

Applicant Student ID	Reviewer Notes	Backgro und:	Benefits: - Benefits - linked to Academi c interests and goals stated - Activity and its significa nce describe d	Composi tion: - Clear, flows logically, reasonab le - Technica l terms defined	Budget: - Complete , detailed, reasonab le, logical - Supporti ng docs/link s verified	Total Points	Total Possible Score	Percent Score
101922963	Proposal touches on key items. However it reads as a bullet list/ laundry list of items.	10	40	5	30	85	100	85%
101922963	Applicant provided a detailed application Applicant's description of their academic interest is not very specific. However, they clearly explained how attending the conference will benefit their career. Their proposal was not as polished as others I have seen, and it has some distracting elements.	19	38	9	28	94	100	94%
101922963	Their budget was reasonable and included good supporting The budget is linked to plates for a lab, not the flight. Also, the supporting documents only show that they have been accepted. The statement clearly states how academic interests align with this workshop and is placed into context with the application stage and career goals.	18	40	9	30	97	100	97%
101292799	Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.	20	40	10	27	96	100	97%
101292799		20	36	10	30		100	96%

The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. Benefits linked to the career goals should be explained more clearly.					94		
101878403		16	38	10	30	100	94%
101878403	Great proposal with relevant supporting materials.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101911628	PDG documents not submitted	0	0	0	0	0	0%
	Applicant is requesting for SRG funds to support a conference the applicant will be presenting at. However, the application is under the PDG category.					100	
101911628	broad community benefits are missing. The background doesn't tell about the person's research interests. The link in the budget document is not working.	20	40	10	30	100	100%
101899260		16	38	9	27	100	90%
101899260	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary documents. Background is great; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference attendance in Chicago; Composition is good, but can be improved if making research be stated to general audience; Budget is good and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	11	15	4	6	36	36%
	Good application but proposed activity is in August 2025 which does not fall within the time periods for this current grant cycle. Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.					97	
102022905		20	40	7	30	100	97%
102022905						82	
102022905		18	32	8	24	100	82%
						94	
102022905		18	36	10	30	100	94%
102062777	Lack of information about academic interest	10	37	8	30	85	85%
	The proposal is not coherent enough. The applicant did not use the budget template, so verifying their line items was impossible.					66	
101878983		10	30	6	20	100	66%
101878983	No link was included to verify the budget	18	39	9	25	91	91%

102057237		20	35	8	20	83	100	83%
102057237	Proposal writes well with technical terms introduced	15	25	9	19	68	100	68%
102054507	How will this experience benefit the broader community?	20	35	9	30	94	100	94%
102054507		12	15	6	26	59	100	59%
	The budget is well-documented and verified. Activity is put into the context of the applicant's stage in a degree program and career goals. Professional goals are clearly stated and described in detail.					100		
102054507	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, current status, research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference participation outside abq within NM; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience; Budget is well-organized and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	20	40	10	30		100	100%
102012389	Great application!	18	35	10	30	93	100	93%
	Academic interests and goals should be stated in more detail. Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.					94		
101983362		16	38	10	30		100	94%
	The proposal is fairly good but the date (June 25-28) of the conference falls out of this funding cycle.					73		
101983362		10	25	8	30		100	73%
101944542	The application is very thorough, well-written and detailed.	20	40	9	30	99	100	99%
101982080	Abbreviations used were not defined in the essay (e.g. AWF)	20	40	7	30	97	100	97%
101982080	Followed the guidelines.	18	35	8	25	86	100	86%
	This PDG application is thoughtfully prepared. The applicant did not apply for FAFSA or State-Aid form for this academic year.					100		
101908302		20	40	10	30		100	100%

