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Updated CSBG Performance Management System
The National Community Action Network Theory of Change

Community Action Goals
- Individuals and families with low incomes are stable and achieve economic security.
- Communities where people with low incomes live are healthy and offer economic opportunity.
- People with low incomes are engaged and active in building opportunities in communities.

Services and Strategies
- Some examples from the network:
  - Health Assessment
  - Housing Placement
  - Family Support Services
  - Employment Coaching
  - Educational Programs
  - Policy Change
  - Community Development
  - Partnerships
  - Collective Impact
  - Advocacy

Community Action Core Principles
- Recognize the complexity of the issues of poverty
- Build local solutions specific to local needs
- Support family stability as a foundation for economic security
- Pursue positive individual, family and community level change
- Maximize involvement of people with low incomes
- Engage local community partners and citizens in solutions
- Leverage state, federal and community resources
- Advocate for systemic change

Performance Management
- How Well Does the Network Operate?
  - Network Excellence
    - Local Organizational Standards
    - State and Federal Accountability Measures
    - Results Oriented Management and Accountability System
- What Difference Does the Network Make?
  - Robust Results
    - National Performance Indicators for Individuals and Families
    - National Performance Indicators for Communities

A national network of over 1,000 high-performing Community Action Agencies, State Associations, State offices, and Federal partners supported by the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) to mobilize communities to fight poverty.

To learn more, check out the Community Action Theory of Change Report. [www.nascsp.org](http://www.nascsp.org)
CSBG Organizational Standards:

• Demonstrate accountability across a complex system
• Work together to characterize an effective and healthy organization
• Build trust
• Provide a roadmap for Continuous Organizational Improvement
• Have buy-in at all levels
COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

Information Memorandum

Transmittal No. 138

Date: January 26, 2015

TO:
State Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Administrators, U. S. Territory CSBG Administrators, Eligible Entities, and State Community Action Associations

SUBJECT:
State Establishment of Organizational Standards for CSBG Eligible Entities under 678B of the CSBG Act, 42 U.S.C. § 9914

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
Office of Community Services
Division of State Assistance
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20447
IM 138

• Summer of 2015 - State Plans address Standards Implementation
• FY 2016 - All States will Implement Standards
• Impact on State Plans, Monitoring, Annual Report
• States Identified Standards Used
  – COE-Developed Standards (OCS recommends)
  – COE-Developed Standards-Modified
  – State Alternative Standards (as rigorous as COE)
CSBG Organizational Standards

- IM 138
- 58 Private CAAs
- 50 Public CAAs
CSBG Organizational Standards

Organized into three thematic groups

**Maximum Feasible Participation**
- Consumer input and involvement
- Community engagement
- Community assessment

**Vision and Direction**
- Organizational leadership
- Board governance
- Strategic planning

**Operations and Accountability**
- Human resource management
- Financial operations and oversight
- Data and analysis
M 138-Assessment

• States are responsible for ensuring that the eligible entities meet all State-established organizational standards. Some standards (i.e., strategic planning, developing an agency-wide budget, etc.) may take several years for eligible entities to meet, but every entity must make steady progress toward the goal of meeting all standards.
During the assessment process...

• If a State finds an eligible entity is not meeting a standard or set of standards, the State’s response will depend on the circumstances.
  – In cases where the eligible entity may be able to meet the standard in a reasonable time frame contingent on some targeted technical assistance, the State and entity may develop a technical assistance plan to target training and technical assistance resources and outline a time frame for the entity to meet the standard(s). If appropriate in other situations, the State may initiate action...including the establishment of a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) with clear timelines and benchmarks for progress.

• As long as the State is confident that the eligible entity is moving toward meeting standards, under a technical assistance plan, QIP, or other oversight mechanism, the State should not initiate action to terminate or reduce funding.
During the assessment process...

