

PREPARING TO COMPLETE MODULE 1 OF THE CSBG ANNUAL REPORT

February 23, 2017

3:30pm-5:00pm



Presenters



Office of Community Services (OCS)

- Seth Hassett, Director, Division of Community Assistance
- Monique Alcantara, Management and Program Analyst


National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCS)

- Jackie Orr, CSBG State Assistance Director
- Lauren Cook, CSBG Team Lead
- Kate Blunt, Consultant
- Katy Kujawski, Consultant

CSBG ANNUAL REPORT

CSBG Annual Report

- Cleared by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on January 12, 2017.
- Cleared for 3-years, expiration date is January 31, 2020.
- [IM 152](#) Provides guidance on implementation.



CSBG Annual Report Implementation: Two Phases

Phase 1:

- States complete only Module 1 in the Online Data Collection (OLDC) System for FY16 and FY17.
- States continue to collect and enter CSBG IS data from CSBG Eligible Entities to enter in the CSBG IS Access database for FY16 and FY17.
- The FY16 submission date for Module 1 in OLDC and the CSBG IS Access database is **April 7, 2017.**

CSBG Annual Report Implementation: Two Phases

Phase 2:

- States will report on Modules 1 – 4 for the FY18 CSBG Annual Report in OLDC.
- States will collect Modules 2-4 from CSBG Eligible Entities and enter the information into OLDC.
- The expected submission date is **March 31, 2019**.

Data Submission for FY16

Due April 7, 2017

- **CSBG Annual Report in OLDC:**
 - Module 1: State Administration
 - Sections A-I
- **CSBG IS Survey in the Access Database:**
 - Section B, Eligible Entity List
 - Section D
 - T/TA Survey
 - Sections E-G
 - NPIs

Module 1

STATE ADMINISTRATION

Module 1: State Administration

ALL information reported in Module 1 will be based on Federal Fiscal Year 2016.

October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016

CSBG Annual Report

Completed in OLDC

Submitted to OCS

Due April 7, 2017

Module 1: State Administration **ONLY**

Section A: CSBG Lead Agency, CSBG Authorized Official, CSBG Point of Contact

Section B: Statewide Goals and Accomplishments

Section C: CSBG Eligible Entity Update

Section D: Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities

Section E: State Use of Funds

Section F: State Training and Technical Assistance

Section G: State Linkages and Communication

Section H: Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal Controls

Section I: Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA)

Module 1: State Administration





- Similar to Sections A-D in the CSBG IS.
- Completed by State CSBG Administrators.
- All information is based on the FFY.
- Data is auto populated from the FY 2016 State Plan.

Module 1: State Administration

- Includes information on:
 - State administration of CSBG funding;
 - The use of State administrative funds and discretionary funds for training and technical assistance;
 - Progress of eligible entities on the organizational standards; and
 - State’s progress in meeting accountability measures related to State monitoring, training and technical assistance and other critical areas.

Module 1 in OLDC

- NASCSP and OCS have been working with a **Module 1 Beta Testing Work Group** to test Module 1 in OLDC.
- Module 1 in OLDC is expected to be available **March 2, 2017**.
- Module 1 is due in OLDC by **April 7, 2017**.

Module 1 - State Administration	CSBG IS Survey
Section A: CSBG Lead Agency, CSBG Authorized Official, CSBG Point of Contact	Section C. General Information on State CSBG office
Section B: Statewide Goals and Accomplishments	Section D. Accomplishments and Coordination of Funds
Section C: CSBG Eligible Entity Update	Section B. General Information on Local CSBG Agencies
Section D: Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities	n/a 
Section E: State Use of Funds	Section A. State Use of CSBG Funds Section B. General Information on Local CSBG Agencies
Section F: State Training and Technical Assistance	Section B. General Information on Local CSBG Agencies
Section G: State Linkages and Communication	n/a 
Section H: Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal Controls	n/a 
Section I: Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA)	n/a 

Module 1

**SECTION B: STATEWIDE
GOALS AND
ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

How the ACSI is Utilized

- In fall 2015, OCS used the ACSI methodology to obtain feedback from:
 - State CSBG Lead Agencies on services provided by the CSBG, as outlined in the Federal Accountability Measures.
 - CSBG Eligible Entities about services provided by the state CSBG Lead Agencies, as detailed in the new State Accountability Measures.
- OCS and the State CSBG Directors received their ACSI Survey Reports in February, 2016.