	Applicant's proposal is very well-organized and covers all required information. I appreciate that the applicant gave real-world examples of how their field of study can be applied to NM. Their budget is detailed and reasonable.	20	40	10	30	100	100%	
101908302	Career interests stated and benefits of attending competition are clearly linked to career goals. Some technical terms are not clearly defined but overall composition is good. Budget is clearly organized and supporting documentation is provided.	18	40	9	10	77	77%	
102026668		19	38	9	30	96	100	96%
102026668		13	24	6	21	64	100	64%
102019386	The budget spreadsheet provides information about Baltimore; the conference is in Florida, which confuses me a bit. It also does not discuss lodging and travel to and from the airport. Outlines how the conference will benefit them and aligns with academic goals.					87		
102019386	The student did not include detailed information about academic interests, nor did provide the conference dates in the proposal.	20	27	10	30		100	87%
						87		
102019386		15	35	7	30		100	87%
101910454	Benefits linked to the career goals should be explained more clearly. Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary documents. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, current status, research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference attendance in Texas; Composition is good, research is stated to general audience; Budget is well-organized and finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	20	36	10	30	96	100	96%
						100		
101845153	Excellent PDG application!	20	40	10	30		100	100%
101845153	The proposal is good but the applicant does not specify when this workshop will be held. With this gap, it is difficult to tell whether it falls within this funding cycle.	19	35	10	30	94	100	94%
						83		
101832459	Applicant's proposal was not explained in detail and didn't capture the date of the conference	10	33	10	30		100	83%
						79		
101832459		17	36	6	20		100	79%

101652910	Applicant has a good and detailed application	20	39	9	30	98	100	98%
101652910		15	35	10	30	90	100	90%
101889689	Academic background is stated in details. But a lot of technical	15	26	7	21	69	100	69%
	Some of the technical and scientific terms are unclear to the person					94		
101889689	who is not from the field of health sciences.	19	38	7	30		100	94%
101889689		15	32	6	18	71	100	71%
	Does not state when the activity is occurring, says this summer.					98		
101830265	Does link to an advancement in skills relating to professional	18	40	10	30		100	98%
	This application is recommended for disqualification under the PDG					0		
	category because the student has requested grant funding for a							
101830265	conference in the last week of June 2025.	0	0	0	0		100	0%
	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly.					94		
	The composition should be improved.□							
	Benefits linked to the career goals should be explained more clearly.							
101830265		18	38	8	30		100	94%
	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary					97		
	documents. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant							
	research interest and current status, benefits are good, the applicant							
	will use the fund for conference attendance, but it can be improved							
	by stating more how it benefit for personal development, career							
	development and community; Composition is great, research is							
	stated to general audience; Budget is good and be finished according							
102058507	to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format	20	37	10	30		100	97%
	Applicant could have elaborated more on the background and					69		
	benefits in their application. Aside that, their proposed activity is							
	scheduled to take place in July 2025 which is outside the timeline of							
102025539	this current grant cycle.	15	20	8	26		100	69%
102019028	Excellent proposal!	20	40	10	30	100	100	100%
102019028	Good application	19	39	9	30	97	100	97%
102004933	Did not upload the budget excell spreadsheet. Otherwise looks good.	20	40	10	28	98	100	98%

102004933	The applicant does not provide the date(s) and duration for the event. There is also an error in the "Total cost" column of budget	15	40	10	27	92	100	92%
		17	37	9	25	88	100	88%
	The PDG Budget form contains mistakes. The total Cost for Airfare (line item 12) should be \$497.75 or \$197.75 if the applicant receives the AASS Scholarship/Funding (-1). While food and transportation items were not included in the request for the PDG budget, the applicant mentioned \$20/day for 6 days. According to the application, the applicant is staying at the conference site for one night. Also, the applicant did not apply for FAFSA or State-Aid Form for this academic year.					99		
	Student did a great job of explaining how the conference will benefit their professional development. Their budget is also well-supported and reasonable. However, I wish they had explained their area of interest in layman's terms.	20	40	10	29	98	100	99%
101129669	Applicant has a solid application	20	40	8	30		100	98%
101129669		20	40	10	29	99	100	99%
101129669		20	40	10	30	100	100	100%
101129669		14	26	8	20	68	100	68%
101702399	some of the technical terms are unclear	19	39	7	30	95	100	95%
101702399		12	26	8	18	64	100	64%
	The budget is complete; finding lodging expenses could have been a bit easier. The document specifies the goal of the workshop and how it will advance the dissertation. It also shows current goals and their trajectory and how the workshop will contribute to it.					100		
101702399		20	40	10	30		100	100%
101896654		18	40	10	30	98	100	98%
	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. Benefits linked to the career goals should be explained more clearly.					96		
101896654		18	38	10	30		100	96%

	Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary documents. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant research interest, current status, research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference attendance in New York; Budget is well-organized and be finished according to the requirements, the applicant uses the provided format					100	
102023528		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102023528		18	40	9	28	95	95%
101982821		20	40	10	30	100	100%
	Applicant is requesting for funds for an event in June, which is outside the grant cycle.					100	
101982821		20	40	10	30	100	100%
	Applicant did a great job of explaining how the conference connects to their academic interests and will benefit their career. Their budget is also reasonable and detailed. Great application!					100	
102023443		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102023443	Applicant has a well detailed application	20	39	9	30	98	98%
	Applicants interests are clearly stated, development program they plan to attend is clearly linked to their academic and professional goals. Well written proposal and clear budget items with verified documentation also provided. Student plans to attend internship before the end of the school year but will continue into summer.					100	
102022519		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102022519	Background is clearly stated.	14	26	8	20	68	68%
	Key terms such as population affinity estimation and trauma analysis are not defined explicitly for clarity. community benefits are not mentioned.					93	
102022519		19	35	9	30	99	93%
	It's probably the most detailed PDG I have ever seen. However, the budget could benefit from more details, such as a breakdown of total hotel cost versus a reviewer needing to math out the costs					100	
101943334		20	40	10	29	100	99%
	The student has not include a detail description about academic interests.					83	
101943334		14	35	7	27	100	83%

102041374	The applicant's academic interest should be explained more clearly. Complete application: HTML, proposal, and budget, supplementary docs. Background is clearly stated, including the applicant current status and research project; benefits are clearly stated, the applicant will use the fund for conference attendance in Virginia; Composition is great, research is stated to general audience; Budget is good, the applicant uses the provided format, supplementary docs	18	40	10	30	98 100	100	98%
101982316	are well-organized and can support the budget.	20	40	10	30		100	100%
101982316		20	38	10	22	90	100	90%

Background Score (18/20)

90

Reasons: The applicant clearly outlines their academic and professional interests in educational psychology, focusing on students' motivation and learning processes. Their professional goals are well-articulated, emphasizing contributions to educational program development and addressing academic challenges in crisis regions. The description of the AERA conference, including its timing and relevance, is clear, but more specifics about how it ties directly to their dissertation or specific academic milestones would enhance the context.

Benefits Score (36/40)

Reasons: The applicant strongly links attending the AERA conference to their professional development, highlighting opportunities for networking, learning, and shaping their dissertation. The benefits are well-contextualized within their stage as a PhD student and their long-term career goals as an educator and program designer. While the personal impact is clear, the proposal could further elaborate on how their attendance might benefit the academic community or their institution.

Composition Score (9/10)

Reasons: The proposal is well-written, flows logically, and is action-oriented. Technical terms are avoided or explained, making it

101878403

18

36

9

27

100

90%

Background Score (18/20)

84

Reasons: The applicant provides a clear overview of their academic background in planetary science, remote sensing, and GIS, and the relevance of the Lunar and Planetary Science Conference (LPSC) to their professional development. The activity is described in detail, including the workshop and poster session, which align well with their academic and professional goals. The description could be further enhanced by explicitly connecting specific aspects of the conference to their long-term objectives in planetary science.

Benefits Score (34/40)

Reasons: The proposal convincingly articulates the benefits of attending the LPSC, particularly networking opportunities and the relevance of the workshop to their expertise in laser-based planetary science research. The applicant effectively connects the conference to their career stage and goals, emphasizing the importance of networking for securing post-doctoral employment. A more detailed explanation of how the workshop and networking will directly impact their job prospects or research trajectory would further strengthen the case.

Composition score (9/10)

Reason: The proposal is well-written, flows logically, and is action-oriented. Technical terms are briefly explained, making the proposal accessible to a general audience. Slight improvements in conciseness could enhance readability.

101845153

18

34

9

23

100

84%

Background Score (19/20)

90

Reasons: The applicant clearly outlines their academic and professional background, including their focus on fungal diseases and their connection to emerging infectious diseases. The description of their research on the mycobiome of Sandhill cranes is detailed and highlights the relevance of their work in the context of global health concerns. The activity, participation in the Molecular Mycology course, is well-described and directly tied to their academic and research goals. A slightly more explicit link to their career aspirations could enhance this section.

