Indiana Bioinventory Grant Scoring Rubric

Score: _____/30

	Scoring values		
Criterion for evaluation	**4–5 points**	**2–3 points**	**0–1 point**
Property description	Property size, habitat(s), placement within a larger landscape, and history (if applicable) are clearly and concisely described.	One of the following is missing and/or not described clearly and concisely: size, habitat(s), placement within a larger landscape, and history (if applicable).	Two or more of the following are missing and/or not described clearly and concisely: size, habitat(s), placement within a larger landscape, and history (if applicable).
Property management plan	Clear and concise summary of property management plan is included. Details of how receiving the requested grant may inform future management are clearly and concisely summarized.	Summary of property management plan is included but is not clear and concise; or, the plan is clear and concise but how receiving the requested grant may inform future management is unclear or unsatisfactory.	Summary of property management plan is not included (0); or, is included but is not clear and concise nor shows how the requested grant may inform future management (1).
Taxa of interest	Strong evidence that unique, undescribed, threatened, imperiled, vulnerable, endangered, or otherwise state or federally rare taxa occur at the property is provided and discussed in context of the proposal. If not available, a convincing statement explaining the significance of the taxa for the proposed survey is provided.	Some or weak evidence that unique, undescribed, threatened, imperiled, vulnerable, endangered, or otherwise state or federally rare taxa occur at the property is provided and discussed in context of the proposal. If not available, a statement explaining the significance of the taxa for the proposed survey is provided, but not convincing.	No evidence that unique, undescribed, threatened, imperiled, vulnerable, endangered, or otherwise state or federally rare taxa occur at the property is provided and discussed in context with the proposal. A statement explaining the interest in and/or importance of the taxa for the proposed survey is not provided.
Habitats of interest	Strong evidence that the surveyed habitat is unique, uncharacterized, threatened or state or federally rare. If not available, a convincing statement explaining the significance of the habitat for the proposed survey is provided.	Some or weak evidence that the surveyed habitat is unique, uncharacterized, threatened or state or federally rare. If not available, a statement explaining the significance of the habitat for the proposed survey is provided but is not convincing.	No evidence that the surveyed habitat is unique, uncharacterized, threatened or state or federally rare. A statement explaining the significance of the habitat for the proposed survey is not provided.
Prior funding and reporting	Organization has not received prior funding (5). Organization has received prior funding, but never for the same group of taxa nor the same site (4). If prior funding was received for a survey >2 years previously, a project report was submitted.	Organization has received prior funding for either the same site or the same group of taxa, but not both (3). Organization has received prior funding for the same taxonomic group at the same site >10 years ago (2). If prior funding was received for a survey >2 years previously, a project report was submitted.	Organization has received prior funding for the same taxonomic group at the same site <10 years ago but a compelling reason for resurveying is provided (1). Organization has received prior funding from the same taxonomic group at the same site <10 years ago, and has no compelling reason for resurvey, or prior funding was received for a survey >2 years previously and has not submitted a project report (0).
Funding efficiency	Dollar amount requested per acre is reasonable, the proposed taxonomist can complete the survey, and there are no obvious barriers identified to completing the project.	One of the following is in doubt: the dollar amount requested per acre is reasonable, the proposed taxonomist can complete the survey, and there are no obvious barriers identified to completing the project.	Two of the following are in doubt: the dollar amount requested per acre is reasonable, the proposed taxonomist can complete the survey, and there are no obvious barriers identified to completing the project.

**Project proposals that do not meet the formatting requirements* (e.g., submitting without signatures) *will be returned to the organization for resubmission.*