FY 2020 Fire Prevention and Safety Grant Program Self-Evaluation Sheet

This Self-Evaluation Sheet is designed to help you understand the criteria that you must address in your Narrative Statement when applying under the Fire Prevention and Safety (FP&S) Activity. A Peer Review Panel will review all the criteria in the Narrative Statement to assess your agency's financial need, 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 FP&S Program priorities. Fire Departments and Interest Organizations are assigned differing weights for each scored element. Space for the Narrative Statement is limited; the maximum amount of characters varies based on the questions being asked.

1. Financial Need (Fire Departments–10%, Interest Organizations–0%) (4,000 characters maximum)

Describe your need for financial assistance to carry out the proposed project(s). Include details about your total operating budget, including a high-level breakdown of the budget. Describe your inability to address financial needs without federal assistance. Discuss other actions you have taken to meet your needs (e.g., state assistance programs or other grant programs) to include information on efforts to obtain funding elsewhere; discuss how similar projects have been funded in the past.

While interest organizations do not receive points for their financial need, they must provide all details listed above in their application regarding their financial need to be considered for funding.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: The applicant documented a critical need for financial assistance. The applicant provided many details about the operating budget, including a high-level breakdown of the budget, described their inability to address financial needs without federal assistance, and discussed other actions they have taken to meet their needs. The applicant included information on unsuccessful attempts to acquire financial assistance.

Agree: The applicant documented a clear need for financial assistance, provided good information about the operating budget, and described an inability to address financial needs.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant provided an average statement of financial need. The applicant could have provided more details about the operating budget and efforts to address financial needs.

Disagree: The applicant provided a below-average discussion of financial need. The applicant provided little information about the operating budget or efforts to address financial needs.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant provided little to no justification to support financial need.

2. Commitment to Mitigation (Fire Departments Only-5%) (3,000 characters maximum)

Fire Department applicants that can demonstrate their commitment and proactive posture to reducing fire risk will receive higher consideration. Applicants must explain their code adoption and enforcement (to include Wildland Urban Interface [WUI] and commercial/residential sprinkler code adoption and enforcement) and mitigation strategies (including whether or not the jurisdiction has a FEMA-approved mitigation strategy). Applicants can also demonstrate their commitment to reducing fire risk by applying to implement fire mitigation strategies (code adoption and enforcement) via this application.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: In a clear, to-the-point statement, the applicant demonstrated a strong commitment and proactive posture to reducing fire risk. The applicant provided detailed code adoption and enforcement and mitigation strategies, and/or strongly demonstrated how they will implement fire mitigation strategies via this application in order to reduce fire risk.

Agree: The applicant provided an above-average statement that demonstrated a clear commitment and proactive posture to reducing fire risk. The applicant explained their code adoption and enforcement and mitigation strategies, and/or demonstrated how they will implement fire mitigation strategies via this application in order to reduce fire risk.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant's commitment to mitigation statement was average. There is a general commitment and proactive posture to reducing fire risk. The applicant provided some information to support their code adoption and enforcement and mitigation strategies, and/or somewhat demonstrated how they will implement fire mitigation strategies via this application in order to reduce fire risk.

Disagree: The applicant's commitment to mitigation statement was below average. The applicant did not clearly demonstrate a commitment and proactive posture to reducing fire risk. Information about code adoption and enforcement and mitigation strategies is lacking and/or there is a lack of information to explain how they will implement fire mitigation strategies via this application in order to reduce fire risk.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant's commitment to mitigation statement was poor. There is little to no commitment to reducing fire risk.

3. Vulnerability Statement (Fire Departments-15%, Interest Organizations-25%) (5,000 characters maximum)

The assessment of fire risk is essential in the development of an effective project goal, as well as meeting FEMA's goal to reduce risk by conducting a risk assessment as a basis for action. Vulnerability is a "weak link," demonstrating high-risk behavior, living conditions, or any type of high-risk situation. The Vulnerability Statement should include a description of the steps taken to determine the vulnerability and identify the target audience. The methodology for determination of vulnerability (i.e., how the vulnerability was found) should be discussed in-depth in the application's Narrative Statement.

- The specific vulnerability that will be addressed with the proposed project can be established through a formal or informal risk assessment. FEMA encourages the use of local statistics, rather than national statistics, when discussing the vulnerability.