Benefits Score (38/40)

Reasons: The applicant articulates clear benefits of attending the course, including access to expert feedback, networking opportunities, and hands-on training crucial for completing their dissertation.

The proposal highlights the unique value of the course, emphasizing the lack of similar opportunities in New Mexico and the potential for advancing their research on fungal pathogens. While the benefits to the applicant are well-defined, a more explicit discussion on the broader academic or societal impact of this training would strengthen the argument.

Composition Score (9/10)

Reasons: The proposal is well-written, flows logically, and is action-oriented. Technical terms such as "mycobiome" are explained,

101292799

19 38 9 24 100 90%

Background Score (17/20)

76

Reasons: The applicant provides a clear overview of their academic background in transportation engineering and their career goals of addressing transportation issues through sustainable solutions. The activity (attending the NM TransCon conference) is described in detail, emphasizing its relevance to their academic research and professional aspirations. The activity (attending the NM TransCon conference) is described in detail, emphasizing its relevance to their academic research and professional aspirations.

Benefits Score (32/40)

Reasons:

The applicant articulates clear benefits of attending the conference, such as networking, skill development, and exposure to new approaches in transportation planning. The focus on connecting with transit planning experts to advance microtransit research aligns well with their academic goals. However, the proposal could better articulate how the knowledge and strategies gained will directly benefit their PhD research or lead to actionable outcomes for their community projects.

Composition Score (8/10)

Reasons:

The proposal is well-structured and flows logically, but the writing could be more concise in some areas. Technical terms are generally accessible, but some elaboration on microtransit implementation and

102012389

17

32

8

19

100

76%

Background Score (19/20)

84

Reasons: The applicant clearly outlines their academic and professional interests, focusing on behavioral addictions and underserved populations, particularly Asian American communities. The activity (attending the Asian American Psychological Association's Annual Conference) is described in detail, highlighting its relevance to their academic and career goals. The background is well-linked to their broader objective of becoming a scientist-practitioner, although providing more specific examples of how this aligns with their current research at UNM would enhance the section.

Benefits Score (36/40)

Reasons: The applicant effectively demonstrates how the conference advanced their professional development, specifically through workshops on tailoring treatments for Asian clients and networking for potential research collaborations. The benefits are clearly contextualized within their doctoral training, with a focus on integrating these experiences into their comprehensive exam and dissertation. A stronger emphasis on the broader impact of their work on the academic or clinical community would further strengthen this section.

102041374 Composition Score (9/10)

19

36

9

20

100

84%

	The applicant's proposal indicates their intention to attend the 2025 International Trombone Festival, scheduled for July 16-19, 2025, which falls outside the eligible funding cycle for this year Professional Development Grant (PDG). The PDG supports activities occurring between June 1, 2024, and May 31, 2025. The proposed activity takes place after the funding period ends,					0	
102025539	making the application ineligible for consideration under the PDG Benefits linked to professional growth and development should be explained in more detail.	0	0	0	0	98	100 0%
102023492	The proposal is quite good, and the supporting materials confirm the authenticity of the request.	20	38	10	30	97	100 98%
101982316	Okay application but the benefits needed to be expanded more.	19	39	9	30		100 97%
102023528		18	35	9	29	91	100 91%
102019028		20	40	10	30	100	100 100%
102062777		20	40	10	30	100	100 100%
101983362	Applicant did a great job of describing the benefits of the conference on their career and how it will allow them to keep up with research trends. Budget is reasonable and academic interest was stated. Field of study was not very easy to understand as written. Unsure if Visa fees are acceptable PDG costs.	16	37	8	26	87	100 87%
101910454						98	
101944542	The academic interest were clearly stated, however they were not linked to your career goals.	20	40	8	30		100 98%
101652910	This is good application. You have articulated yourself well. The budget and documents are well submitted.	12	25	7	20	64	100 64%
101908302						90	
102023492	You have a great focus, and your passion for your interest and goals. You added your name to the application which is against the grant code. Besides that, you have a great application	15	35	10	30		100 90%
102026668	The budget are not well prepared and researched. The budget is not complete, the link attached comes as error and does not make a good case for your application.	20	40	10	30	100	100 100%
101899260		14	36	7	26	83	100 83%
						85	
		10	35	10	30		100 85%
						75	
		20	40	10	5		100 75%

