A CLOSER LOOK:
The CSBG ANNUAL REPORT – MODULE 1

Module 1 of the CSBG Annual Report focuses on **State Administration** which includes information on administrative and discretionary funds for training and technical assistance, progress of CSBG Eligible Entities on the organizational standards, and States' progress in meeting accountability measures related to monitoring, training, as well as other state management activities.

The sections of Module 1 described below focus primarily on four questions in Section I, Results-Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System and one question in Section B about Statewide Goals and Accomplishments. The questions in Section I provide states the opportunity to report on their ROMA implementation, support of Eligible Entities with ROMA activities, their review of eligible entity data, and on continuous improvement in the Community Action network. The question highlighted from Section B asks the state to describe what the state considers to be the top management accomplishment achieved by the State CSBG office during the reporting year.

This document provides detailed examples of state responses to these questions and is a first look at data provided by states through Module 1.

	Question in Module 1	Common Response Examples	Less Common Response Examples
B.4. State Management Accomplishment	Describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during the reporting year (FFY). Provide examples of how administrative or leadership actions led to improvements in efficiency, accountability, or quality of services and strategies.	Planned, developed and implemented Organizational Standards such as a process for uploading documentation and tracking progress in a centralized database. Increased communication and collaboration with the State Association and CAAs by coordinating T/TA (often in relation to Standards) and addressing ACSI results. Increased number of ROMA Trainers and/or ROMA implementers in the state.	Made efforts in Community Needs Assessment processes by designing client needs assessment and satisfaction surveys and enhancing the design of state-wide assessment tools. Reorganized State Office and partnerships by assigning trainers or points of contact for each CAA, combining WX, LIHEAP, and CSBG, or revising the State funding formula. Launched new state-wide programs such as the development of a Two-Generation approach.

	Question in Module 1	Common Response Examples	Less Common Response Examples
I.2. State ROMA Support	How did the State support the CSBG Eligible Entities in using the ROMA system or alternative performance measurement system in promoting continuous improvement? Describe any data systems improvements, support for community needs assessment, support for strategic planning, or data analysis.	Increased NCRT and NCRIs in the states by, for example, working with Association to support trainings. Formed a ROMA Alliance or Data Task Force. Revised the Community Action Plan to reflect the ROMA Cycle. Updated and upgraded state-wide data systems.	Made efforts in Community Needs Assessment processes by revising written guidance and requirements, creating an executive summary outline, and providing quality samples of needs assessments. Coordinated an annual retreat for ROMA trainers. Conducted surveys with agencies to ascertain their data needs and collection issues.
	Question in Module 1	**Common Response Examples**	**Less Common Response Examples**
I.3. State Review of CSBG Eligible Entity Data	Describe the procedures and activities the State used to review the ROMA data (i.e. all data from elements of the ROMA cycle) from CSBG Eligible Entities for completion and accuracy (e.g. methodology used for validating the data submitted annually by the local agencies).	Reviewed and provided feedback on the Community Action Plan. State staff reviewed agency reports to assess targets. Validated various data points at both desk reviews and onsite monitoring visits. Utilized the CSBG IS Database review tool.	Conducted state regional training for all Executive Directors in reviewing the materials submitted for the IS and what additional analysis could be done. Created plans to start using previous data to determine program changes by comparing previous year reports to the current fiscal year.

	Question in Module 1	Response Examples
I.4. State Feedback on Data Collection, Analysis, and	State Accountability Measure 5S(ii) requires states to submit written feedback to each CSBG Eligible Entity regarding the entity's performance in meeting ROMA goals, as measured through National Performance Indicator (NPI) date, within 60 calendar days of submitting the State's Annual Report.	Many State Offices are in the process of developing procedures to inform CAAs of their performance within 60 days. Used NASCSP Cleaning Memo as a communication tool. Regular feedback occurred throughout the year, during the IS submission and review process. Provided written feedback on prior year vs. current year performance and targets. Provided TTA on new performance management systems.
I.5. State and CSBG Eligible Entity Continuous	Provide 2-3 examples of changes made by CSBG Eligible Entities to improve service delivery and enhance impact for individuals, families, and communities with low-incomes based on their in-depth analysis of performance data.	Upon review of data, one agency noted that many clients were returning annually for utility and other assistance as soon as they became eligible. The agency began piloting a program to steer returning program participants into financial education and income management programs. An agency serving a densely populated area identified a need to increase its capacity to serve more clients efficiently. They added increased automation for data sharing, record processing, and signature gathering across its service locations. An agency discontinued emergency services and began instead to focus on early intervention/education, an unmet need identified in the community.

NASCSP