CSBG SURVEY, PLANNING AND REPORTING CYCLES BY QUARTER (Q) for FY 2016-FY2018

	1 st Q FY2016 ¹	2 nd Q FY2016	3 rd Q FY2016	4 th Q FY2016	1 st Q FY 17	2 nd Q FY 2017	3 rd Q FY2017	4 th Q FY2017	1 st Q FY2018	2 nd Q FY2018	3 rd Q FY2018	4 th Q FY2018
ACSI Survey of the States	1st survey conducted ²						2nd survey conducted				3rd survey conducted	
ACSI Survey of the Eligible Entities	1st survey conducted	States get survey data				2 nd survey conducted	States receive survey data			3 rd survey conducted	States receive survey data	
Model State Plan				FY 2017 Submission ³				FY2018 Submission ⁴				FY2019 Submission ³
Annual Report						FY 2016 Submission ⁶				FY 2017 Submission ⁷		

- Survey 1 is coded yellow
- Survey 2 is coded green
- Survey 3 is coded blue

B.2. ACSI

B.2. CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction Targets:

In the table below, provide the State's most recent target for CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction during the performance period (FFY).

Prior Year Target	Most Recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) Score	Future Target	Delete
<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="74"/>	<input type="text" value="75"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Add Section B2:

- Enter the most recent ACSI overall satisfaction score and the future target.
- Visit IM 150 for information on targeting.

p. 4

The ACSI and the CSBG Annual Report

- As part of their FY 2016 Annual Report, due **April 7, 2017**, States will report on:
 - The State’s most current ACSI Overall Satisfaction Score;
 - How the State considered feedback from eligible entities and other sources;
 - What actions were taken as a result of that feedback; and
 - Next year’s target for Overall Satisfaction of the eligible entities in the State.

p. 4

The ACSI and The CSBG Annual Report

- Because the State CSBG Plan may cover **two fiscal years**, annual updates related to the eligible entities satisfaction should be provided in the Annual Report.
- Information about the **overall satisfaction** score and future target are requested in both the State Plan and the Annual Report.

p. 4

B.4., B.5. & B.6. - Success Stories

- Success Stories
 - State Management Accomplishments
 - CSBG Eligible Entity Management Accomplishments
 - Innovative Solutions Highlights
- These questions are also included in Section D of the CSBG IS (questions 2a, 2b and 3a).
- During the transition year, report in both Module 1 and the CSBG IS.

p. 5

Module 1

SECTION C: ELIGIBLE ENTITY UPDATE

C.1. CSBG Eligible Entities

SECTION C CSBG Eligible Entity Update

C.1. CSBG Eligible Entities:

The table below includes a list of CSBG Eligible Entities in the State as described in the CSBG State Plan for this reporting year (FFY). Please review and note any changes or updates in this information. This table should include every CSBG Eligible Entity to which the State allocated 90 percent of CSBG funds during the reporting period (FFY). The table should not include entities that only receive remainder/discretionary funds from the State or tribes/tribal organizations that receive direct funding from OCS under Section 677 of the CSBG Act.

C.2. Changes to Eligible Entities List: Did the list of eligible entities under item C.1 change during the reporting period (FFY)? If yes, briefly describe the changes.

C.1a. CSBG Eligible Entity	C.1b. Public or Non Profit	C.1c. Type of Entity (Choose all that apply)	C.1d. Geographical Area Served by County (Provide all counties)	C.1e. Brief Description of "Other"	C.2a. Yes/No	C.2b. Briefly describe changes	Mark for Delete
Northern Plains Community Action Agency	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA) Limited Purpose Agency Local Government Agency Migrant or Seasonal Farmworker Organization	Kent County, Harris County, Pitt County		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/>
Tri-County Community Action Partnership	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA) Limited Purpose Agency Local Government Agency Migrant or Seasonal Farmworker Organization	Smith County, Richland County, Plant County		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/>
Heartland Community Action Agency	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA) Limited Purpose Agency Local Government Agency Migrant or Seasonal Farmworker Organization	Small County, Lott County, Martin County		<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Name changed from Small-Lott CAA to	<input type="checkbox"/>

Add Section C - CSBG Eligible Entities: 1

C.1. CSBG Eligible Entities

- Report any changes to CSBG Eligible Entities in C.1.
- Include the following information:
 - The old name and the new name
 - What changed in the county list
 - DUNS numbers for new entities
 - Addresses

Module 1

**SECTION D:
ORGANIZATIONAL
STANDARDS FOR ELIGIBLE
ENTITIES**

D.2. Organizational Standards

D.2. Organizational Standards Performance:
 In the table below, please provide the percentage of CSBG Eligible Entities that met all State-adopted organizational standards in the reporting period (FFY). The target set in the CSBG State Plan is provided in the left-hand column. For more information on the CSBG Organizational Standards, see [CSBG Information Memorandum # 138](#).