	You have a good budget but you did not indicate how you intend to fund the rest of it. For instance, your flight cost is 385 but you are only requesting for 300. You did not indicate if you have any					80		
102058507	additional sources of funds to cater for the rest of the budget. Any Disqualification. Applicant is requesting for funds for a conference that will occur on 16th-19th July, 2025 which falls outside fall	20	40	10	10	0	100	80%
102025539	outside the grant cycle dates.	0	0	0	0		100	0%
	Goals were not stated. Activity was described but details like date for the conference was omitted. The supporting document is very blur and I cannot see anything on the supporting document. Budget shows prices of items but doesn't show payment of items					89		
102023443		18	38	9	24		100	89%
101832459	Applicants workshop or training is in Albuquerque.	18	38	8	28	92	100	92%
	Conference was held on 25th and 26th October 2024. Applicant went for the conference on the said date and applicant is now					78		
102062777	requesting for PDG this spring semester.	14	35	5	24		100	78%
	There were no links to verify the conference student membership					90		
101878983	(\$25) and the conference registration fee (\$165).	18	38	9	25		100	90%
101982080	Technical or abbreviated terms like AWP were not explained.	16	38	8	27	89	100	89%
102021743	Excellent application!	20	40	10	30	100	100	100%
	Applicant's conference is in two part parts:					0		
	a virtual component from May 29th- 30th, followed by an in-person gathering in Athens, Georgia, from June 20th-24th, 2025. Applicant							
101982821	is requesting funds to go for the in person conference in June 2024 and this fall outside the grant cycle dates. Therefore, this warrants a	0	0	0	0		100	0%

	This is a good application. You have linked academic interest to your goals well. And eventually how it contributes to your professional development.					100		
102014880		20	40	10	30		100	100%
	The applicant only provided prices of items but hasn't paid for the hotel and the flight ticket in the supporting document. The links in the budget couldn't be verified especially the links for lodging and					81		
102043845	Applicant has their name in the uploaded documents, resulting in a breach of anonymity.	19	38	9	15		100	81%
101983944	Applicant has their name in the uploaded documents, resulting in a breach of anonymity.	20	40	10	30	100	100	100%
102014880	Applicant has their name in the uploaded documents, resulting in a breach of anonymity.	20	40	9	30	99	100	99%
102043845		20	40	10	30	100	100	100%
	Your budget is well presented. You did well by attaching all the necessary supporting documents. Your proposal is well composed and clearly articulated.					100		
102018395		20	40	10	30		100	100%
	This is a good application. I am impressed with your research focus and the benefits of thus conference to your professional development which has been clearly stated. The intersection of AI and writing pedagogy is an interesting development especially in					100		
102057238		20	40	10	30		100	100%

	<p>This PDG application is thoughtfully prepared. However, the budget sheet is written confusingly compared to the PDG proposal and supporting documentation. In the budget form, the flight cost is \$425, and convention registration is \$175. It can be considered that the applicant was trying to match the \$600 PDG limit. This makes a \$64 difference from the supporting documentation for flights, where flight costs are \$489. Also, in the PDG Proposal, the applicant mentions that the flight price is \$400-\$430. Hence, disparities are found between the PDG proposal and the PDG budget supporting documentation (-1). A typo is found on the budget sheet: 'NBLSA conventiom,' and in the PDG proposal, the applicant mentioned receiving external funds to pay for hotel expenses but did not list it on the budget sheet (-1). Furthermore, in the proposal, the applicant specified the convention they are going to and where it takes place. However, the dates for the convention are missing (-1). The dates for the conference were only included in the budget sheet.</p>							
102004933	Great application overall. I think you clearly indicated how the conference links with your academic goals. But had to deduct a mark because I thought you could have shed more light on what exactly your future goals are.	19	40	10	28	99	100	97%
101983944	Caution is required for this application. The PDG proposal does not meet the word count (455 words). Also, in the PDG Budget Supporting Documentation, the applicant's full name is disclosed. Moreover, it can be reasonably speculated that the applicant may share the hotel room with two other people. But the hotel expenses are included at full price. In the budget sheet, the total amount is \$970.48. This goes over the PDG maximum funding amount of \$600. No other explanation is included on how to cover \$370.48 (-	19	40	10	30	99	100	99%
102024766	Great application overall. I just thought you could have adequately structured your essay to clearly communicate how this conference links to your future career goals.	20	40	10	29	99	100	99%
102018395		20	40	9	30		100	99%

