

Applicant Student ID	Reviewer Notes	Backgr ound: - Acade mic interes ts and goals stated - Activity and its signific ance descri bed	Benefit s: - Benefit s linked to profess ional growth & develo pment - Benefit s linked to career goals	Comp ositio n: - Clear, flows logica lly, reaso nable - Techn ical terms defin ed	Budget : - Compl ete, detaile d, reason able, logical - Support ing docs/li nks verifie d	Total Points	Percen t Score
101129669	The budget template was used and supporting document were provided. Benefits were clearly stated and linked to professional growth and career. Academic goals and the significant of the activity were explained.	18	38	8	23	87	87%
101129669	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?</p> <p>Qualification recommended</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101129669	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$ 600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (No)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (No)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Disqualification applicant failed to maintain anonymity and also did not use the right budget template.</p>	19	38	8	5	70	70%
101278103	<p>The applicant clearly explains their doctoral research on BIM, AI, and technology adoption in the construction industry. Attending the AIA conference strongly connects to their research and career goals. The proposal shows clear professional value and academic relevance. Writing is very clear and well organized. The budget appears reasonable and supported.</p>	18	35	9	27	89	89%
101278103	<p>Applicant is not anonymous. Identity is not redacted at the supporting docs. I am rejecting the applicant for PDG.</p>	5	5	5	5	20	20%
101278103	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant satisfies all requirements adequately)</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101609659	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) qualification: no barriers</p>	20	35	10	30	95	95%
101609659	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Background: The applicant clearly describes their academic background, regional connection to the Southwest, and the certification activity, though the exam logistics (date, location, and process) could be described more specifically.</p> <p>Recommendation: The question is, IS THIS CERTIFICATION REQUIRED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF NM? If No, then it should not be funded. Until we deduced that, I will go ahead and grade.</p>	17	38	9	30	94	94%
101609659	<p>Academic interests should be stated in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>The composition should be improved.</p> <p>The supporting document doesn't include receipts or proof of all costs mentioned in the budget table</p>	16	35	8	27	86	86%
101712775	Recommended for PDG.	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101712775	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$0</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (No)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (No)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes/No)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes/No)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (This application does not qualify for this grant because no application materials were attached to this application.)</p>	0	0	0	0	0	0%
101712775	<p>Amount Requested: Unsure</p> <p>Application Compliance</p> <p>Meets word count requirement? No</p> <p>Required supporting docs included? No</p> <p>Benefits</p> <p>Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? No</p> <p>Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? No</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Budget template complete? No</p> <p>Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No budget provided</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Is the need described in detail? No</p> <p>Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? No</p> <p>Composition</p> <p>Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? No</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)</p> <p>This student failed to fill out the entire application and submitted it incomplete. As such, I must recommend disqualification.</p>	0	0	0	0	0	0%

101715668	<p>Word count:520</p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates their research interests and professional goals and provides a strong justification for attending the CPA conference. The proposal effectively explains how the conference will contribute to the applicant's research development, dissertation preparation, and professional networking.</p>	18	34	9	22	83	83%
101715668	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification because applicant has made direct connections between attending the conference and the benefit it will have on their research, specifically their dissertation.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101715668	<p>The proposal clearly outlines the applicant’s research interests in addiction science and the goal of addressing substance use among underrepresented populations. The connection between conference attendance and long-term research goals is clear, though the proposal could provide more detail regarding current research activities.</p> <p>Benefits: The applicant explains how attending the CPA conference will provide exposure to current research, methodological approaches, and networking opportunities. The conference theme aligns well with the applicant’s research interests. More specific examples of sessions or expected academic outcomes would strengthen this section.</p> <p>Composition: The proposal is well organized and generally easy to follow. Some sentences are repetitive, but the overall structure and clarity remain strong.</p> <p>Budget: The budget is complete and includes clear cost estimates for registration, membership, airfare, baggage, and meals. Supporting documentation verifies these costs, and the expenses are reasonable for conference participation.</p>	17	32	8	27	84	84%
101763554	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? Partial 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - * Application could use a simple proofreading e.g. it's one long paragraph which is too hard to read, doesn't specify where the conference will be etc.</p>	20	40	5	27	92	92%