- In a clear, to-the-point statement, the applicant should summarize the vulnerability the project will address, including who is at risk, what the risks are, where the risks are, and how the risks can be prevented, reduced or mitigated.

- For the purpose of the FY 2020 FP&S NOFO, formal risk assessments consist of the use of software programs or recognized expert analysis that assess risk trends.

- Informal risk assessments could include an in-house review of available data (e.g., National Fire Incident Reporting System [NFIRS]) to determine fire loss, burn injuries or loss of life over a period of time, and the factors that are the cause and origin for each occurrence, including a lack of adoption and enforcement of certain codes.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: In a clear, to-the-point statement, the applicant summarized the vulnerability the project will address, including who is at risk, what the risks are, where the risks are, and how the risks can be prevented, reduced, or mitigated. The applicant provided a detailed description of the steps taken to determine the vulnerability and target population. The applicant provided local statistics, rather than national statistics, when discussing the vulnerability.

Agree: The applicant provided an above-average explanation of the vulnerability that the project will address. The applicant described the steps taken to determine vulnerability and provided rationale for the choice of target population. The statistics supported the discussion.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant's vulnerability statement was average. The applicant provided some information about the steps taken to determine the vulnerability and the reasoning for the choice of target population. Statistical information was provided but could have been improved.

Disagree: The applicant's vulnerability statement was below average. The applicant provided little detail about the steps taken to determine vulnerability and target population. Statistical information was lacking.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant's vulnerability statement was poor. The applicant presented little to no detail about the steps taken to determine the vulnerability and the rationale for the choice of target population. Statistical information was poor or not provided.

4. Project Description (Fire Departments - 20%, Interest Organizations - 25%) (5,000 characters maximum)

Applicants must describe in detail not only the project components but also how the proposed project addresses the identified capability gap, due to financial need and/or the vulnerabilities identified in the vulnerability statement. The following information should be included:

- Project components

- Review of any existing programs or models that have been successful

- Detailed description of how the proposed project components fill the identified capability gap

- If working with Fire Service partners/organizations, identify each partner/organization and the role(s) they will fill in the successful completion of the proposed project.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: The applicant made a clear and strong connection between the project components and how the proposed project will address the identified vulnerability. The applicant's project is modeled on existing programs that have been successful. The applicant's partners and their roles are clearly identified and will likely contribute to the successful completion of the proposed project.

Agree: The applicant provided an above-average explanation of the project components and explained how the project will address the identified vulnerability. The applicant provided detailed information about existing programs or models that have been successful. The applicant identified each partner and their role in the successful completion of the project.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant's project description was average. The applicant provided general information about the project, how it will fill the identified capability gap, and partnerships.

Disagree: The applicant's project description was below average. The applicant provided little detail about the project components or how the project will fill the identified capability gap. The description lacked information.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant's project description was poor. The applicant did not connect the project components to the vulnerability. Required information was poor or not provided.

5. Implementation Plan (Fire Departments-25%, Interest Organizations-30%) (5,000 characters maximum)

Each project proposal should include details on the implementation plan that discusses the proposed project's goals and objectives. The following information should be included to support the implementation plan:

- Goals and objectives

- Details regarding the methods and specific steps that will be used to achieve the goals and objectives

- Timelines outlining the chronological project steps (this is critical for determining the likeliness of the project's completion within the period of performance)

- Where applicable, examples of marketing efforts to promote the project, who will deliver the project (e.g., effective partnerships), and the way in which materials or deliverables will be distributed

- Requests for props (i.e., tools used in educational or awareness demonstrations), including specific goals, measurable results, and details on the frequency for which the prop will be utilized as part of the implementation plan. Applicants should include information describing the efforts that will be used to reach the high-risk audience and/or the number of people reached through the proposed project (examples of props include safety trailers, puppets, or costumes).

- Where human subjects are involved, describe plans for submission to the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

NOTE: For applicants proposing a complex project that may require a 24-month period of performance, please include significant justification and details in the implementation plan that justify the applicant's need for a period of performance of more than 12 months.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: The applicant provided a comprehensive plan that made it evident that the project will be successfully implemented within the one- or two-year period. The applicant provided a clear connection between the project goals and objectives and the specific methods and steps that will be used to achieve those goals and objectives. The applicant provided a chronological, realistic and feasible timeline. If applicable, the applicant provided detailed information about marketing and justification for props.