• The failure of an eligible entity to meet multiple standards may reflect deeper organizational challenges and risk. In those cases, a State must determine whether it may be necessary to take additional actions, including reducing or terminating funding, in accordance with CSBG IM 116 (Corrective Action, Termination, or Reduction of Funding), issued May 1, 2012. OCS and States do not have the authority under the CSBG Act to bypass the process described in CSBG IM 116 in order to re-compete CSBG funding based on failure to meet organizational standards.
Implementation

• States must follow a process that is consistent with State rules and is as fair and reasonable as possible.
• Allow for input from the boards and leadership of eligible entities on the timing and procedures for implementing, documenting, and reporting on the standards.
• Integrate the organizational standards in State CSBG plans, contracts with eligible entities, funding documents, and oversight and monitoring instruments and reports.
• Clearly communicate expectations around organizational standards prior to State oversight and monitoring activities.
• Only modify organizational standards based on established State rules and procedures that are publicly communicated and transparent.
The State Plan Describes...

- Whether the State is using the COE-developed organizational standards (and any modifications, if applicable);
  - Alternative organizational standards, if applicable;
  - The process for establishing organizational standards officially in the State (e.g., through State regulation, contract terms and conditions, or other official policy documents), including a timeline;
  - The approach for assessing eligible entities against standards;
  - Procedures for corrective action activities based on organizational standards; and
  - Exceptions for limited purpose or very small eligible entities, if applicable.

- States will report on the status of eligible entities based on organizational standards through the required CSBG Annual Report.
Balancing Act

Local Resources and Capacities

Need for a Robust System
Reminders

• Many of the Standards address processes, not participation in the processes-use caution when interpreting.
• Keep it direct and straightforward.
• All parties work together to meet the Standards.
• No one is 100% correct on anything 100% of time. Human beings are doing this work at both the CAA and State CSBG Office and we need to work together.
Tools to Help Assess

• Assessment Tool
• Separate Tools for States and CAAs
• Separate Tool for Private and Public CAA State Assessments
• Includes Final COE-Developed Standards Language
• COE Guidance
Assessment Template

States and CAAs
Summary Sheet
Documentation Packet

SAMPLE Table of Contents (EACH CAA’s TABLE OF CONTENTS WILL VARY)

A. Check Off List of items on File with State CSBG Office

B. Relevant Portions of Board Approved Strategic Plan

C. Additional Strategic Planning Documents
   a. Committee Meeting Minutes/Notes
   b. Summaries of Focus Groups/Surveys

D. Relevant Portions of Community Needs Assessment
   a. Additional Community Needs Assessment Documents

E. Relevant Board Minutes/Sections

Date of Assessment __________________________ Agency Name __________________________

Section 1: CSBG Organizational Standards Which Need to Be Documented as Met Annually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Number</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Standard Category</th>
<th>CAA Assessment Met</th>
<th>CAA Assessment Not Met</th>
<th>Documentation Packet Page Number(s)</th>
<th>State’s Assessment Agrees with CAA’s Y/N</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The organization demonstrates low-income individuals’ participation in its activities.</td>
<td>Consumer Input and Involvement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The organization has a systematic approach for collecting, analyzing, and reporting customer satisfaction data for the governing board.</td>
<td>Consumer Input and Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The organization has documented or demonstrated partnerships across the community, for specifically identified purposes. Partnerships include other anti-poverty organizations in the area.</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>The organization communicates its activities and its results to the community.</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The organization documents the number of volunteers and hours mobilized in support of its activities.</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The organization’s Community Action Plan is outcome-based, anti-poverty focused, and ties directly to the community assessment.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Assistance Plan Tracking Form

DRAFT STATE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PLAN TRACKING FORM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY NAME:</th>
<th>MONITOR NAME:</th>
<th>DATE FORM COMPLETED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unmet CSBG Organizational Standard Number</th>
<th>Performance Improvement Deliverable</th>
<th>Deliverable Deadline</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Progress Review Date</th>
<th>Initial Review Date</th>
<th>Previous Actions Taken</th>
<th>Action Status**</th>
<th>Comments - Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>UW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please attach other documents as needed and appropriate. Form may be modified/adapted as needed by State CSBG Office. Form may be completed quarterly or as frequently as needed.