101763554	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why)</p> <p>I must unfortunately recommend this application for disqualification because the proposal is less than 500 words (~473).</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101763554	<p>The application is underwritten. It is expected that the applicant write at least 500 words. The purpose of the fund is mostly clear, but could have been expanded. Similarly, the professional benefits could have been more vividly demonstrated. Hence, I recommend that the fund not be granted this time.</p>	18	37	8	30	93	93%
101767190	<p>Academic background and activity significance were explained. Benefits were link to professional growth and goals. The application was logically composed. The applicant used the budget template and also supported it with documents.</p>	19	37	9	28	93	93%
101767190	<p>Amount Requested: 588</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?</p> <p>Qualification recommended – Activity is a professional development conference outside Albuquerque and aligns with PDG funding criteria.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101767190	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification because applicant meets all basic requirements.</p>	19	37	8	27	91	91%
101841957	<p>The applicant clearly explains research interests in transportation systems, equity, and mobility services. Conference participation strongly supports professional development and research dissemination, especially with two paper presentations. The proposal shows clear alignment with career goals and leadership activities. Writing is clear and well organized. Budget appears reasonable and supported by documentation.</p>	19	36	9	27	91	91%
101841957		20	40	10	30	100	100%
101841957	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Proof not concrete. Only shows prices of tickets online and not proof of purchase</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant qualifies for funding but only needs to provide concrete proof of purchases pertaining to conference)</p>	20	40	10	15	85	85%

101872661	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Qualification: no barriers</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101872661	Benefits linked to professional development is quite vague	17	33	8	29	87	87%
101872661	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$1368</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (No)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Recommendation for disqualification for the reason being that the applicant did not redact his name from the conference paper acceptance email. The applicant did not provide the correct link to justify the lodging cost. I could only account for \$450 of the budget.)</p>	20	40	10	25	95	95%

101876677	<p>Background Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes Is the need described in detail? Somewhat Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes Composition Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly) Although this student provides a compelling request for aid, they applied for the PDG, which does not provide for conferences where the student is presenting. Since this is the case here, I must recommend disqualification.</p>	18	35	9	0	62	62%
101876677	<p>Word count: 590 The applicant provides a strong description of their artistic research and clearly connects the summit to their thesis development and professional goals.</p>	17	32	8	25	82	82%
101876677	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? (Yes) 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes) 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes) 5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes) 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. While the proposal is jargon-dense, the applicant makes direct connections between their work and why attending the summit is necessary for their work and is beneficial to their career goals.</p>	20	30	5	30	85	85%

101880713	<p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification</p> <p>Qualified.</p> <p>The applicant meets the administrative requirements for the Professional Development Grant. The proposal falls within the word limit, includes a completed GPSA budget template, and provides documentation verifying the cost of the conference registration. The requested funding supports attendance at the Art + Environment Summit in Reno, which aligns with the applicant's professional development goals in interdisciplinary environmental art.</p>	17	34	8	28	87	87%
101880713	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$340</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes/No)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes/No)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes/No)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - Clear application.</p> <p>Applicant has also already registered for conference and had some costs already covered by another source.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101880713	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$340</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why)</p> <p>I recommend this application for qualification because the proposal is well-written and covers all of the necessary information, their budget is reasonable, and they have strong supporting documents.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101887562	The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101887562	The applicant used the budget template. However, some of the links provided were repetitive and didnt describe the item listed. The applicant also included supporting documents. Academic background and goals were explained. Benefits to professional growth were explained and also linked to career goals. The application was logically composed	18	32	10	26	86	86%
101887562	Amount Requested: 600 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Activity is a professional development conference outside Albuquerque and aligns with PDG funding criteria.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101891577	1. Amount Requested: \$ 600 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification because all the important requirements have been successful fulfilled	18	35	5	28	86	86%

101891577	The applicant clearly explains research interests in trauma, sexual assault, and cultural influences on mental health. Both conference participation and poster presentation strongly support research dissemination and professional development. The proposal shows strong alignment with career goals in academia and interdisciplinary work. Writing is clear and organized, and the budget appears reasonable and supported.	19	37	9	28	93	93%
101891577	I recommend this fourth-year clinical psychology doctoral student for PDG funding, as attending ASA 2025 will directly support their interdisciplinary research, professional development, and career preparation.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101892999	1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Proof not concrete. Only shows prices of registration and not proof of purchase 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant qualifies for funding but only needs to provide concrete proof of purchases pertaining to conference)	20	40	10	15	85	85%
101892999	Grants Scoring Comment Section – PDG 1. Amount Requested: 600\$ 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Qualification: no barriers minus five points for suspected partial AI use.	20	40	5	30	95	95%

