



<https://www.bearbiology.org>

IBA Special Grants Committee Review Process

- I. Guiding Principles
- II. Proposal Review Criteria
- III. Proposal Marking

I. Guiding Principles:

1. All submitted proposals will be treated alike, irrespective of where they originate, the identity of the applicant, bear species, or whether a research/conservation, management, or educational theme.
2. Where possible, grants will be guided by the mission and vision of the IBA , unless specific guidance has been given by the individual funding body.
3. All submitted proposals will be treated in a confidential manner by members of the Special Grants Committee (SGC).
4. Only the materials presented in the submitted proposals will be considered within the review process and no direct communications will occur with the applicants for additional information or clarification during the review process.
5. Only those proposals and materials submitted to the IBA for special grants on or before the IBA published due date will be considered by the SGC.
6. To provide a clear framework for researchers preparing proposals the IBA SGC will post the review criteria on the IBA webpage to aid applicants with submissions and to provide transparency to this process.
7. SGC members will identify any conflicts of interest that may arise where there is a direct relationship (collaboration, student, part of a research team, etc.) with an application and recuse themselves from the review of that submission. Should any two SGC members be in a conflict situation with an application the Chairman will solicit another review from an IBA council member following identified criteria.
8. All successful applicants will be contacted by the SGC on the outcome of the review process. Once grants are accepted by applicants, unsuccessful applicants will be contacted by the SGC committee.



<https://www.bearbiology.org>

II. Proposal Review Criteria

1. Quality.

Proposals should include clearly stated objectives and rationale, and demonstrate quality scientific, technical and/or managerial applications. It is expected that the submission clearly indicates the underlying rationale for the work.

2. Design and feasibility - the project proposal should meet the following criteria:

1. Written so that a person with no prior knowledge of the subject may make an informed judgment as to the scientific/scholarly merit/conservation value of the proposed project.
2. Clearly describe what the project is expected to accomplish if successfully completed.
3. Clearly explain how the PI will achieve the stated objectives.

Clearly describe methodology, including evidence and/or justification that the methods are suited to the stated objectives.

The activities described can reasonably be completed within the stated timeline.

3. Significance of expected results/products/outcomes – the proposal should demonstrate:

1. Potential for producing a quality scholarly product, publication, or communications materials.
2. Important conservation/management value for the identified ursid species.
3. Potential to leverage additional external funding and/or support from potential partners or collaborators.
4. The extent to which new ideas may be generated, or established concepts may be reexamined.
5. A rationale supported by existing published literature or which meets with the published directives of recognized technical advisory bodies (e.g. IUCN BSG).

4. Budget and Project Schedule

1. Sufficient detail is provided in the application to evaluate the expected costs of the work. All costs appear to be reasonable, and match stated methods.
2. Matching, other, and/or in-kind funding for the project are identified or addressed in the text of the application.
3. The proposal presents a realistic timeline/schedule, including identification of important milestones, to allow sound project management and time for evaluation and reporting.

5. Supporting Materials Provided

1. Submitted references (yes/no)
2. CV (yes/no)



<https://www.bearbiology.org>

III. Proposal Marking

SGC members examine the individual items comprising each of individual components within the 5 evaluation criteria and score these on a six-point scale from 0 to 5.

In this scheme, the scores indicate the following with respect to the individual component under examination:

0 - the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information

1 – poor, 2 – fair, 3 – good, 4 - very good, 5 - excellent

Where appropriate, half marks may be given.

All applications will be scored individually by at least 2 SGC members (in cases of stated conflict of interest situations). The individual component scores will be added to provide a single score for each of the 5 evaluation criteria. The total score for the proposal will be the sum of the 5 evaluation criteria scores. SGC member scores will then be averaged to provide a final score for each proposal.