Target vs. Actual Performance on the Organizational Standards

Fiscal Year	State CSBG Plan Target	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met <u>All</u> (100%) State Standards	Actual Percentage Meeting <u>All</u> (100%) of State Standards	Delete
2016		2	1	50.00%	<input type="checkbox"/>

Add Section D - D2: 1

Progress Indicators

Indicate the number of entities that met the following percentages of Organizational Standards

<p>Note - While the State targets the percent of CSBG Eligible Entities to meet 100% of the Organizational Standards, targets are not set in the State Plan for 90%, 80%, and 70% progress indicators.</p>	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between <u>90%</u> and <u>99%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	2	1	50.00%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between <u>80%</u> and <u>89%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	2	0	0.00%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between <u>70%</u> and <u>79%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
2	0	0.00%	

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability measures 6Sa.

D.2. Organizational Standards – Target vs. Actual

- **“State CSBG Plan Target”** will be blank for the first year of reporting.
- The **total number assessed** in D.2 will typically equal the **total number of Eligible Entities** within the state.

D.2. Organizational Standards – Progress Indicators

- The “number of entities” assessed in the **Progress Indicators** will auto-populate from D.2.
- Progress Indicators track the change over time in entities meeting standards.

D.2.b Organizational Standards

D.2b. Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category.

In the table below, provide the number of eligible entities that met each category of the Organizational Standards. The percentage that met all standards in each category will be automatically calculated and totaled in the bottom row.

Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category

Category	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met all Standards in Category	Actual Percentage
1. Consumer Input and Involvement	19	15	78.95%
2. Community Engagement	19	18	94.74%
3. Community Assessment	19	15	78.95%
4. Organizational Leadership	19	17	89.47%
5. Board Governance	19	19	100.00%
6. Strategic Planning	19	13	68.42%
7. Human Resource Management	19	16	84.21%
8. Financial Operations & Oversight	19	15	78.95%
9. Data & Analysis	19	14	73.68%

D.2.b Organizational Standards by Category

- This table provides a description of progress over time in meeting all Organizational Standards.
- This table can be used as a tool to target training and technical assistance.
- The **total number assessed** will **auto-populate** from D.2.

p. 9

Module 1

SECTION E: STATE USE OF FUNDS

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation:

Using the table below, specify the actual allocation of 90 percent of CSBG funds to CSBG Eligible Entities, as described under Section 675C(a) of the CSBG Act. While the CSBG State Plan allows for either percentages or dollar amounts, this table in the administrative report must be based on actual dollars allocated to each CSBG Eligible Entity during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). For each Eligible Entity receiving CSBG funds, provide the Funding Amount allocated to the CSBG Eligible Entity during the FFY.

Planned vs Actual CSBG 90 Percent Funds					
CSBG Eligible Entity	Planned		Actual		Delete
	Funding Amount (\$)	Funding Amount (%)	Allocations (Based on State Formula)	Obligations	
Northern Plains Community Action	0	90.00%	75,000	75,000	
Tr-County Community Action Partnership	0	0.00%	55,000	55,000	
Heartland Community Action Agency	0	0.00%	65,000	65,000	
Total	0	90.00%	195,000	195,000	

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation

- **Allocations (Based on State Formula):**
Enter the dollar amount each CSBG Eligible Entity should receive during the Federal Fiscal Year 2016 based on the **State formula**.
 - This amount may include carryover from previous Federal Fiscal Years.

p. 10

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation

- **Obligations:** Please enter the **actual** dollar amount of funds that were **committed** to each CSBG Eligible Entity through contracts, grants or sub-awards during the Federal Fiscal Year 2016.
 - This amount may include carry over from previous Federal Fiscal Years.

p. 10

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation

- Enter only allocations and obligations to each CBSG Eligible Entity during the Federal Fiscal Year.
- Do not enter *expenditures*.