101892999	<p>Background: The applicant clearly states their academic program, editorial role, and the conference activity, though the proposal could include more specific details about what the applicant will do at the conference beyond general participation.</p> <p>Benefits: The proposal explains several professional benefits including networking, publication opportunities, and pedagogical development, but the outcomes could be articulated more concretely in relation to long-term career goals.</p> <p>Composition: The proposal is readable and logically structured, though some sentences could be more concise and the opening letter-style format is slightly informal for a grant narrative.</p> <p>Budget: Compliance with GPSA budget template. Provided a breakdown of cost and supporting document.</p> <p>Recommendation: Applicant self identified name, I decided to grade because I don't personally know this individual.</p>	18	37	8	30	93	93%
101898440	<p>Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>The composition should be improved.</p> <p>The supporting document doesn't include receipts or proof of all costs mentioned in the budget table</p>	16	30	8	27	81	81%
101898440	Recommended for PDG.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101898440	Please check the budget documents. I couldn't open the attachments	18	35	8	10	71	71%

101920342	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Applicant did not mention that because it is not an activity that requires traveling)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled. Note that the exams and related activities are scheduled for June and July 2026 (Summer semester).</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101920342	<p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Is the need described in detail? Yes</p> <p>Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes</p> <p>Composition</p> <p>Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)</p> <p>This student's application reflects both academic effort and thoughtful engagement with their goals. Based on the overall strength of the submission, I recommend them for scholarship qualification.</p>	19	38	10	30	97	97%

101920342	<p>Word count:505</p> <p>The applicant clearly outlines their academic interests in power systems and provides a strong rationale for attending the PECl conference for professional development and networking. However, the requested amount exceeds the PDG funding limit and should be adjusted to comply with program guidelines.</p>	17	33	8	25	83	83%
101921187	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$621</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Partial)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant notes that attending the conference will help them by keeping them up-to-date on current industry trends. They don't say much about how this directly aligns with their research interests, but the conference and the applicant are in the same field. Their budget includes links to expedia.com, but not to a specific page showing where they got their ticket pricing. However, they do have a screenshot of prices under their supporting documents.</p>	15	40	10	28	93	93%

101921187	<p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes – Urbana-Champaign, Illinois</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification</p> <p>Disqualified (Budget exceeds PDG limit). The applicant meets most administrative requirements for the Professional Development Grant, including submission of a completed budget template and supporting documentation verifying travel costs. However, the amount requested from GPSA is \$621, which exceeds the PDG maximum funding limit of \$600, making the application technically ineligible under the program guidelines.</p> <p>Scoring Background — 17 / 20 Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly explains the applicant’s academic focus on power systems and renewable energy integration Demonstrates how the PECl conference aligns with the applicant’s academic interests and doctoral aspirations 	17	32	8	25	82	82%
101921187	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - clear application meeting all requirements. Seems like applicant is requesting reimbursement from an event which they had already made payments for already so very committed.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101929409	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because of its strong proposal, clear budget, and good supporting documents.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101929409	<p>The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. However, rather than the applicant's background, the professional benefits could have been expanded a little further. I recommend that the fund be granted.</p>	20	38	10	30	98	98%
101929409	<p>The benefits to professional and career goals were clearly explained. Applicants academic interest and significance were stated. The application was clearly composed. The applicant used the budget template. There were no enough supporting documents to support the application.</p>	18	35	8	19	80	80%

101943373	<p>Amount Requested: 600</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Activity is a professional development conference outside Albuquerque and aligns with PDG funding criteria.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101943373	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (No)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (No)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Disqualification applicant did not use the right budget template, also did not have the right supporting document uploaded.</p>	18	37	8	5	68	68%
101943373	<p>The applicant explains academic goals in computer engineering and interest in cloud computing. The activities support career development and exposure to research and professional opportunities. However, the proposal is somewhat general and provides limited detail about specific research outcomes. Writing is clear and organized, and the budget appears reasonable and documented.</p>	16	30	8	26	80	80%

101944542	The activity appears eligible under PDG guidelines; however, the supporting documentation includes only estimated costs without adequate external verification. The application does not fully meet budget documentation requirements at this time.	10	30	8	10	58	58%
101944542	Has stated her name when everything was supposed to be anonymous. So I recommend disqualify her for PDG	0	0	0	0	0	0%
101944542	<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Proof not concrete. Only shows prices items in cart and not proof of purchase</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? No</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymity maintained? No</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant does not qualify for PDG based on what the funding is required for)</p>	20	40	10	15	85	85%
101953688	<p>Grants Scoring Comment Section – PDG</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? No</p> <p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymity maintained? No</p> <p>6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Disqualification: anonymity not maintained, inappropriate use of funds.</p>	10	0	7	0	17	17%