** NS (Not Started)  UW (Underway)  C (Completed)
Tools to Help Assess

Glossary of Terms

This glossary is provided as guidance by the Organizational Standards Center of Excellence (OSCOE). It is intended to provide some clarity as to the intent of the CSBG Working Group in the development of the Standards. Please note that this is not official guidance and CAAs and State CSBG Offices are encouraged to work together to come to agreement on definitions and to refer to the CSBG Act and Office of Community Services’ Information Memoranda when needed.
Calendar of Required Actions

- Annually
- Every 2 Years
- Every 3 Years
- Every 5 Years
- Documentation
Tools Already Available to Help CAAs Meet the Standards

ONLINE TOOLS

Nonprofit Risk Management Center
Find the answer here | nonprofitrisk.org

Click to access information and resources

Click on the logo above to be taken to the National Training Center's Affiliates Page or Nonprofit Risk Management Center. This will be your entry page to the various affiliate risk management resources available.

CCM business model

CAPLAW

COST ALLOCATE
Red Flags and Remedies

MONITORING MAP FOR CAAs
A GUIDE FOR NAVIGATING THE CSBG REVIEW PROCESS

PREPARING FOR YOUR COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY'S FUTURE: Sustainability, Succession & Transition

PART III: Executive Succession Planning Guide

AUDIT ESSENTIALS
What Every Board Member Needs to Know

EXEMPLARY LEGAL PRACTICES & POLICIES GUIDEBOOK
PART I: Do the Right Thing

How CAAs Can Cultivate a Culture of Compliance and High Ethical Standards
Boards of Directors/Advisory Boards

- Handouts
- Videos

The Boards of Directors play a unique and important role in the life of a Community Action Agency. While staff members transition, founding directors retire, and programs change, the board offers consistency in purpose, intent, and responsibility. The governing board acts as a body, not as individuals, and its members are bound by the Duties of Care, Loyalty, and Obedience, bearing legal liability for their individual actions as well as those of the corporation.
Community Action Partnership
YouTube Channel-Board Videos

COE-developed CSBG Organizational Standards - What Do Boards Need To Know?
by Community Action Partnership • 10 videos • Updated yesterday

This series of 10 videos are designed to introduce governing boards of Private (nonprofit) Community Action Agencies to the COE-developed CSBG Organizational Standards. For more information on the Organizational Standards please visit bit.ly/sta... more

1. Standards for Boards Introduction
   by Community Action Partnership
   11:36

2. Standards for Boards - Consumer Input and Involvement
   by Community Action Partnership
   3.56

3. Standards for Boards - Community Engagement
   by Community Action Partnership
   7.04

4. Standards for Boards - Community Assessment
   by Community Action Partnership
   6.26

5. Standards for Boards - Organizational Leadership
   by Community Action Partnership
   11:59
Toolkits and Webinars for Each of the Nine Categories

• Additional Guidance
  – Definition
  – Compliance
  – Document
• Beyond Compliance
• Resources
• Assessment Scales
Standard 5.2 The organization’s governing board has written procedures that document a democratic selection process for low-income board members adequate to assure that they are representative of the low-income community.

A. Guidance on the Definition and Intent of the Standard

The CSBG Act states that CAA boards must have the tripartite structure noted above, including at least one-third of its membership being democratically selected representatives of the low-income community. Standard 5.2 states that CAA boards need to have written procedures for how this is done in their local organization. It is important to note that the Act states democratically selected, not elected. Once a potential board member is selected, that individual will still need to be elected and seated to the board following the CAA’s bylaws and board policies.

According to IM 82 “the implicit intent of this requirement is to assure that those who currently live in areas served by the agency are represented so that they have a strong voice in agency governance and direction and are able to convey to those they represent the presence and significance of community action in their lives.” All CAA board members have an equal voice and vote in agency governance.

IM 82 continues, “Every effort should be made by eligible entities to assure that board members representing low-income individuals and families:

- Have been selected on the basis of some form of democratic procedure, either directly through election, public forum, or, if not possible, through a similar democratic process such as election to a position of responsibility in another significant service or community organization such as a school PTA, a faith-based organization leadership group, or an advisory board/governing council to another low-income service provider;
- Are truly representative of the geographic area to be served, including racial and ethnic composition, as determined by periodic selection or reselection by the community. Being current should be based on the recent or annual demographics changes as documented in the needs/community assessment. This does not preclude extended service of low-income community representatives on boards. If any question exists, continued representation may be appropriate, but does suggest that continued board

B. Guidance on Compliance and Documentation

Documentation may include the written policy itself, board policy or procedure manual, bylaws, minutes, etc.

