

Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Program Self-Evaluation Sheet: Hiring of Firefighters Activity

This Self-Evaluation Sheet is designed to help you understand the criteria that you must address in your Narrative Statements when applying under the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Program – Hiring of Firefighters Activity. A peer review panel will review all the criteria in the Narrative Statement to assess your department’s financial need, 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 application aligns with the SAFER Program priorities. The panel score is 50% of the total application score. Space for the Narrative Statement is limited to a total of 3,000 characters per narrative element and 4,000 characters for the Financial Need.

1. Project Description (30%)

Applicants must describe in detail why the positions requested are needed by the department, as well as how the positions will be used within the department (e.g., fourth firefighter on engine, open a new station, eliminate browned out stations, reduce overtime). The applicants must clearly specify what unique and specific services the positions requested will provide to the fire department and community. In addition, applicants must clearly demonstrate how the funds awarded through this grant will enhance the department’s ability to protect critical infrastructure within the primary response area.

Below are the same scoring dimensions the peer review panel will use to rate each application. Using the criteria below, rate your own application and assess how the peer reviewers might rate your application:

Strongly Agree: 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 unique and specific services 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.

Agree: 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 unique and specific services they



FEMA

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. I understand most elements of the project description, but a greater level of detail would have been helpful.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant provides some explanation of why the department needs the positions requested in the application, but details are lacking regarding how the positions would be used as well as the unique and specific services they would provide to the community and fire department. The applicant provides some information about how the positions will help protect critical infrastructure but lacked details. The project is somewhat described, but more detail on most of the elements would have been helpful.

Disagree: The applicant provides minimal detail and explanation regarding why the department needs the positions requested in the application. There is minimal explanation of how the positions would be used and the unique and specific services 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. I do not have a clear understanding of the project or how this grant would address the department's needs.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant provides no detail or 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 nor is there an indication that the positions requested 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 (30%)

Applicants must describe how the community and current firefighters are at risk without the positions requested in the application. The applicant must also describe how the risk will be unequivocally reduced if awarded.

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

Strongly Agree: The applicant clearly explains the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters and how those risks would be unequivocally reduced. I have a clear understanding of the risks and how those risks will be mitigated if awarded grant funding.

Agree: The applicant provides an adequate explanation of the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters as well as how those risks would be unequivocally reduced if grant funding is awarded. I understand the risks to the current firefighters and community and how the risk would be reduced, but a greater level of detail would have been helpful.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant provides some explanation of the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters and how those risks would be unequivocally reduced if awarded grant funding. I have some understanding of the risks, but it is not entirely clear how the addition of the requested positions would reduce those risks.

Disagree: The applicant provides minimal details about the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters or how that risk would be unequivocally reduced if awarded grant funding. I do not have a clear understanding of the risks

or how the addition of the requested positions is unequivocally linked to the reduction of risk, both to the current firefighters and the community.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant provides no details or explanation regarding the risk(s) to the community and current firefighters or how the risk would be reduced. I do not believe that the addition of the requested positions is linked to the reduction of risk, either to current firefighters or the community.

3. Financial Need (30%)

Applicants must provide a detailed income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget. The applicant must discuss how the critical functions of the department are uniquely affected without this funding. The applicant must include details about the department's precise budget shortfalls and inability to address financial needs without federal assistance. Applicants must explain what other actions the department has taken to obtain funding elsewhere (e.g., state assistance programs, other grant programs).

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

Strongly Agree: The applicant clearly identifies and articulates an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget. The applicant clearly describes their precise budget shortfalls and provides clear justification regarding why federal assistance is needed. The applicant provides clear details on how critical functions of their department are uniquely affected without federal funds. The applicant provides clear information on other actions they have taken to obtain funding from other sources. It is clear that the financial needs described by the applicant are beyond the applicant's control, and I believe their request shows a dire need for federal assistance.

Agree: The applicant adequately identifies and articulates an income versus expenses breakdown of the current annual budget. The applicant adequately describes their precise budget shortfalls and provides adequate justification on why federal assistance is needed. The applicant provides adequate details on how critical functions of their department are uniquely affected without federal funds. The applicant explains some attempts to obtain funding from other sources. 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.

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant provides some information on an income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget. The applicant briefly explains their precise budget shortfalls but the reasons why federal assistance is needed are lacking. The applicant provides some details on how critical functions of their department are uniquely affected without federal funds. The applicant briefly discusses their attempts to obtain funding from other sources. I am unsure of the applicant's current budget and needs; therefore, I am unsure if there is an urgent need for financial assistance.

Disagree: The applicant provides minimal details on an income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget. There is minimal detail on their precise budget shortfalls or the need for federal assistance. There is minimal information on how critical functions of their department are uniquely affected without federal funds. There is minimal explanation on their attempts to obtain funding from other sources. There is minimal information to understand the applicant's financial need. I believe there is no apparent need for financial assistance.

Strongly Disagree: The applicant provides no detail on an income versus expenses breakdown of their annual budget. There is no detail on their budget shortfalls or need for federal assistance. There is no information on how critical functions of their department are affected without federal funds. There is no explanation on their attempts to obtain funding from other sources. There is no detail for the reviewer to understand the extent of the department's financial situation or budget. I am unable to determine a financial need.

4. Cost Benefit (10%)

Applicants must clearly describe the unique and specific benefits (e.g., quantifying the anticipated savings and/or efficiencies) the department and community will realize if awarded the positions requested in this application.

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

Strongly Agree: The applicant provides a clear and quantifiable explanation of the unique and specific benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I believe the benefits are well explained and likely to be achieved.

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

Neither Agree nor Disagree: The applicant provides some explanation of the unique and specific benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I believe the benefits have not been clearly defined and I am unsure if the benefits will be achieved; more detail would have been helpful.

Disagree: There is minimal detail regarding the unique and specific benefits the department and community expect to achieve. I am unable to determine if the stated benefits would be achieved.

Strongly Disagree: 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.