

# Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (AFG)



## SAFER Self-Evaluation Sheet Hiring Applications

### (1) Why Firefighters Are Needed (Project Description)

Using the information provided within the Project Description portion of the narrative as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions within the entire application package, the panel reviewers will assess the degree to which the proposal addresses your need for positions being requested within your grant application. In order to receive a higher rating, the narrative should clearly discuss all of the following points. Be sure that details are sufficient for the reviewer to understand fully how the firefighters will be used and that there is evidence the benefits will be achieved.

- Why does your department need grant funds?
- How will the requested firefighters be used within the department?
- What is the specific benefit these firefighters will provide for the department and community?
- How will the grant enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure?
- If requesting grant funding under the Rehiring of Firefighters Activity, please describe when and why the vacancies occurred. How did the vacancies affect service to the community?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the panel reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how your application might be rated by the peer reviewers.

#### Option: Strongly Agree

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant clearly identifies and provides detailed justification on why grant funds are needed. There is a thorough explanation of how the firefighters would be used, and the specific benefits the firefighters would provide to the community and fire department. The applicant provides detailed information on how firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the rehiring activity, and provides a clear explanation of why and when vacancies occurred and how these vacancies have affected service. The reviewer believes the needs are critical and the benefits are very likely to be achieved.

#### Option: Agree

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant identifies and provides justification on why grant funds are needed. There is a sufficient explanation of how firefighters would be used, and the benefits the firefighters would provide for the community and fire department are well described. The applicant provides enough information on how firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the rehiring activity, and provides an explanation of why and when vacancies occurred and how these vacancies have affected service. The reviewer believes the needs are real and the benefits may be achieved.

#### Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides some explanation on why grant funds are needed, but details and justification are lacking. There is some explanation of how firefighters would be used, as well as benefits the firefighters would provide for the community and fire department. The applicant provides some information on how the firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure, but again lacks the levels of details needed. The applicant applied under the rehiring

activity, and provides some explanation of why and when vacancies occurred and how these vacancies have affected service. The reviewer believes the needs do not seem urgent and is doubtful the benefits will be achieved.

**Option: Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The application provides very little detail and explanation on why grant funds are needed. There is an insignificant amount of detail on how firefighters would be used and benefits the firefighters would provide to the community and fire department. There is little or no explanation on how firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the rehiring activity; however, there is insufficient information on vacancies and how these vacancies have affected service. The reviewer believes there is no apparent need and is unable to determine if the benefits would be achieved.

**Option: Strongly Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides no detail and explanation on why grant funds are needed. There is no detail on how firefighters would be used or benefits they would provide to the fire department and the community. There is no indication that firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the rehiring activity; however, there is no information on vacancies or affected service. The reviewer does not understand what the project proposes to accomplish.

## **(2) Risk to Firefighters and Community (Impact on Daily Operations)**

Using the information provided within the Impact on Daily Operations portion of the narrative as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions within entire the application package, the panel reviewers will assess the degree to which the proposal addresses the impact on your daily operations and how the grant will enhance the department's ability to operate safely to save lives and property. In order to receive a higher rating, the narrative should clearly discuss all of the following points. Be sure that the details are sufficient for the reviewer to assess to what extent the risk to firefighters and the community will be reduced if the applicant is awarded.

- How are the community and current firefighters at risk without the requested positions?
- What extent will the risk(s) be reduced if awarded?
- What impact will the awarded positions have on NFPA and/or OSHA compliance?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the panel reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how your application might be rated by the peer reviewers.

**Option: Strongly Agree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant clearly identifies the significant risk(s) to the fire department and community, and thoroughly explains how those risks would be greatly reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides detailed information on how these positions will impact their NFPA and/or OSHA compliance. The reviewer believes there is a strong indication that the addition of firefighters is directly linked to the reduction of risk, both to firefighters and the community.

**Option: Agree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides a sufficient explanation of current risks to the fire department and community, and provides pertinent information on how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides some information on the impact these positions would have on their NFPA and/or OSHA compliance. The reviewer believes there is an indication that the addition of firefighters is linked to the reduction of risk, both to firefighters and the community.

**Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides some explanation of the risks to the fire department and community, but lacks detailed information. The applicant briefly discusses how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides information to show what impact these positions could have on their NFPA and/or OSHA compliance, but has not included details needed to confirm this. The reviewer believes there is some indication that the addition of firefighters is linked to the reduction of risk, both to firefighters and the community.

**Option: Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides little information of the risks to the fire department and community, and the extent on

how the risks would be reduced if awarded the grant is unclear. The applicant provides very little information on the impact these positions would have on their NFPA and/or OSHA compliance. The reviewer believes there is little indication that the addition of firefighters is linked to the reduction of risk, both to firefighters and the community.

**Option: Strongly Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides no details on current risks to the fire department and community nor is there information on the impact these positions would have on their NFPA and/or OSHA compliance. The reviewer does not believe that the addition of firefighters is linked to the reduction of risk.

### **(3) Financial Need**

Using the information provided within the Financial Need portion of the narrative as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions within the entire application package, the panel reviewers will assess the degree to which the fire department needs federal financial assistance. In order to receive a higher rating, the narrative should clearly discuss all of the following points. Be sure that the details are sufficient for the reviewer to understand your need.

- What are the specifics of your department's organizational budget?
- Why is your department unable to address the needs without federal assistance?
- What other actions has your department taken to meet the staffing needs?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the panel reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how your application might be rated by the peer reviewers.

**Option: Strongly Agree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant clearly identifies and fully articulates the department's organizational budget and provides detailed justification on why federal assistance is needed. It is absolutely clear that the applicant has done everything in their power to find other resources to address their needs and has no ability to fund this project with existing funds. The financial need described by the applicant is beyond the applicant's control; therefore, the reviewer believes their request shows a dire need for federal assistance.

**Option: Agree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant identifies and articulates the department's organizational budget and provides justification on why federal assistance is needed. The applicant explains some attempts to find additional resources and somewhat demonstrates that they cannot fund the project with existing funds. The financial need of the applicant is explained with some detail; therefore, the reviewer understands the applicant's current budget and believes there is a need for federal assistance.

**Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides some information on the department's organizational budget, but details and justification on why federal assistance is needed are lacking. The applicant briefly discusses their attempts to find additional resources and somewhat demonstrates that they cannot fund the project with existing funds. The applicant briefly explains their financial need; however, the reviewer is unsure of the applicant's current budget and need, and does not believe there is an urgent need for financial assistance.

**Option: Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The application provides very little detail on the department's organizational budget and the need for federal assistance. There is little or no explanation on their attempts to find additional resources or why they cannot fund the project with existing funds. There is little information to understand the applicant's financial need; therefore, the reviewer believes there is no apparent need for financial assistance.

**Option: Strongly Disagree**

**Definition/Standard:** The application provides no detail on the department's organizational budget or their need for federal assistance. There is little or no explanation on their attempts to find additional resources or why they cannot fund the project with existing funds. There is no detail for the reviewer to understand the extent of the department's financial situation or budget; therefore, the reviewer is unable to determine a financial need.

## (4) Cost Benefit

Using the information provided within the Cost Benefit portion of the narrative as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions with the entire application package, the peer reviewers will assess the degree to which the proposal addresses the operations and personnel safety needs of the applicant in an economic and efficient manner. In order to receive a higher rating, the narrative should clearly discuss the following points. Be sure that details are sufficient for the reviewer to understand fully how the proposal maximizes the grant funding to achieve maximum benefits.

- What benefits (e.g., anticipated savings and/or efficiencies) will your department and/or community realize if the project is funded?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the panel reviewers will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how your application might be rated by the peer reviewers.

### Option: Strongly Agree

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides a thorough explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer believes the benefits are well thought out, and the benefits are very likely to be achieved.

### Option: Agree

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides sufficient explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer believes the benefits are thought out and may be achieved.

### Option: Neither Agree Nor Disagree

**Definition/Standard:** The applicant provides a brief explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer believes the benefits have not been thought out and is doubtful benefits will be achieved.

### Option: Disagree

**Definition/Standard:** There is insignificant detail on the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer believes there are no apparent benefits to be achieved.

### Option: Strongly Disagree

**Definition/Standard:** There is little to no detail on the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. Because there is insufficient information, the reviewer does not understand what the project proposes to accomplish and is unable to determine if benefits would be achieved.