Agree: The applicant provided an above-average plan that made it clear that the project will likely be implemented within the one- or two-year period. The applicant included a detailed discussion of the methods and steps that will be taken to achieve goals and objectives. The applicant provided a clear timeline in chronological order. If applicable, the applicant provided good information about marketing and justification for props.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant provided an average implementation plan which has the potential to be implemented within the period of performance. The applicant provided broad goals and objectives, as well as broad statements about how the goals will be accomplished. The plan lacks details to support the timeline, information about marketing, and/or a justification for props.

Disagree: The applicant's implementation plan was below average and is not likely to be timely implemented. The implementation plan contained little detail regarding the goals and objectives and/or the methods and steps taken to accomplishment them. The plan lacked some required information.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant's implementation plan was poor. Required information was poor or not provided.

6. Evaluation Plan (Fire Departments-15%, Interest Organizations-15%) (5,000 characters maximum)

Projects should include a plan for evaluation of effectiveness and identify measurable goals. Applicants seeking to carry out awareness and educational projects, for example, should identify how they intend to determine that there has been an increase in knowledge about fire hazards, or measure a change in the safety behaviors of the audience. Applicants should demonstrate how they will measure risk at the outset of the project in comparison to how much the risk decreased after the project is finished. There are various ways to measure the knowledge gained about fire hazards, including the use of surveys, pre- and post-tests, or documented observations. Applicants are encouraged to attend training on evaluation methods, such as the National Fire Academy's "Demonstrating Your Fire Prevention Program's Worth".

Note: In addition to a detailed evaluation plan as described above, if awarded, grant recipients are required to report on specific performance metrics through performance reports and at closeout.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: The applicant provided a comprehensive evaluation plan that identified measurable goals, including an in-depth explanation of how the project's effectiveness will be measured. The applicant provided a strong plan for how it will measure risk at the outset of the project in comparison to how much the risk decreased after the project is finished. The applicant explained the specific steps that will be taken and/or the tools that will be used to determine the increase in knowledge and/or behavioral change.

Agree: The applicant provided an above-average evaluation plan that identified measurable goals, measures of effectiveness, and measures of how risk will be reduced after the project is finished. Success will be measured by specific steps and tools used to determine the increase in knowledge and/or behavioral change.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant's evaluation plan is average, including a broad discussion of goals, measures of effectiveness, and measures of risk reduction. The evaluation plan includes some steps that will be taken and/or some tools that will be used to determine the increase in knowledge and/or behavioral change, but more details are needed.

Disagree: The applicant's evaluation plan is below average and is not likely to produce measures of the project's effectiveness. The evaluation plan provides little detail on the steps that will be taken or the tools that will be used to determine the increase in knowledge and/or behavioral change.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant's evaluation plan is poor and does not adequately explain how the project's effectiveness will be measured.

7. Cost Benefit (Fire Departments-10%, Interest Organizations-5%) (2,500 characters maximum)

Projects will be evaluated and scored by the Panel Reviewers based on how well the applicant addresses the fire prevention needs of the department or organization in an economic and efficient manner. The applicant should show how it will maximize the level of funding that goes directly into the delivery of the project. The costs associated with the project also must be reasonable for the target audience that will be reached, and a description should be included of how the anticipated project benefit(s) (quantified if possible) outweighs the cost(s) of the requested item(s). The application should provide justification for all costs included in the project in order to assist the Technical Evaluation Panel with their review.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the Peer Review Panel will use to rate your application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application.

Strongly Agree: The applicant will provide a significant benefit to the target population when compared to the funds requested. The applicant provided a strong justification for all costs and maximized the funds that go directly into the delivery of the project.

Agree: The applicant will provide a reasonable benefit to the target population when compared to the funds requested. A justification for all costs is provided and the costs of project delivery are low.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant will provide only some benefit to the target population when compared to the funds requested. The costs of project delivery might be consistent with the benefits provided, but details are lacking.

Disagree: The applicant will provide only a marginal benefit to the target population when compared to the funds requested and/or the costs of project delivery are too high, not fully explained, or not discussed.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant will provide a low benefit to the target population when compared to the funds requested, and the costs of project delivery are not discussed or are very high.