

Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (AFGP)



2016 SAFER

Self-Evaluation Sheet

Hiring of Firefighters Activity Applications

This Self Evaluation Sheet has been developed to help you understand the criteria that you must address in your Narrative Statement when applying for the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grant. The Peer Reviewers will review all the criteria in your Narrative Statement and assess the degree to which your proposal best describes your fire department and community risks, the requirements you have listed that will reduce those risks, and how your project(s) align with the SAFER Grant priorities.

(1) Project Description

Using the information provided within the Project Description portion of the Narrative Statement, as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions within the entire application package, Peer Reviewers will assess the degree to which the proposal addresses the need for positions being requested within the grant application. In order to receive the highest rating, the Narrative Statement should clearly discuss all of the following points

- Why does the department need the positions requested in the application? If the request is based on a needs assessment or Insurance Services Office rating, what are the details of those outcomes?

How will the requested positions be used within the department (e.g., fourth on engine, open a new station, eliminate browned out stations, reduce overtime, etc.)? What are the specific benefits that the requested positions will provide to the department and community?
- How will the grant enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Peer 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 explains why the department needs the positions requested in the application. If applicable, details on the outcome of a needs assessment or Insurance Services Office rating were provided. There is a clear explanation of how the positions will be used, as well as the specific benefits they would provide to the community and fire department. The applicant provides a clear description of how these positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. I have a clear understanding of the project description.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant adequately explains why the department needs the positions requested in the application. If applicable, adequate details on the outcome of a needs assessment or Insurance Services Officer rating were provided. There is an

adequate explanation of how the positions would be used, and the specific benefits they would provide to the community and fire department. The applicant provides adequate information on how these positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. I have an understanding of most elements of the project description, but a greater level of detail on some aspects would have been helpful.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides some explanation on why the department needs the positions requested in the application, but details and justification are lacking. If applicable, some details on the outcome of a needs assessment or Insurance Services Officer rating were provided. There is some explanation of how the positions would be used, as well as the benefits they would provide to the community and fire department, but it is not absolutely clear. The applicant provides some information on how these positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure, but the information lacks the levels of detail needed. The project description was moderately described, but more detail on most of the elements would have been helpful.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal detail and explanation on why the department needs the positions requested in the application. If applicable, minimal details on the outcome of a needs assessment or Insurance Services Officer rating were provided. There is minimal explanation of how the positions would be used and the benefits they would provide to the community and fire department. There is minimal explanation on how these positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. I don't have a clear understanding of why the positions are needed and the benefits that would be realized through the addition or restoration of these positions. I am unclear as to what the project intends to accomplish.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides no detail and explanation on why the department needs the positions requested in the application. If applicable, no details on the outcome of a needs assessment or Insurance Services Officer rating were provided. There is no explanation of how the positions would be used or the benefits they would provide to the fire department and the community. There is no indication that the positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. I do not understand what the project proposes to accomplish.

(2) Impact on Daily Operations

Using the information provided within the Impact on Daily Operations portion of the Narrative Statement, as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions within the entire application package, Peer Reviewers will assess the degree to which the proposal addresses the impact on the daily operations and how the grant will enhance the department's ability to operate safely to save lives and property. In order to receive the highest rating, the Narrative Statement should clearly discuss all of the following points:

- How are the community and current firefighters employed by the department at risk without the positions requested? How will that risk(s) be reduced if awarded?
- What impact will the positions requested have on the department's NFPA compliance?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Peer 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 explains the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters without the positions requested in the application, and clearly describes 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 compliance. I have a clear understanding of the risks that will be reduced, both to the current firefighters and the community, through the addition of these positions.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides an adequate explanation of the risks to the community and current firefighters without the positions requested in the application, as well as adequate information on how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides adequate information on how these positions would impact their NFPA compliance. I have a clear understanding of the risks to the current firefighters and community, but a greater level of detail on some aspects would have been helpful.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides some explanation of the risks to the community and current firefighters without the positions requested in the application, and provides some information on how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides some information on how these positions would impact their NFPA compliance, but has not included the level of detail needed to confirm this. I believe there is some indication that the addition of these positions is linked to the reduction of risk, both to the community and current firefighters, but more details on most elements would have been helpful.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal information of the risks to the community and current firefighters without the positions requested in the application. The extent to which the risks would be reduced if the grant was awarded is unclear. The applicant provides minimal information on how these positions would impact their NFPA compliance. Without any additional detail, I believe there is little indication that the addition of these positions is linked to the reduction of risk, both to firefighters and the community.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides no details on risks to the community and current firefighters without the positions requested in the application, nor is there any information on how these positions would impact their NFPA compliance. I do not believe that the addition of these positions is linked to the reduction of risk, both to the firefighters and the community.

(3) Financial Need

Using the information provided within the Financial Need portion of the Narrative Statement, as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions within the entire application package, Peer Reviewers will assess the degree to which the fire department needs federal financial assistance. In order to receive the highest rating, the Narrative Statement should clearly discuss all of the following points:

- Are additional details on the department's operational budget provided, including a high-level income versus expenses breakdown of the annual budget?
- What are the department's budget shortfalls and why is the department unable to address their financial needs without federal assistance? What other actions has the department taken to obtain funding elsewhere (e.g., state assistance programs or other grant programs)?
- How are the critical functions of the department affected without this funding?

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Peer 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 articulates the department's operational budget, including an income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget. The applicant clearly describes their budget shortfalls and provides clear justification on why federal assistance is needed. It is absolutely clear that the applicant has done everything in their power to obtain funding from other sources 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 and it is clear that critical functions of the department will be affected without this funding; therefore, I believe their request shows a dire need for federal assistance.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant adequately identifies and articulates the department's operational budget, including an income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget. The applicant provides adequate justification on why federal assistance is needed. The applicant describes some attempts to obtain funding from other sources to address their needs and adequately demonstrates that they cannot fund the project with existing funds. The financial need of the applicant is explained with adequate detail; therefore, I understand the applicant's current budget and believe there is a need for federal assistance but a greater level of detail on some aspects would have been helpful.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides some information on the department's operational budget, including a limited income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget but details and justification on why federal assistance is needed are lacking. The applicant briefly discusses their attempts to obtain funding from other sources and somewhat demonstrates that they cannot fund the project with existing funds, but details are not included. The applicant briefly explains their financial need; therefore, I am unsure of the applicant's current budget and needs, and I am unsure if there is an urgent need for financial assistance. More detail on most elements would have been helpful.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal detail on the department's operational budget and no income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget and justification of their need for federal assistance is lacking. There is minimal explanation on their attempts to obtain funding from other sources or why they cannot fund the project with existing funds. There is minimal information provided to understand the applicant's financial need; therefore, I believe there is no apparent need for financial assistance.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides no detail on the department's operational budget and no income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget. There is a justification of their need for federal assistance. There is no explanation on their attempts to obtain funding from other sources 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, I am unable to determine a financial need.

(4) Cost Benefit

Using the information provided within the Cost Benefit portion of the Narrative Statement, as well as the general questions and activity-specific questions with the entire application package, 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 the highest rating, the Narrative Statement should clearly discuss the following points:

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

Below are the same scoring dimensions that the Peer 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 clear explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I believe the benefits are well explained and likely to be achieved.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides an adequate explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I believe the benefits are described and may be achieved, though a greater level of detail would have been helpful.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides some explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I believe the benefits have not been clearly defined and I am unsure if benefits will be achieved; more detail would have been helpful.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: There is minimal detail on the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I am unable to determine if benefits would be achieved.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: There is no detail on the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. Because there is insufficient information, I do not understand what the project proposes to accomplish and it is doubtful the benefits would be achieved.