101953688	<p>Amount Requested: \$591</p> <p>Background: The applicant clearly describes their academic focus, career goals, and conference participation, though the proposal could include more specific details about planned sessions or activities during the convention.</p> <p>Benefits: The proposal explains how attending ISA will support dissertation development, methodological training, and networking, though the professional development outcomes could be articulated more concretely.</p> <p>Composition: The narrative is generally clear and logically organized, though there are minor grammatical issues and several sentences could be more concise.</p> <p>Budget: Used the GPSA budget template. Provided a detail of the budget items and their associated costs.</p>	18	38	9	30	95	95%
101953688	<p>Academic interests should be stated in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>The composition should be improved.</p>	15	35	8	30	88	88%
101955286	Recommended for PDG.	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101955286	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies because all requirements were fulfilled)</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101955286	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Application Compliance</p> <p>Meets word count requirement? Yes (590)</p> <p>Required supporting docs included? Yes</p> <p>Benefits</p> <p>Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes</p> <p>Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Is the need described in detail? Yes</p> <p>Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes</p> <p>Composition</p> <p>Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)</p> <p>While the applicant states they are not formally presenting at the conference, their participation in the Graduate Student Forum involves discussing a research paper developed within</p>	19	37	9	30	95	95%

101957597	<p>Word count: 540</p> <p>The applicant clearly explains how attendance at the AAAA conference supports required professional training and aligns with their academic and clinical goals. The proposal effectively demonstrates how participation will strengthen professional development and preparation for entering the anesthesiologist assistant field.</p>	18	35	9	27	89	89%
101957597	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant is required by department to attend conference, conference will provide valuable feedback and educational conversations.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

101957597	<p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes – Denver, Colorado</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification</p> <p>Qualified.</p> <p>The applicant meets the administrative requirements for the Professional Development Grant. The proposal falls within the word limit, includes a completed GPSA budget template, and provides documentation verifying the estimated airfare and transportation costs associated with attending the American Academy of Anesthesiologist Assistants (AAAA) Conference in Denver. Attendance at this conference aligns with the applicant's academic training and professional development requirements within their anesthesia program.</p> <p>Scoring</p> <p>Background — 18 / 20</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly explains the applicant's academic focus on anesthesia practice, patient safety, and clinical excellence 	18	34	9	27	88	88%
101968654	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes/No)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualify - application is clear and meets all requirements</p>	20	40	8	30	98	98%

101968654	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for qualification because the proposal is clear, the budget is complete, and the supporting documents match the budget.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101968654	<p>The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101978604	<p>The interest, background and goals of the applicant were clearly stated. The significant and intended use of funds were also stated. However, there was no clear path or specific use of the funds. "Consistent access to professional environment". This indicates the applicant does not have a specific use of the funds. The applicant used the budget template but could not use it properly or in the right way. There were also not enough supporting documents.</p>	17	23	10	10	60	60%

101978604	<p>Amount Requested: 600</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes, but Santa Fe</p> <p>Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Disqualification recommended – Activity involves job search activities within Santa Fe and requests funding for items such as professional attire and coworking spaces, which are not allowable PDG expenses.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101978604	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Partial)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Disqualification because applicant did not complete the budget template and also some of the links attached was not accessible.</p>	19	37	9	15	80	80%
101978648	<p>The proposal clearly explains the applicant's academic goals and how attending the ASPA conference will support their professional development. The connection between the conference theme and career goals is strong. I support the candidate for PDG.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101978648	<p>does not have the excel sheet with the budget. So I disqualify her for PDG and the conference is after the cycle.</p>	0	0	0	0	0	0%

101978648	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? No</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? No concrete proof provided except proof of acceptance</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant meets all requirements except a completed budget and proof of funding use)</p>	20	40	10	10	80	80%
101982316	<p>Grants Scoring Comment Section – PDG</p> <p>1. Amount Requested: 600\$</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? No</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? No</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why)</p> <p>Disqualification: no supporting materials or budget.</p>	20	40	10	0	70	70%
101982316	Incomplete Application with no proposal, neither budget and supporting documents provided. Recommendation: Disqualified	0	0	0	0	0	0%
101982316	The applicant didn't submit an essay, a budget, and supporting documents.	0	0	0	0	0	0%
101983054	Not recommended for PDG. Incomplete application.	0	0	0	0	0	0%
101983054		16	29	7	29	81	81%

101983054	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$508</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (All requirements were fulfilled. Application qualifies)</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101984316	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Application Compliance</p> <p>Meets word count requirement? Yes (535)</p> <p>Required supporting docs included? Yes</p> <p>Benefits</p> <p>Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes</p> <p>Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? No</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Is the need described in detail? No</p> <p>Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes</p> <p>Composition</p> <p>Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)</p> <p>The applicant's budget documentation indicates expenses of approximately \$500, while the request is for \$600 in reimbursement. Because the requested amount does not align with the</p>	18	25	9	15	67	67%