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation

	1st Q FY16	2nd Q FY16	3rd Q FY16	4th Q FY16
FFY 16	October-December 2015	January-March 2016	April-June 2016	July-September 2016
State Reporting Period	2nd Q FY16	3rd Q FY16	4th Q FY16	1st Q FY 17
July 1-June 30	October-December 2015	January-March 2016	April-June 2016	July-September 2016
State Reporting Period	1st Q FY16	2nd Q FY16	3rd Q FY16	4th Q FY16
October 1 - September 30	October-December 2015	January-March 2016	April-June 2016	July-September 2016
State Reporting Period	4th Q FY15	1st Q FY16	2nd Q FY16	3rd Q FY16
January 1- December 31	October-December 2015	January-March 2016	April-June 2016	July-September 2016

E.9. Total Obligations

E.9. Total Obligations:	
Category	Actual Obligations
Obligations to Eligible Entities (from State CSBG 90% Formula Funds)	\$195,000
State Administrative Costs	\$9,750
Remainder/Discretionary Funds	\$9,750
Total Obligations in FY	\$214,500

- E.9 will auto-populate. Only enter information for E.9a and E.9b.

p. 14

E.9. Total Obligations

E.9a. Prior Year Carryover Of the total amount reported in the row above, the amount that represents carryover funding from the prior fiscal year.	<input type="text" value="15,000"/>
E.9b. Carryover for this Fiscal Year Of the total CSBG amount to the State for this Fiscal Year, the amount that was unobligated and will carry forward to the next Fiscal Year.	<input type="text" value="7,500"/>

- Enter prior year carryover and carryover for this Federal Fiscal Year.

p. 14

E.9. Total Obligations

- Only enter information for E.9a and E.9b:
 - **Carry over** is the amount of total funds the state carried over from the previous Federal Fiscal Year (FFY15).
 - **Carry over from this fiscal year** is the total amount the state will carry over from this Federal Fiscal Year (FFY16).

Questions populated from the CSBG State Plan

- Items E.2., E.4., E.5. & E.6. auto-populate, but will not for certain states who submitted a second year state plan.
- Effected states:
 - Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Utah, Virginia and Washington state

Questions populated from the CSBG State Plan

Annual Report Q	CSBG MSP Q	Editable	CT	MD	MA	UT	VA	WA
Table E.2 Planned Funding Amount Column 2 or 3	Table 7.2. Year One Funding Amount \$ or %	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Table E.4 Planned Admin Funds Target Column 1	7.6	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Item E.5 Staff Positions Funded	7.7	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Table E.6 State FTEs	7.8	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

Item E.2.

- Columns 1 – 3 auto-populate from CSP 7.2.
- **CSBG Eligible Entity** – completed by all states
- **Planned Funding Amount**
 - **Effected States:** Connecticut, Massachusetts, Utah, Virginia and Washington state
 - Complete the actual amounts in Columns 4 and 5 (Allocations and Obligations)

Planned vs Actual CSBG 90 Percent Funds				
CSBG Eligible Entity	Planned		Actual	
	Funding Amount (\$)	Funding Amount (%)	Allocations (Based on State Formula)	Obligations
Action for Bridgeport	0	0.00%	0	0
ACCESS Agency, Inc. (ACCESS)	0	0.00%	0	0

Item E.4.

- **Target from CSBG State Plan 7.6.** – auto-populates
 - **Effected States:** Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Utah, Virginia and Washington state
- **If Entered in the CSBG State Plan...** – can be left
- **Actual Amount Obligated** – Enter the actual amount obligated

State Administrative Funds		
CSBG State Plan		Actual Amount Obligated
Target from CSBG State Plan 7.6	If entered in the CSBG State Plan as a percentage, convert and insert your number in dollars based on actual award amount.	
%	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="\$0"/>

Item E.5.

- **CSBG State Plan** auto-populates from CSP 7.7.
 - **Effected States:** Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Utah, Virginia and Washington state
- **Actual Number**
 - Provide the actual number of staff positions funded

E.5. How many State staff positions were funded in whole or in part with CSBG funds in the reporting period (FFY)?	
Staff Positions Funded	
CSBG State Plan	Actual Number
	<input type="text"/>

Item E.6.

- **CSBG State Plan** auto-populates from CSP 7.8.
 - **Effected States:** Connecticut and Washington state
- **Actual Number**
 - Provide the actual number of staff positions funded

E.6. How many State Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds in the reporting period (FFY)?	
State FTEs	
CSBG State Plan	Actual Number
0	<input type="text"/>

Module 1

**SECTION F: STATE
TRAINING AND
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

F.1. State Training and Technical Assistance

SECTION F Training, Technical Assistance, or Both

F.1. Describe how the State delivered CSBG-funded training and technical assistance to CSBG Eligible Entities by completing the table below. Add a row for each activity; indicate the timeframe; whether it was training, technical assistance or both; and the topic. CSBG funding used for this activity is referenced under Item E.7 (Planned vs. Actual Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds.)

Note: F.1 is associated with State Accountability Measure 3Sc

Training and Technical Assistance							Delete
Training	Topic	Not Conducted	Actual Dates Start Date	Actual Dates End Date	Brief Description		
Training	ROMA	<input type="checkbox"/>	4/11/2016	4/15/2016	This was a week long Intro to ROMA Train the Trainer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Training	Organizational Standards - General	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			This training was not conducted as planned due to scheduling issues. We plan to offer during the next reporting period.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Training	Community Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	5/10/2016		The state office offered a one-day workshop on Community Needs Assessments. All entities were in attendance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Training	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	8/8/2016	8/10/2016	Our state office offered a three day state wide conference in partnership with our state association.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Add Section F.1.: 1

F.1. State Training and Technical Assistance

- Enter only training and technical assistance that was provided or paid for by the **state**.
- Include all discretionary funded training and technical assistance.
- There may be training and technical assistance that occurs in the state that is not reported here.

p. 15

F.1. State Training and Technical Assistance

Example:

Do not include: a training provided by a state association, funded by Regional Performance and Innovation Consortia (RPIC) funds.

Do Include: a conference organized by a state association that was supported by state discretionary funds.

p. 15

F.2. State Training and Technical Assistance

F.2. Indicate the types of organizations through which the State provided training and/or technical assistance as described in Item F.1, and briefly describe their involvement? (Check all that apply.)

CSBG Eligible Entities (if checked, provide the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to receive funds)

If checked, provide the expected number of CSBG eligible entities to receive funds

Five entities will receive discretionary funding for financial security programs.

- Other community-based organizations
- State Community Action Association
- Regional CSBG technical assistance provider
- National technical assistance provider
- Individual consultant(s)
- Tribes and Tribal Organizations
- Other

F.2. State Training and Technical Assistance

- Training or technical assistance that was contracted may be reported in the table in F.1.
- Enter only the types of entities with whom the state contracted.

Module 1

**SECTION G: STATE
LINKAGES AND
COMMUNICATION**

ACSI Report 2015 – Linkages and Communication Scores

	National Min	National Max	Scores	Sample Size	National Impact
Sample Size			579		
Linkages & Communication	6	91	65	576	2.5
Awareness of efforts	11	89	57	522	--
Sufficiency of linkages	19	89	56	500	--
Effectiveness of partnerships	0	86	56	510	--
Sufficiency of information	0	92	62	566	--
Usefulness of feedback	22	94	65	561	--
Frequency of communication	11	97	71	573	--
Clarity of communication	0	100	69	574	--
Responsiveness of staff to requests	0	100	74	567	--
Consistency of responses	0	100	68	567	--

G.1. State Linkages and Coordination at the State Level

- Examples of State linkages and coordination at the State level:
 - The State CSBG office participates in boards, task forces, cross-department meetings to coordinate and promote the work of CSBG.
 - The State CSBG office works closely with LIHEAP and Weatherization to streamline eligibility where possible.
 - The State CSBG office participates in working groups that offer coordination between state and local service providers and CSBG Eligible Entities including homelessness, housing and asset development.

p. 17

G.4. WIOA Combined Plan Activities

- Example of WIOA Combined Plan Activities:
 - The State CSBG office identified CSBG Eligible Entities who operated Employment and Training Programs or who provided employment support services as “one-stop” partners and included those programs and services in the WIOA Combined Plan. This allows WIOA customers to utilize CSBG services in a streamlined manor.