CAAs are encouraged to keep this process straightforward and not to incorporate something too complex. Examples of democratic selection procedures for low-income sector directors include:

C. Beyond Compliance Benchmarking Organizational Performance

Having true representation from the low-income community is an important element of a CAA governance structure. Working to ensure that all board committees (beyond committees that have decision-making authority which are already required to maintain the structure) have a tripartite structure can help a CAA move beyond compliance toward excellence. In addition, incorporating advisory committees that engage low-income residents can also bring additional voice to the table.

D. Resources

As with the first standard in this category, this requirement is not new. Such procedures may be written in the agency’s bylaws (and under some states’ CSBG laws or regulations, may be required to insert it into the CAA’s bylaws), procedure manuals, or other document to meet this Standard.


# Assessment Scales

- For Internal Use by CAAs Only
- Moving Beyond Compliance
- Accompanying webinars

## Standard 5.1
The organization's governing board is structured in compliance with the CDBG Act:
- At least one-third democratically-selected representatives of the low-income community;
- One-third local elected officials (or their representatives) and;
- The remaining membership from major groups and interests in the community.

## Standard 5.2
The organization's governing board has written procedures that document a democratic selection process for low-income board members adequate to assure that they are representative of the low-income community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5.1</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Advancing</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our bylaws do not reference the tripartite structure.</td>
<td>Our bylaws reference the tripartite structure but the board does not reflect this.</td>
<td>The organization’s governing board is structured in compliance with the CDBG Act: 1. At least one-third democratically-selected representatives of the low-income community; 2. One-third local elected officials (or their representatives) and; 3. The remaining membership from major groups and interests in the community.</td>
<td>Our low income board seats are filled with people living in low-income communities standing committees that have the power to act on behalf of the board (such as the executive committee) have a tripartite structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5.2</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Advancing</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We do not have a written democratic selection process and the board does not have 1/3 of its membership coming from the low income community</td>
<td>We do not have a written democratic selection process but the board is seated with 1/3 being representatives of the low income community.</td>
<td>The organization’s governing board has written procedures that document a democratic selection process for low-income board members adequate to assure that they are representative of the low-income community.</td>
<td>Our written procedures for selection are followed and reviewed by the board (or appropriate committee) every five years to assess its success and modified as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5.3</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Advancing</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has been more than 10 years since our bylaws were reviewed by an attorney, or never reviewed by an attorney.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an attorney in the past 10 years ago.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an attorney within the past 5 years.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an outside attorney familiar with the state’s nonprofit law within the past 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5.3</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Advancing</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has been more than 10 years since our bylaws were reviewed by an attorney, or never reviewed by an attorney.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an attorney in the past 10 years ago.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an attorney within the past 5 years.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an outside attorney familiar with the state’s nonprofit law within the past 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Nationally Certified ROMA Trainer (NCRT) is to be accessed by each Eligible Entity during the course of the ROMA Cycle. This can be done through a conference call, in person consultation or training, etc. at some point during the cycle. Again, the documentation of this interaction is not meant to be burdensome, but a brief narrative describing the type of interaction with the Certified ROMA Trainer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Certified ROMA Trainer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of Trainer to CAA (On staff, consultant, State Association, Other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Interaction (in person or by phone/web meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date(s) of Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Brief Description of Interaction

This Standard is intended to demonstrate the Eligible Entity's use of all of the phases of the ROMA Cycle in its work. The documentation for this standard can be found in its Community Assessment, Strategic Plan, and agency reports (to external entities and to its board). It is not intended to be a complex or burdensome description of use, but an affirmation that the agency engaged in thoughtful assessment of needs, planning to meet those needs, implementation of programs and services designed to meet those needs, collection of data, and an analysis of this data.

Please provide a brief narrative describing your agency's use of each step of the ROMA Cycle using elements of your Community Assessment and/or Strategic Plan to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Assessment</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Agency Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement of Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached checklist that Nationally Certified ROMA Trainers may use to frame discussion with local agencies about specific areas of the Cycle.
The Learning Community Resource Center’s Webinar Schedule

The Learning Community Resource Center is offering a national mini-webinar series to explore the successes and challenges of our Agencies as they fight the root causes of poverty.