101984316	<p>Word count: 504</p> <p>The applicant clearly explains their academic focus in public archaeology and the relevance of the SAA conference for professional development and networking. The proposal demonstrates alignment with career goals in education and outreach, though the narrative could be more concise and clearly structured.</p>	16	33	8	26	83	83%
101984316	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (No)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Disqualification. Unfortunately, they left their name on the support document pdf. I also have some problems with their budget. They are asking GPSA to cover their membership cost and conference registration, but is also asking their department to cover the same costs again.</p> <p>Their proposal looks good.</p>	20	40	10	15	85	85%

102012389	<p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes – San Francisco, California</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification</p> <p>Qualified.</p> <p>The applicant meets the administrative requirements for the Professional Development Grant. The proposal falls within the word limit, includes a completed GPSA budget template, and provides documentation verifying conference registration and membership costs for the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) Annual Meeting in San Francisco.</p> <p>Scoring</p> <p>Background — 17 / 20</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly explains the applicant’s graduate program in Public Archaeology and focus on education and outreach • Identifies the SAA conference as the premier conference in the discipline • Connects conference participation to the applicant’s career goal of becoming an educator in archaeology 	17	33	7	26	83	83%
-----------	--	----	----	---	----	----	-----

102012389	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Partial</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Disqualify. It's not clear to me how the \$600 being requested would be used in the budget. There is an attachment of support but that doesn't tell the whole story and that should be clear for a third person to see.</p> <p>* Application could use a simple proofreading e.g. it's one long paragraph which is too hard to read, doesn't specify where the conference will be etc.</p>	20	40	5	25	90	90%
102012389	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why)</p> <p>I recommend this application for qualification. The proposal covers the required information, but submitting one giant chunk of text makes the proposal less clear (-2 for composition). The budget and supporting documents are complete and reasonable.</p>	20	40	8	30	98	98%
102014880	<p>The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. However, the budget is incomplete or insufficiently detailed. The amount for each cost section could have been entered in the Excel sheet. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted, but a notification regarding detailed budget writing is given to the applicant.</p>	20	40	9	25	94	94%

	The applicant used the budget template. There were supporting documents to the application. The supporting document added has a 2023 date. The academic goals and interest were stated. Benefits to applicants professional growth and careers goals were explained.						
102014880	Overall, the application was logically composed.	18	35	9	28	90	90%
	Amount Requested: \$600 Budget template complete? Yes Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes Anonymity maintained? Yes Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Activity is a professional development conference outside Albuquerque and requested expenses (transportation and per diem) align with PDG funding criteria.						
102014880		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102019386		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102019386	Not going to conference	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? No 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? No concrete proof provided 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? No 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant does not meet PDG funding usage requirement)						
102019386		20	40	10	10	80	80%

102020800	<p>Grants Scoring Comment Section – PDG</p> <p>1. Amount Requested: 600\$</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? No</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? n/a</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification?</p> <p>Disqualification: inappropriate use of funds (textbooks and course software is not covered by the PDG)</p>	10	0	10	0	20	20%
102020800	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Background: The applicant clearly states their academic interests, research trajectory, and conference activities, though a slightly clearer description of specific sessions or expected engagement could strengthen the activity description.</p> <p>Benefits: The proposal strongly connects the symposium to the applicant’s methodological development, research direction, and professional networking at an early stage of their PhD training.</p> <p>Composition: The proposal is logically structured, clear, and accessible to a general audience, with only minor grammatical issues and formatting inconsistencies.</p> <p>Budget: Compliance with GPSA budget template. The applicant also provided a cost breakdown and attached supporting documents.</p>	18	38	9	30	95	95%

102020800	<p>Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>The composition should be improved.</p> <p>The supporting document doesn't include receipts or proof of all costs mentioned in the budget table, e.g., flight. Also, the hotel fee is \$811.15, while the total hotel fee is mentioned as \$600.</p>	16	35	8	27	86	86%
102023443	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Application qualifies for funding. All requirements were fulfilled.)</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

102023443	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Application Compliance</p> <p>Meets word count requirement? Yes (577)</p> <p>Required supporting docs included? Yes</p> <p>Benefits</p> <p>Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes</p> <p>Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Is the need described in detail? Yes</p> <p>Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes</p> <p>Composition</p> <p>Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)</p> <p>The applicant clearly explains how attending the Public Interest Environmental Law Conference will support their professional development and transition into public interest environmental</p>	19	37	9	30	95	95%
102023443	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? No; name and email not blurred in the flight document</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Disqualify - not anonymous. Great application minus that though.</p> <p>* Application was hard to read as it's one long paragraph.</p>	20	40	7	20	87	87%