Questions populated from the CSBG State Plan

- Items G.2., G.3a., G.3b., G.5. & G.6. auto-populate
- Complete narrative based on actual implementation
 - Refer to original two-year plan they submitted as needed
- **Effected states:**
 - Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts (except G.6.)
 - South Dakota, Utah, Virginia and Washington state

Annual Report Q	CSBG MSP Q	Editable	CT	MD	MA	SD	UT	VA	WA
G.2.	9.2.	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
G.3a.	9.3a	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
G.3b.	9.3b.	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
G.5.	9.8	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
G.6	9.10.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N

Module 1

SECTION H: MONITORING, CORRECTIVE ACTION, AND FISCAL CONTROLS

H.1. Monitoring of CSBG Entities

SECTION H Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal controls

Monitoring of CSBG Eligible Entities (Section 678B(a) of the CSBG Act)

H.1. Briefly describe the actual monitoring visits conducted during the reporting year including: full on-site reviews; on-site reviews of newly designated entities; follow-up reviews - including return visits to entities that failed to meet State goals, standards, and requirements; and other reviews as appropriate. If a monitoring visit was planned during the year but not implemented, provide a brief explanation in the far right column of the table below.

Instructional Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(i).

CSBG Eligible Entity	Review Type	Planned Site Visit Date	Actual Site Visit Date		Brief Description of Purpose Note: If a monitoring visit was a part of the original state monitoring plan, the State may note that this was a routine scheduled monitoring visit. If the visit was not a part of the original monitoring plan, the State will provide a brief explanation for the purpose of the Visit (e.g. a follow-up regarding a special issue). This section should not be used to outline findings, but should simply note the purpose of the monitoring (FFY) (e.g. follow-up regarding corrective actions).	Not Conducted	Delete
			Start Date	End Date			
Northern Plains Community Action Agency	Full onsite	FY1 Q2	5/16/2016	5/18/2016	This was a regular triennial onsite monitoring visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tr-County Community Action Partnership	Select	FY1 Q3	6/21/2016	6/23/2016	This was a regular triennial onsite monitoring visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heartland Community Action Agency	Select	FY1 Q3	7/12/2016		This visit was TTA follow-up from last year's regular onsite monitoring.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Module 1

SECTION I: ROMA SYSTEM

I.1.a. & I.1.b. ROMA Participation

- Describe how the state:
 - updated data collection systems;
 - implemented new processes to review outcome data;
 - reviewed community needs assessments or community action plans.
- Describe any changes in these processes.

p. 22

I.3. & I.4. State Review and Feedback of Data

- How did the state review and provide feedback on ROMA data?
- Possible activities used by the state:
 - Used the available comparison tools in the CSBG IS Database to identify targeting accuracy and fluctuations.
 - Compared outcome data to Community Action Plans or Needs Assessments.
 - Compared agency documents such as strategic plans to CSBG IS data.

p. 22

I.3. & I.4. State Review and Feedback of Data

- The state provided feedback by:
 - Providing written feedback on the discoveries from the review.
 - The state made a recommendation that the entity consider targeting more individuals for a particular outcome because the entity regularly exceeded their goals.

p. 22

I.5. State and CSBG Eligible Entity Continuous Improvement

- The state identified the following that occurred at an Eligible Entity:
 - An Eligible Entity implemented a single application for individuals and families being served for all programs.
 - An entity organized and operated all of its programs, services, and activities toward accomplishing results identified in their Community Action Plan.
 - An entity cross-trained staff to serve all participants across programs.

p. 23

I.1. ROMA Participation

- States for whom this section will not auto-populate:
 - **Effected States:** Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, Utah, Virginia and Washington state
- In this case, select the best option.

I.1. ROMA Participation:

In which performance measurement system did the State and CSBG Eligible Entities participate, as required by Section 678E(a) of the CSBG Act and the assurance under Section 676(b)(12) of the CSBG Act?

The Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System

Another performance management system that meets the requirements of Section 678E(b) of the CSBG Act

An alternative system for measuring performance and results

Questions?

Tools and Resources

- Currently Available:
 - [Module 1 Word Document](#)
 - [IS and CSBG Annual Report High Level Crosswalk](#)
 - [Annotated CSBG Annual Report](#)
- Coming Soon:
 - Module 1 1-pager
 - Instructions Manual

TOOLS AND RESOURCES

Next Webinar: Preparing for Module 1 Submission in OLDC

Monday, February 27, 2017 3:00-4:30 PM ET

Presented by NASCSP and OCS

Module 1 is expected to be available in OLDC on March 2, 2017. Join OCS and NASCSP for a demo and overview of how to submit your responses.