

Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Grant Program

FY 2019 SAFER Grant Program

Self-Evaluation Sheet

Hiring of Firefighters Activity Applications

This Self-Evaluation Sheet has been developed to assist potential applicants of the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) grant program funding in understanding the criteria that must be addressed within the Narrative Statement sections of the FY 2019 SAFER grant program application. After the application has been submitted, peer reviewers will evaluate Narrative Statements using the criteria below to assess the degree to which proposals best describe fire department and community risks, the requests for funding included that will address those risks, and how the proposed project(s) align with the SAFER grant program priorities. The peer review panel score represents **50 percent** of the total application score. Therefore, applicants must ensure that all narrative statements clearly address each of the below evaluation criteria elements with detailed but concise information. Applicants should only provide the information being requested for each element; if information pertaining to the narrative elements is provided elsewhere in the application, applicants must still include the requested details in each respective narrative section. A failure to provide all requested information may result in a lower score, or the application may not be funded.

Using the criteria below, applicants may rate their own application and assess how the application might be rated by the Peer Reviewers.

(1) Project Description

In order to receive the highest rating related to Project Description, applicants must clearly address the following points:

- Why does the department need the positions requested in this application?
- How will the positions requested in this application be used within the department (e.g. fourth firefighter on engine, open a new station, eliminate browned out stations, reduce overtime)?
- What specific benefits will the requested positions provide to the fire department and community?
- Describe how funds awarded through this grant enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure within the primary response area.

Option: Strongly Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant clearly explains why the department needs the positions requested in the application. 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. The applicant has sufficiently addressed the need for federal financial assistance.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant adequately explains why the department needs the positions requested in the application. 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 an adequate description regarding how the positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant has provided a thorough explanation of most elements of the project description, but a greater level of detail on some aspects would have been helpful to the reviewer.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides some explanation of why the department needs the positions requested in the application, but details and justification for federal assistance are lacking. 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 those benefits are not always clear. The applicant provides some information regarding how the positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure, but the information lacks the level of detail needed. The project description is moderately described, but more detail on most of the elements would have been helpful to the reviewer.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal detail and explanation of why the department needs the positions requested in the application. 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 of how these positions would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant has not provided a clear understanding of why the positions are needed and the benefits that would be provided to the community through the addition of these positions; it is unclear as to what the project intends to accomplish.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides no detail and explanation of why the department needs the positions requested in the application. 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; it is unclear what the project proposes to accomplish.

(2) Impact on Daily Operations

In order to receive the highest rating related to Impact on Daily Operations, applicants must clearly address the following points:

- Explain how the community and the current firefighters employed by the department are at risk without the positions requested in this application.
- How will that risk will be reduced if awarded?

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 a clear understanding of the risks that will be reduced, both to the current firefighters and the community, through the addition of the 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 regarding how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant clearly addresses the risks to the current firefighters and community, but a greater level of detail on some aspects would have been helpful to the reviewer.

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. There is some indication that the addition of the 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 to the reviewer.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal information on 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. Without additional information, there is minimal 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 regarding the risks to the community and current firefighters without the positions requested in the application, nor is there any information provided about how the risk would be reduced. It is highly unlikely that the addition of the positions is linked to the reduction of risk to either the firefighters or the community.

(3) Financial Need

In order to receive the highest rating related to Financial Need, applicants must clearly address the following points:

- Provide an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget.
- Describe the department's budget shortfalls and inability to address financial needs without federal assistance.
- What other actions has the department taken to obtain funding elsewhere (e.g. state assistance programs, other grant programs)?
- Address how the critical functions of the department are affected without this funding.

Option: Strongly Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant clearly identifies and articulates an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget. The applicant clearly describes the budget shortfalls and provides clear justification regarding why federal assistance is needed. It is absolutely clear that the applicant has done everything possible to obtain funding from other sources to address the stated needs but has no ability to fund this project with existing funding. The financial need the applicant describes is beyond the applicant's control and it is clear that critical functions of the department will be affected without SAFER grant funding; therefore, the request indicates a dire need for federal assistance.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant adequately identifies and articulates an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget. The applicant provides adequate justification regarding why federal financial assistance is needed. The applicant describes some attempts to obtain funding from other sources to address the needs, and adequately demonstrates that the project cannot be completed with existing funding sources. The financial need of the applicant is explained with adequate detail and the need for federal financial resources has been adequately addressed, but a greater level of detail on some aspects would have been helpful to the reviewer.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides a limited income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget but details, and the justification regarding why federal assistance is needed is insufficient. The applicant briefly describes the attempts to obtain funding from other sources and somewhat demonstrates why the project cannot be completed with existing funds, but details have not been included. The applicant briefly explains the financial need; therefore, the applicant's current budget and needs are unclear, and it is unclear if there is an urgent need for federal financial assistance. It would have been helpful to the reviewer if additional detail on was provided.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal detail related to an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget, and the justification of the need for federal assistance is insufficient. There is minimal explanation of the attempts to obtain funding from other sources, or why the project cannot be completed with existing funding. There is minimal information regarding the applicant's financial need; therefore, no apparent need for financial assistance has been identified.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant does not provide sufficient details related to an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget. There is no justification of the need for federal assistance. There is no explanation of the attempts to obtain funding from other sources, or why the project cannot be completed with existing funding. There is insufficient detail for the reviewer(s) to understand the extent of the department's financial situation or budget; therefore, the financial need cannot be determined.

(4) Cost Benefit

In order to receive the highest rating related to Cost Benefit, applicants must clearly address the following points:

- Describe the benefits (e.g., quantifying the anticipated savings and/or efficiencies) the department and community will realize if awarded the positions requested in this application.

Option: Strongly Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides a clear explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. 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. The benefits described appear likely to be achieved, though a greater level of detail would have been helpful to the reviewer.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides some explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The benefits have not been clearly defined and it is unclear if benefits will be achieved; more detail would have been helpful to the reviewer(s).

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: There is minimal detail regarding the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer is unable to determine if benefits would be achieved.

Option: Strongly Disagree

Definition/Standard: There is no detail regarding the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. Due to insufficient information, the reviewer(s) are unable to understand what the project proposes to accomplish, and it is unlikely that the benefits would be achieved.