102023492	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600 2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes 5. Anonymity maintained? No 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) I recommend this application for disqualification because the proposal is below the required word count (~431 words) and has the applicant's name on their supporting document. The proposal also reads as AI-generated.</p>	20	40	6	30	96	96%
102023492	<p>The application is underwritten. It is expected that the applicants write at least 500 words for this fund application. Though the fund's purpose and professional benefits are clearly stated, they could be expanded, especially when discussing the conference theme and the applicant's dissertation connection. Hence, I recommend that the fund not be given this time.</p>	18	35	8	30	91	91%
102023492	<p>Academic interest were clearly stated and significant well described. Benefits were well explained and linked to career goals. the application was logically composed. The budget template was used and there was enough supporting document.</p>	20	39	9	30	98	98%

102024294	<p>Amount Requested: 600</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Qualification recommended – Applicant is attending a conference that supports professional networking and career development relevant to their academic field.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102024294	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$595.26</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Partial)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes/No)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Disqualification because some of the links in the budget template were not verifiable.</p>	19	38	9	15	81	81%
102024294	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? No concrete proof provided</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (Applicant meets requirements except concrete supporting documentation)</p>	20	40	10	20	90	90%

102026423	<p>1. Amount Requested: 600\$</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why) Qualification: no barriers.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102026423	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Background: The applicant clearly states academic interests, career goals, and describes the conference activity, though the description of specific sessions or planned engagement could be slightly more detailed.</p> <p>Benefits: The proposal strongly connects the conference to professional development, future medical training, and long-term goals in healthcare leadership and AI integration.</p> <p>Composition: The narrative is well organized, clear, and accessible for a general audience with strong logical flow.</p> <p>Budget: Items breakdown, supporting documents attached and compliance with GPSA budget template.</p>	18	39	9	30	96	96%
102026423	<p>The significance of the activity should be described in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>The composition should be improved.</p> <p>The budget table is not accurately completed, e.g., Airfare is \$374 in the supporting document, but in the table, \$370 is mentioned.</p>	16	35	8	27	86	86%
102026635	Recommended for PDG.	20	40	10	30	100	100%

102026635	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (This application qualifies for PDG. The applicant fulfilled all application requirements.)</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102026635	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Application Compliance</p> <p>Meets word count requirement? Yes (598)</p> <p>Required supporting docs included? Yes</p> <p>Benefits</p> <p>Are the benefits to the applicant's academic/professional development clear? Yes</p> <p>Are the benefits to the academic community / NM community (if applicable) explained? Yes</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>Does the budget seem reasonable, well researched, and justified? Yes</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Are academic/professional interests & degree stage clearly stated? Yes</p> <p>Is the need described in detail? Yes</p> <p>Is it clearly tied to the applicant's field and/or goals? Yes</p> <p>Composition</p> <p>Is the proposal well-written, logical, and free of jargon? Yes</p> <p>Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly)</p> <p>This application demonstrates a clear connection between the proposed conference attendance and the applicant's professional development in transportation safety and</p>	18	38	9	30	95	95%

102028355	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? No</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Disqualify - Incomplete application. There's support material but no budget is included.</p>	20	40	10	10	80	80%
102028355	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? (State clearly why)</p> <p>I recommend this application for qualification because the proposal is clear, well-organized, and covers all required information. The budget and supporting documents are complete and reasonable.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102028355	<p>The applicant clearly explained the purpose of the fund and linked it to their professional benefits. The flow of logic and reasons is clear and compact. The budget is also complete and detailed. Hence, I recommend that the fund be granted.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102028724	<p>The applicant clearly explains research interests in robotics and humanoid locomotion. Conference participation and presenting work at AUTOMATE 2026 strongly support research development and feedback from experts. The proposal shows clear connection to academic goals and project progress. Writing is generally clear. Budget appears reasonable and supported. And he is also in need of medical help. so he should be funded.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

102028724	The applicant clearly explains academic interests in electrical engineering, distributed systems, and blockchain innovation. The proposed activities support research development, networking, and professional growth. The proposal demonstrates strong motivation and financial need. Budget appears reasonable and documented.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102028724		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102057757	<p>Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>Background: The applicant clearly explains their research focus, academic stage (dissertation work), and detailed conference activities, including chairing panels and professional service roles.</p> <p>Benefits: The proposal strongly connects conference participation with dissertation development, scholarly networking, and professional leadership in the field of medieval feminist scholarship.</p> <p>Composition: The proposal is generally clear and structured, though several sentences are lengthy or slightly repetitive and could be tightened for readability.</p> <p>Budget: Detail budget with breakdown and supporting document. Utilized GPSA budget template.</p>	19	39	8	30	96	96%
102057757	<p>Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>Benefits linked to career goals should be explained in more detail.</p> <p>The composition should be improved.</p>	20	30	8	30	88	88%