Rural IMPACT Webinar on Tuesday, March 21, at 2:00pm ET. This webinar discusses rural, inter-generational poverty. Register [here](#).

Bundling Services to Improve Outcomes Webinar on Thursday, April 6, at 2:00pm ET. This webinar discusses bundling and aligning services to alleviate poverty. Register [here](#).

Financial Empowerment for Families Webinar on Wednesday, May 24, at 2:00pm ET. This webinar discusses financial empowerment and inclusion. Register [here](#).

Trauma-Informed Approaches Webinar on Thursday, May 25, at 2:00pm ET. This webinar discusses trauma-informed approaches to fighting poverty. Register [here](#).

Statement from Community Action Partnership CEO Denise Harlow

Response to President’s Proposed Budget

March 19, 2015, Washington, DC
2017 Annual Convention

Community Action:
Transforming Communities, Changing Lives

August 29th – September 1st

Join us in Philadelphia for valuable training, legislative information, timely program updates, and unparalleled networking!

Philadelphia Downtown Marriott - Philadelphia, PA

www.communityactionpartnership.com
How do they fit together? Organizational Standards Monitoring, Corrective Action Plans, QIPs & TAPs

TAMARA FAHEY – CSBG PROGRAM COORDINATOR
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
How did MA implement Organizational Standards?

- Hybrid approach using 2 methods identified in IM 138:
  - Self-assessment (with validation by the State AND State-authorized third party)
  - Regular, on-site CSBG monitoring

- Overhauled monitoring processes and devoted time/resources to building a web-based system; gained efficiencies and limited burden on network.

- Incorporated Org. Standard reviews into triennial onsite monitoring (annual review completed either as part of triennial or through desk-review process).
Assessment Scheduling

- Multiple Factors Considered:
  - Triennial Monitoring schedule set in State Plan
  - Date of last assessment (annual reviews scheduled around same month as last triennial)
  - Due dates of other CSBG deliverables
  - Staffing needs
## CSBG Activity Timelines (FY 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Begin work on planning guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>...begin State Plan work before Org. standards due Jan...</td>
<td>...work on planning guide...</td>
<td>Released IS survey to CAAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Release FY17 monitoring schedule and open &quot;Agency Assessment&quot; early Oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAAs responses due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>...work on survey...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>IS survey due to NASCSP by 3/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>...work on state plan before Org. Standards due May...</td>
<td>...work on planning guide...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete planning guide, organize training/kick-off event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Training/Kick-Off Event (June 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Public Hearing (July 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>FY 17-18 State Plan due by 9/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- **CAA Deliverable Due**
- **State Deliverable Due**
“Agency Assessment” (E.Gov)

- CAAs complete self-assessment, upload supporting documentation, and submit Technical Assistance Plans through the web-based system.

- State reviews and validates responses, documents feedback provided, and tracks data on monitoring results.

- Additional State specific “standards” included for triennial monitoring
“Agency Assessment” (E.Gov)

- System features intended to reduce burden:
  - Links to Community Action Partnership's Technical Assistance Guide and additional State specific requirements
  - TAP entry field automatically appears when “Not Met” is selected
  - Documentation and “Met”/“Not Met” rating from last assessment carries over; CAA reviews and updates as needed.
  - Notifications when assessment submitted or reviewed, documents expire, etc.
  - Review and comment history maintained
  - Ability to generate PDF’s of agency Assessment and TAPs; various state reports
Maximum Feasible Participation - Category 2: Community Engagement

Standard 2.1 The organization has documented or demonstrated partnerships across the community, for specifically identified purposes; partnerships include other anti-poverty organizations in the area.

Guidance
- Please upload the completed DHCD Program Eligibility and Service Area and Partnerships Charts.
- For further guidance, refer to the Community Action Partnership Technical Assistance Guide.

