



FEMA

2013 SAFER Self-Evaluation Sheet Hiring Applications

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

(1) Why Firefighters Are Needed (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 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?
- 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?
- 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 thoroughly identifies and provides detailed justification on why grant funds are needed. There is a thorough explanation of how the firefighters would be used, as well as the specific benefits the firefighters would provide to the community and fire department. The applicant provides thorough information on how firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the Rehiring Activity, and provides a thorough 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 adequate justification on why grant funds are needed. There is an adequate explanation of how the firefighters would be used, and the benefits the firefighters would provide for the community and fire department are well described. The applicant provides adequate information on how firefighters would

enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the Rehiring Activity, and provides an adequate 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 the 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 applicant provides minimal detail and explanation on why grant funds are needed. There is minimal explanation on how the firefighters would be used and the benefits the firefighters would provide to the community and fire department. There is minimal explanation on how firefighters would enhance the department's ability to protect critical infrastructure. The applicant applied under the Rehiring Activity; however, there is minimal 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 the firefighters would be used or benefits they would provide to the fire department and the community. There is no indication that the 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 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 at risk without the requested positions? To what extent will the risk(s) be reduced if awarded?
- What impact will the awarded positions have on 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 thoroughly identifies the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters, and thoroughly explains how those risks would be greatly reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides thorough information on how these positions will impact their NFPA 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 an adequate explanation of the risks to the community and current firefighters, as well as adequate information on how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides adequate information on the impact these positions would have on their NFPA 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 community and current firefighters, and provides some information on how those risks would be reduced if the grant is awarded. The applicant provides some information to show what impact these positions could have on their NFPA 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 the community and firefighters.

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides minimal information of the risks to the community and current firefighters, and the extent on how the risks would be reduced if awarded the grant is unclear. The applicant provides minimal information on the impact these positions would have on their NFPA 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 risks to the community and current firefighters, nor is there information on the impact these positions would have on their NFPA 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 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:

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

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 thoroughly identifies and articulates the department's organizational budget and provides thorough 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 adequately identifies and articulates the department's organizational budget and provides adequate justification on why federal assistance is needed. The applicant explains some attempts to find additional resources and adequately demonstrates that they cannot fund the project with existing funds. The financial need of the applicant is explained with adequate 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 minimal detail on the department's organizational budget and the need for federal assistance. There is minimal explanation on their attempts to find additional resources or why they cannot fund the project with existing funds. There is minimal 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 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 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/or community experience if the project is funded?

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 thorough explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer believes the benefits are well explained and likely to be achieved.

Option: Agree

Definition/Standard: The applicant provides adequate explanation of the benefits the department and community expect to achieve. The reviewer believes the benefits are adequately described and may be achieved.

Option: Neither Agree nor Disagree

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

Option: Disagree

Definition/Standard: There is minimal detail on 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 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 doubtful the benefits would be achieved.