102057757	The applicant clearly explains research interests in applied mathematics, numerical methods, and biological modeling. Conference participation and presenting research strongly support academic development and career goals. The proposal shows clear relevance to dissertation work and research dissemination. Writing is organized and clear. The budget appears detailed, reasonable, and supported by documentation.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102061329	Recommended for PDG.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102061329	Not recommended for PDG. Attendance is within New Mexico.	20	40	10	27	97	97%
102061329	Benefits should be more specific on how to apply the gain from the conference to one's own studies	14	27	7	29	77	77%
102062777	Word count: 590 The proposal clearly demonstrates strong alignment between the applicant's doctoral research, professional goals, and participation in the AERA Annual Meeting. The applicant provides a compelling explanation of how attending the conference will support dissertation development, teaching responsibilities, and professional networking within the field of educational research.	18	34	8	26	86	86%
102062777	Word count: 599 The applicant clearly explains their research interests in statistical modeling and data science and provides a strong rationale for attending the SDSS conference. The proposal demonstrates how the training, short courses, and networking opportunities will support the applicant's methodological development and early-stage doctoral research planning.	18	35	9	27	89	89%

	1. Amount Requested: \$Blank						
	2. Budget template complete? (No)						
	3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (No)						
	4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (No)						
	5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)						
	6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Disqualification. Incomplete application.	0	0	0	0	0	0%
102062777							
	I recommend this third-year PhD student for PDG funding to attend TLS-SIAM 2025, as the travel and registration expenses will directly support their professional development and dissertation research.						
102064365		20	40	10	30	100	100%
	The applicant demonstrates strong initiative and entrepreneurial drive by participating in a competitive accelerator program outside Albuquerque. The experience provided meaningful mentorship, technical feedback, and networking opportunities that support professional growth in computer science and engineering. Participation in this program clearly contributed to the applicant's development as a technical founder and engineer, strengthening both practical skills and industry connections.						
102064365		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102064365		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102089146		20	40	10	30	100	100%
	The applicant demonstrates initiative and entrepreneurial energy, but the proposed activity is framed primarily as startup development rather than graduate professional development tied clearly to the academic program						
102089146		13	20	7	29	69	69%

102089146	<p>While the experience may have been valuable, the proposal emphasizes networking with founders, product evolution, and entrepreneurial momentum more than transferable professional skills grounded in the applicant's graduate training.</p>	13	20	9	29	71	71%
102097563	<p>2. Budget template complete? Yes 3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes 4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes – Detroit, Michigan 5. Anonymity maintained? Yes 6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification Qualified. The applicant satisfies the administrative requirements for the Professional Development Grant. The proposal falls within the required word limit, includes a completed GPSA budget template, and provides supporting documentation verifying the listed expenses. The requested funding supports attendance at the American Planning Association National Planning Conference (NPC 2026) in Detroit, which aligns with the applicant's academic focus on climate resilience, water systems, and environmental planning. Scoring Background — 18 / 20 Strengths • Clearly explains the applicant's academic focus on climate change, water systems, and environmental resource vulnerability • Demonstrates a strong connection between</p>	18	33	9	27	87	87%

	<p>2. Budget template complete? Yes</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes – Los Angeles, California</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification Qualified.</p> <p>The applicant meets the administrative requirements for the Professional Development Grant. The proposal falls within the word limit, includes a completed GPSA budget template, and provides documentation verifying travel and lodging estimates associated with attending the Women’s Transportation Seminar (WTS) International Annual Conference in Los Angeles.</p> <p>Scoring Background — 18 / 20 Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly describes the applicant’s doctoral research focus on transportation safety, land use, and roadway design • Demonstrates interdisciplinary engagement with engineering, planning, and public health • Explains the relevance of the WTS conference to leadership development and professional engagement in transportation 	18	35	9	27	89	89%
102097563		18	38	9	30	95	95%
102100667	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$600</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? Partial</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? Yes</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? Yes</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? Yes</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Disqualification because applicant did not complete budget template fully therefore could not verify supporting document attached.</p>	19	38	7	15	79	79%