	Caution is needed for this PDG application. The word count for the PDG proposal is 639 words. The PDG proposal includes some typos and grammatical mistakes (-1). The budget sheet is written confusingly. The conference registration fee can be reduced to \$100 from \$150 if the applicant registers early. It is recommended that the applicant pursue economical options where available (-1). Airfare is double-applied for PDG funding and departmental funding. This					97	
102057237	Applicant provided a clear and concise application	20	40	9	28	100	97%
102057238	Great submission on how the CCCC conference will benefit your academic and future career development. I had to deduct 2 because I thought more explanation about the CCCC and what their 2025 conference goal is would have created a clearer picture of how the conference theme matches with your interests and career goals. I also thought more explanation about RNF could have helped me understand what it is. Great submission overall.	18	39	10	30	97	97%
	Applicant did a great job of explaining their area of interest and gave a much more detailed explanation of the specific benefits of conference attendance than the usual responses. Budget is reasonable and their proposal was enjoyable to read.					98	
102057238	Great application by applicant	20	40	8	30	100	98%
						100	
101943334		20	40	10	30	100	100%
102014880		20	38	9	30	97	97%

Background Score (20/20)

99

Reasons: The applicant provides a clear and detailed overview of their academic program in Community and Regional Planning and their focus on GIS, watershed management, and environmental planning. Their long-term career goals are well-articulated and closely tied to the activity, emphasizing the integration of spatial analysis and community engagement.

The activity (attending the National American Planning Association Conference) is described thoroughly, with specific details on its relevance to their academic and career progression.

Benefit Score: 39/40

Reasons:

The applicant demonstrates strong alignment between the conference and their professional development goals, emphasizing exposure to best practices, networking, and enhanced understanding of industry trends. They effectively link the activity to their academic progression, highlighting how it will support their final project and career trajectory in environmental and regional planning. While the benefits to the broader UNM community are mentioned, a more detailed plan for sharing insights gained from the conference would further strengthen this section.

Composition Score (10/10)

Reasons: The proposal is well-written, concise, and logically organized. The proposal is well-written, concise, and logically

102024766

20

39

10

30

100

99%

Background Score (19/20)

97

Reasons: The applicant clearly describes their academic background as a master's student in Statistics and their interests in pharmaceutical research and drug development. The Duke Industry Statistics Symposium (DISS25) is described in detail, highlighting its relevance to their academic and professional journey.

Benefits Score (37/40)

Reasons: The applicant articulates strong benefits, including exposure to real-world applications of statistical methods, mentorship opportunities, and networking with industry professionals.

The alignment between their academic stage and the symposium's focus on clinical trials and drug development is clearly presented. The proposal effectively explains how attending DISS25 will shape their research trajectory, but a more detailed discussion of the potential broader impact on their department or academic community would strengthen this section.

Composition Score (10/10)

Reason: The proposal is well-structured, clear, and concise.

Technical terms are explained adequately, making the application accessible to a general audience.

Budget Score (27/30)

102043845	Reasons:	19	39	10	29	100	97%
	The respective prices for flight and hotel bookings were not attached. The applicant could have explained a little more about the AWP conference. The applicant did not emphasize how these experiences could lead to specific career opportunities or				93		
102023492		18	38	10	27	100	93%

	Good application, but a slight refinement in transitions could improve overall flow. A little more information about what AFS is would have been great.					95		
102021743		17	40	8	30		100	95%
	Great application. I deducted 2 points because technical terms like Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and Structure from Motion (SFM) are mentioned, but could benefit from a brief, more precise definition for a broader audience.					98		
101911628		20	40	8	30		100	98%