Organization Self-Assessment
- Met
- Not Met

Documentation used:
- Description: 
- Upload Date: 12/30/2015
- Effective Date: 11/30/2015

Partnership documentation: agreements, emails, MOU/ MOAs, charts

Status: Submitted Fiscal Year 2017-5
Other State and Federal Compliance Standards - Category 10: Governance

Standard 10.1 Bylaws include all requirements pursuant to 760 CMR 29.06 (d)

Organization Self-Assessment
- Met
- Not Met

Internal Review: ○ Met ○ Not Met ○ Beyond Compliance
This information is internal and can only be seen by Reviewers.

Public Review: ○ Met ○ Not Met ○ In Process
This information is public and can be seen by Submitters when assessment is set to Reviewed. Modifications Requested status.

Documentation used:
- Description
- Upload Date
- Effective Date
- Page Number(s)
- Expires On

Board bylaws
- Bylaws
- Approved by BOD 6/26/2013 12/23/2015
- 06/26/2013

Aging: As Needed/More frequent than annually

Status: Reviewed-Accepted Fiscal Year: 2016-4
Standard 7.4 The governing board conducts a performance appraisal of the CEO/Executive Director within each calendar year.

Guidance
- For further guidance, refer to the Community Action Partnership Technical Assistance Guide

Organization Self-Assessment
- Met
- Not Met

Internal Review: Met
- This information is internal and can only be seen by reviewers.
- Pending TAP

Public Review: Met
- This information is public and can be seen by Submitters when assessment is not in Review: Modifications Requested Status.

see review history

Documentation used:

Board minutes:
- Description: Board Minutes 12-17-15
- Upload Date: 01/11/2016
- Effective Date: 12/17/2015

Technical Assistance Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Deliverable</td>
<td>Proposed Deliverable Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>01/10/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aging: 1 year
Expires On: 12/17/2015
Triennial Onsite Monitoring Process

**Program Year Starts**
(October 1)
- Announce monitoring calendar to CAAs
- “Agency Assessment” available

**Self-Assessment Due Date**
(2 Months Before Onsite)
- CAAs submit “Agency Assessment” (self-assessment, documentation, proposed TAPs)

**Desk Review**
- Review documentation/proposed TAPs, determine onsite follow-up needed, coordinate agenda

**Final Report**
(Within 6 Weeks of Onsite)
- CAA has 2 weeks to respond to preliminary report before final issued
- Final report includes negotiated TAPs

**Onsite Monitoring Date**
- Discuss follow-up questions
- Negotiate TAPs (if needed)
- Conduct file/fiscal reviews

**TAP Progress**
- CAAs submit TAP updates via “Agency Assessment” TAP function
- CAAs encouraged to complete TAPs prior to next Self-Assessment due date
Annual Desk Review Process

**Program Year Starts**  
(October 1)  
- Announce monitoring calendar to CAAs  
- “Agency Assessment” available

**Self-Assessment Due Date**  
(January or May)  
- CAAs submit “Agency Assessment” (self-assessment, documentation, proposed TAPs)

**Desk Review**  
- Review documentation/proposed TAPs, determine exit conference follow-up needed, coordinate agenda

**TAP Progress**  
- CAAs submit TAP updates via “Agency Assessment” TAP function  
- CAAs encouraged to complete TAPs prior to next Self-Assessment due date

**Final Report**  
(Within 2 Weeks of Exit Conference)  
- Final report includes negotiated TAPs

**Exit Conference Date**  
- Discuss follow-up questions  
- Negotiate TAPs (if needed)
Corrective Action

- FY16 was baseline year; emphasized movement towards meeting all 58 rather than total “Not Met”

- Only TAPs utilized, no QIPs

- TAP negotiation process very important
  - Action must occur before Agency Assessment due date for standard to be “Met”.
  - Agency proposes TAP deliverable and deadline, State requests modification if needed.
  - TAP deliverable describes aspect of standard not met, how it will be resolved, and what will be provided to document resolution.
  - TAP deadlines give enough time to adjust processes (if needed) and resolve Not Met before next “Agency Assessment” due.
Lessons Learned

❖ Org. Standards didn’t replace monitoring protocol but were the catalyst for its redesign.

❖ Time and money invested in systems helped reduce long-term burden

❖ Extensive conversations with network during the first year helped clarify expectations for year two and beyond

❖ Org. Standards helped inform state guidance in other areas (e.g. – community needs assessment, strategic plan, network training needs)