scholarship, and networking with migration and gender researchers. 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, $600 request for airfare is reasonable and within grant limits; applicant	20	40	10	25	95
101906819	1. Eligibility & Status Amount Requested: $600 2. Application Compliance Meets word count: Yes (~580) Budget template: Complete Supporting documents: Included 3. Evaluation of Narrative Background: Applicant clearly defines academic goals and dissertation focus on migration and care economies. The proposed conference attendance in Belfast is well described and appropriately timed for the dissertation phase. Benefits: Strong articulation of how attending will broaden professional networks, enhance global engagement, and support academic job market preparation. The proposal effectively ties the activity to long-term professional and scholarly development. Budget: Request is reasonable, justified, and limited to airfare. Documentation aligns with PDG requirements. Composition: Exceptionally clear, well-organized, and written in a professional, concise tone. Recommendation: Qualify. The proposal is compelling and demonstrates a clear, direct connection between the conference and the applicant's professional advancement.	20	40	10	29	99

101906819	-requesting $600 ~580 words (within range) -Incomplete budget template, supporting documents missing/insufficient *Disqualified for Award Why: This is a high-quality, well-written proposal that perfectly aligns with the PDG's mission; attending an international professional conference directly connected to the applicant's research, career goals, and academic development. However, incomplete budget documentation and missing supporting materials place it below full compliance. Under GPSA Code Section 4.E and 4.F, missing or incomplete budget materials may result in disqualification at the discretion of the Grants Chair. If permitted for review, it would still be considered a strong contender with moderate scoring penalties. *Would qualify if budget documentation is corrected; otherwise disqualified for incompleteness.	20	38	10	15	83
101321914	1. Amount Requested $600 2. 3. Academic/professional interest and activity were clearly explained and are tied to the applicant's field. The budget seems justifiable 4. This application does not qualify for PDG because the applicant did not state the credit hours they are taking.	20	40	10	26	96
101321914	Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail. Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail. The composition should be improved. The total cost column of the budget table is the summation of the amount requested from GPSA and other resources.	16	30	8	28	82
101321914	Amount Requested: $600 Meets word count requirement? No (~800 words) Budget template complete? The proposal outlines cost components Evaluation of Narrative Applicant is a first-year Ph.D. student in Exercise Science with a strong academic record and recent master's completion. The activity (CPSS certification) is highly aligned with the applicant's academic and professional goals in elite sports performance and university teaching. Certification is well-explained and directly relevant to research in muscle recovery, sports physiology, and performance optimization. Emphasis on real-world applications, future research collaborations, and academic competitiveness adds strong value. Budget is reasonable, though a more specific breakdown would help. Narrative is very well-written and clearly communicates value. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?	20	40	10	30	100