102100667	<p>1. Amount Requested: \$595.26</p> <p>2. Budget template complete? (Yes)</p> <p>3. Required supporting documentation of the budget included? (Yes)</p> <p>4. Is the applicant travelling outside of Albuquerque? (Yes)</p> <p>5. Anonymity maintained? (Yes)</p> <p>6. Recommendation for Qualification or Disqualification? Recommendation for Qualification. Applicant shows why it is necessary that they attend this conference as it provides interaction with industry professionals.</p>	18	40	10	30	98	98%
102100667	<p>Both applications are well-written in terms of expressing research purpose, professional goal, and degree completion. However, it is not clear whether the applicant is expecting funding for the same conference for both PDG and SRG, since the same city is mentioned in the budgets, and the title appears to be the same. In the PDG application, while the research importance is vividly clarified, the professional relevance could have been expanded a bit more. I recommend that the applicant be granted one of the funding sources, preferably SRG, and not the other.</p>	20	37	10	28	95	95%
102101694	<p>The applicant describes professional goals relevantly in the two essays. The budget is clear and compact. However, the research significance, especially in the GSF essay, is missing. The expenses shown in the budget and in the GSF essay seem to contradict each other to some extent. The PDG fund seems to have a much more specific use. So, I recommend that the applicant be considered for the PDG fund only.</p>	20	38	8	30	96	96%

102101694	<p>This is a good essay that meticulously describes the research and professional goals. The conference participation mentioned in the essay is relevant and significant for the applicant's future as both a researcher and a professional. So, with confidence, I recommend this application for the PDG grant.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%
102101694	<p>Amount Requesting: \$600</p> <p>Background: Clear articulation of MD-PhD trajectory, AI/bioinformatics focus, and physician-scientist career goals; conference details (LMSA Southwest, UTMB, Feb–Mar 2026) well-specified and aligned with community-centered medicine values.</p> <p>Benefits: Strong linkage between mentorship/networking opportunities and dissertation-phase professional development; explicit connection to Latino physician-scientist pathway and transferable skills (leadership, communication, ethical AI practice).</p> <p>Composition: Well-organized, logical flow, professional tone; minor abbreviation clarification needed (UTMB, GSF).</p> <p>Budget: Provides breakdown of estimate, using GPSA template. Also provides supporting documents.</p>	20	40	10	30	100	100%

102108855	<p>Background: Clear academic identity as 4th-year PhD in stable isotope geochemistry with specific technical focus (TILDAS, triple oxygen isotopes); conference details (GSA 2026 Triple Joint Section Meeting, Memphis, Mar 8–11) well-specified; explicit mention of non-presenting status and multiple participation modes (short course, field trips, volunteering) demonstrates thorough planning. Minor deduction: could strengthen connection to "professional development" framing per PDG scope—reads slightly more like research advancement than career/identity development at points.</p> <p>Benefits: Strong pedagogical focus aligns well with stated professor career goal; field trips effectively linked to research methodology and teaching capacity; volunteering framed as leadership/networking opportunity; good dissertation-phase timing justification. Minor deductions: (1) networking benefits described somewhat generically ("deeper conversations," "sustained networking") without specific target outcomes or professional relationships sought; (2) analytical development phase connection to conference content is logical but could specify 1–2 particular methods or researchers of</p>	20	35	9	30	94	94%
-----------	---	----	----	---	----	----	-----

102108855	<p>Amount Requesting: \$600</p> <p>Background: Identifies as first-year PhD in Exercise Science with clear interests (exercise physiology, metabolic health, minority populations) and stated career goal (lecturer/educator/researcher at "high-end university"); conference specified (RMACSM, Fort Collins, Apr 10–11).</p> <p>Benefits: Networking intent clearly stated with specific named contacts (Tony Nuñez, Emily Schmitt) and explicit job fair focus; early-career timing justification attempted.</p> <p>Composition: Adequate organization with discernible structure; professional tone attempted. Weaknesses: (1) repetitive and redundant phrasing ("profound" appears twice, "further" three times, "help" four times).</p> <p>Budget: Provides break-down and supporting documents.</p>	18	39	8	30	95	95%
-----------	---	----	----	---	----	----	-----

	<p>Background: trong professional context established (10 years arts administration experience at major institutions including Art Institute of Chicago, Mana Contemporary); clear artistic practice description (family collective history, reenacted memories, collaborative portraiture); specific conference identified (Filter Photo Festival, Chicago, Sept 17–20, 2025); explicit long-term goal (national-level museum/gallery exhibitions).</p> <p>Benefits: Exceptional concrete outcomes: work selected for 1 solo exhibition, 10 group exhibitions, 3 print publications, Lucie Foundation Scholarship finalist status—demonstrates immediate ROI from conference attendance; specific keynote references (Diana Markosian, Leonard Suryajaya) with clear articulation of influence on artistic direction; explicit thesis development connection ("refine direction, sequencing, and content"); professional network expansion quantified ("curators, editors, artists nationwide"); institutional representation benefit noted (UNM MFA visibility)</p>						
102108855	Composition: Excellent clarity and flow;	19	40	9	30	98	98%