

IAS/ILPA Bioinventory Grant Proposal Rubric

Criterion for evaluation	Scoring values		
	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 point
Property description	Property is thoroughly described and includes size, habitats, ecological significance, and property's placement within a larger landscape (if applicable).	Property description is missing either size, habitats, ecological significance, or property's placement within a larger landscape (if applicable).	Property description lacks several identifying features and/or is vague and lacks detail.
Organization's management plan	Clear and concise summary of management plan is included and provides details about existing and potential future plans and significance.	Summary of management plan is included but the bioinventory work requested does not fit within the scope of the property's plan.	Summary of management plan is not included.
Taxa of interest	Strong evidence indicating the presence of unique, threatened, imperiled, vulnerable, endangered, or otherwise state- or federally rare taxa is included and is discussed in context with the proposal scope.	Some or weak evidence indicating the presence of unique, threatened, imperiled, vulnerable, endangered, or otherwise state- or federally rare taxa is included and is discussed in context with the proposal scope.	No evidence indicating the presence of unique, threatened, imperiled, vulnerable, endangered, or otherwise state- or federally rare taxa is included and is discussed in context with the proposal scope.
Scope and impact	A short and detailed description of how the proposed bioinventory will be used to advance the organization's conservation work is included.	A short but vague description of how the proposed bioinventory will be used to advance the organization's conservation work is included.	No description of the importance or organizational impact of the bioinventory is included.
Prior funding received	Organization has not received prior funding for the same group of taxa nor the same site.	Organization has received prior funding, but for a different taxonomic group or for a different site.	Organization has received prior funding for the same taxonomic group and at the same site.
Funding efficiency	Dollar amount requested per acre is very reasonable, especially when compared to other proposals.	Dollar amount requested per acre is comparable to other proposals.	Dollar amount requested per acre is high compared to other proposals.

Project proposals that do not meet the formatting requirements will be returned to the organization for resubmission.

Scoring notes: