

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
1S. State Plan Development Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Plan 	1Sa. State provided opportunities for eligible entities to contribute to the development of the State Plan and provide feedback on it, including opportunities such as public comment at a public hearing. (Yes/No) 1Sb. The State plan includes a State-wide vision with specific goals for meeting the intent and purpose of CSBG, and indicates how local Community Action Plans link to the vision and goals. (Yes/No)	1Sa. State provided opportunities for eligible entities to contribute to the development of the State Plan and provide feedback on it, including opportunities such as public comment at a public hearing. (Yes/No) 1Sb. The State plan includes a State-wide vision with specific goals for meeting the intent and purpose of CSBG, and indicates how local Community Action Plans link to the vision and goals. (Yes/No)	1Sa. State provided opportunities for eligible entities to contribute to the development of the State Plan and provide feedback on it, including opportunities such as public comment at a public hearing. (Yes/No) 1Sb. The State plan includes a State-wide vision with specific goals for meeting the intent and purpose of CSBG, and indicates how local Community Action Plans link to the vision and goals. (Yes/No)
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
2S. Distribution of Funds Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Annual Report State Plan 	2Sa. When the State has the authority to distribute CSBG funds (i.e., it has received notification from OCS and, if applicable, authorization from the State's budget and/or legislative offices), the State CSBG agency will contract or obligate the funds to local entities within "x" days and in accordance with the lead State agency's written procedures for fund distribution and consistent with the Federal Act's intent. The number of days will be determined jointly by OCS and the State lead agency. (Yes/No)	2Sa. When the State has the authority to distribute CSBG funds (i.e., it has received notification from OCS and, if applicable, authorization from the State's budget and/or legislative offices), the State CSBG agency will contract or obligate the funds to local entities within "x" days and in accordance with the lead State agency's written procedures for fund distribution and consistent with the Federal Act's intent. The number of days will be determined jointly by OCS and the State lead agency. (Yes/No)	2Sa. When the State has the authority to distribute CSBG funds (i.e., it has received notification from OCS and, if applicable, authorization from the State's budget and/or legislative offices), the State CSBG agency will contract or obligate the funds to local entities within "x" days and in accordance with the lead State agency's written procedures for fund distribution and consistent with the Federal Act's intent. The number of days will be determined jointly by OCS and the State lead agency. (Yes/No)
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
3S. Discretionary Funds Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Annual Report State Plan 	3Sa. State CSBG Plan includes a technical assistance strategy to guide the use of CSBG State discretionary funds. The plan is made publically available and clearly outlines how CSBG discretionary funds are allocated within the State. The report includes the % of funds used for capacity building activities (e.g., T/TA, IT, staff training, etc.); for corrective actions; for other CSBG purposes; for other purposes. (Yes/No)	3Sa. State CSBG Plan includes a technical assistance strategy to guide the use of CSBG State discretionary funds. The plan is made publically available and clearly outlines how CSBG discretionary funds are allocated within the State. The report includes the % of funds used for capacity building activities (e.g., T/TA, IT, staff training, etc.); for corrective actions; for other CSBG purposes; for other purposes. (Yes/No)	3Sa. State CSBG Plan includes a technical assistance strategy to guide the use of CSBG State discretionary funds. The plan is made publically available and clearly outlines how CSBG discretionary funds are allocated within the State. The report includes the % of funds used for capacity building activities (e.g., T/TA, IT, staff training, etc.); for corrective actions; for other CSBG purposes; for other purposes. (Yes/No)

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED

MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
<p>4S. Grantee Monitoring and Corrective Action</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Plan • State Annual Report 	<p>4Sa. State agency conducts monitoring activities in accordance with State plan and as required by CSBG Statute. (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sb. State agency staff disseminates monitoring reports to local entities in a timely manner (i.e., within 35 days or date specified in State Plan and State Policies and Procedures). (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sc. In instances where State agency identifies findings or deficiencies through monitoring process, the State requires and receives (in accordance with time frames identified in State Policies and Procedures) a corrective action plan from local eligible entity that contains specific timelines and requirements for improvements.(Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sd. 100% of local entities meeting the agreed upon schedule to resolve corrective action plans or take an appropriate course of action, based on the requirements of the CSBG Act, including reduction of funding or termination of grant eligibility for cause, if necessary. The percentage will be determined by the base year and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</p> <p><i>Schedules will be determined jointly by the state and local entity. The percentage will be based on the number of corrective action plans expected to be completed in a twelve-month reporting period and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time. In cases where corrective action plans are not scheduled for completion by the end of the year, the case will be tracked in the next year. In other words, if the schedule calls for corrections to be made by the next calendar year, these cases will be counted in the following year, not the current year. If corrections are not made during the year in which they are scheduled, a narrative explanation will be submitted and the case will be tracked separately until corrections are complete.</i></p> <p>4Se. 100% of eligible entity A-133 Audits reviewed and closed by the State as required by OMB Circular A-133 within 30 days unless a longer period is agreed to in advance by the Federal agency.</p>	<p>4Sa. State agency conducts monitoring activities in accordance with State plan and as required by CSBG Statute. (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sb. State agency staff disseminates monitoring reports to local entities in a timely manner (i.e., within 35 days or date specified in State Plan and State Policies and Procedures). (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sc. In instances where State agency identifies findings or deficiencies through monitoring process, the State requires and receives (in accordance with time frames identified in State Policies and Procedures) a corrective action plan from local eligible entity that contains specific timelines and requirements for improvements. (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sd. 100% of local entities meeting the agreed upon schedule to resolve corrective action plans or take an appropriate course of action, based on the requirements of the CSBG Act, including reduction of funding or termination of grant eligibility for cause, if necessary. The percentage will be determined by the base year and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</p> <p><i>Schedules will be determined jointly by the state and local entity. The percentage will be based on the number of corrective action plans expected to be completed in a twelve-month reporting period and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time. In cases where corrective action plans are not scheduled for completion by the end of the year, the case will be tracked in the next year. In other words, if the schedule calls for corrections to be made by the next calendar year, these cases will be counted in the following year, not the current year. If corrections are not made during the year in which they are scheduled, a narrative explanation will be submitted and the case will be tracked separately until corrections are complete.</i></p> <p>4Se. 100% of eligible entity A-133 Audits reviewed and closed by the State as required by OMB Circular A-133 within 30 days unless a longer period is agreed to in advance by the Federal agency.</p>	<p>4Sa. State agency conducts monitoring activities in accordance with State plan and as required by CSBG Statute. (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sb. State agency staff disseminates monitoring reports to local entities in a timely manner (i.e., within 35 days or date specified in State Plan and State Policies and Procedures). (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sc. In instances where State agency identifies findings or deficiencies through monitoring process, the State requires and receives (in accordance with time frames identified in State Policies and Procedures) a corrective action plan from local eligible entity that contains specific timelines and requirements for improvements. (Yes/No)</p> <p>4Sd. 100% of local entities meeting the agreed upon schedule to resolve corrective action plans or take an appropriate course of action, based on the requirements of the CSBG Act, including reduction of funding or termination of grant eligibility for cause, if necessary. The percentage will be determined by the base year and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</p> <p><i>Schedules will be determined jointly by the state and local entity. The percentage will be based on the number of corrective action plans expected to be completed in a twelve-month reporting period and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time. In cases where corrective action plans are not scheduled for completion by the end of the year, the case will be tracked in the next year. In other words, if the schedule calls for corrections to be made by the next calendar year, these cases will be counted in the following year, not the current year. If corrections are not made during the year in which they are scheduled, a narrative explanation will be submitted and the case will be tracked separately until corrections are complete.</i></p> <p>4Se. 100% of eligible entity A-133 Audits reviewed and closed by the State as required by OMB Circular A-133 within 30 days unless a longer period is agreed to in advance by the Federal agency.</p>

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED

MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
<p>5S. Data Collection, Evaluation and Reporting</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Annual Reports 	<p>5Sa. State’s reporting system collects quantitative data for accountability measures in accordance with CSBG Information Survey (IS) format. (Yes/No).</p> <p>5Sb. State agency submits IS report on time. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sc. State agency submits IS report in prescribed format that allows for aggregation across States according to the agreed upon common definitions and measures. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sd. State agency includes data collection requirement in contracts with local entities. (Yes/No)</p>	<p>5Sa. State’s reporting system collects quantitative data for accountability measures in accordance with CSBG Information Survey (IS) format. (Yes/No).</p> <p>5Sb. State agency submits IS report on time. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sc. State agency submits IS report in prescribed format that allows for aggregation across States according to the agreed upon common definitions and measures. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sd. State agency includes data collection requirement in contracts with local entities. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Se. State agency reporting process incorporates the review of the quality of the data submitted by the local entity to ensure that reporting is complete and standard measures and definitions have been used consistently. The objective is to have data collection and review take place frequently enough to promote timely review and adjustment of activities/resource allocation. The initial data collection and review will be done on a semi-annual basis, with the objective of moving toward a quarterly review for a sub-set of measures that will be determined in consultation with the CSBG Network.</p> <p>5Sf. State agency provides semi-annual (later quarterly) feedback to local entities regarding review of planned versus actual performance as assessed through local data. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sg. On a semi-annual basis (later quarterly), the State agency provides feedback to DSA regarding the progress being made by the local entities for a subset of measures based on the performance data collected. For the feedback, State agencies might compare local entity performance over time.</p>	<p>5Sa. State’s reporting system collects quantitative data for accountability measures in accordance with CSBG Information Survey (IS) format. (Yes/No).</p> <p>5Sb. State agency submits IS report on time. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sc. State agency submits IS report in prescribed format that allows for aggregation across States according to the agreed upon common definitions and measures. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sd. State agency includes data collection requirement in contracts with local entities. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Se. State agency reporting process incorporates the review of the quality of the data submitted by the local entity to ensure that reporting is complete and standard measures and definitions have been used consistently. The objective is to have data collection and review take place frequently enough to promote timely review and adjustment of activities/resource allocation. The initial data collection and review will be done on a semi-annual basis, with the objective of moving toward a quarterly review for a sub-set of measures that will be determined in consultation with the CSBG Network.</p> <p>5Sf. State agency provides semi-annual (later quarterly) feedback to local entities regarding review of planned versus actual performance as assessed through local data. (Yes/No)</p> <p>5Sg. On a semi-annual basis (later quarterly), the State agency provides feedback to DSA regarding the progress being made by the local entities for a subset of measures based on the performance data collected. For the feedback, State agencies might compare local entity performance over time.</p>

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED

MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
<p>6S Organizational Standards</p> <p>Data Source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Plan • State Annual Report 	<p>6Sa. The State developed implementation framework for organizational standards in cooperation with Eligible Entities and the CAA State Association (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sb. Organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards are included in the State Plan (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sc. Organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards are included in State contracts with eligible entities. (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sd. The State Plan includes identification of necessary T/TA to enable Eligible Entities to meet organizational standards (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Se. The State measures and reports the number of Eligible Entities that meet the following percentage of organizational standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% • 90%-99% • 75%-89% • 50%-74% • Less than 50% 	<p>6Sa. The State developed implementation framework for organizational standards in cooperation with Eligible Entities and the CAA State Association (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sb. Organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards are included in the State Plan (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sc. Organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards are included in State contracts with eligible entities. (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sd. The State Plan includes identification of necessary T/TA to enable Eligible Entities to meet organizational standards (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Se. The State measures and reports the number of Eligible Entities that meet the following percentage of organizational standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% • 90%-99% • 75%-89% • 50%-74% • Less than 50% <p>6Sf. The State has in place corrective action plans for all Eligible Entities meeting less than 90% of organizational standards (Yes/No)</p>	<p>6Sa. The State developed implementation framework for organizational standards in cooperation with Eligible Entities and the CAA State Association (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sb. Organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards are included in the State Plan (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sc. Organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards are included in State contracts with eligible entities. (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Sd. The State Plan includes identification of necessary T/TA to enable Eligible Entities to meet organizational standards (Yes/No)</p> <p>6Se. The State measures and reports the number of Eligible Entities that meet the following percentage of organizational standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% • 90%-99% • 75%-89% • 50%-74% • Less than 50% <p>6Sf. The State has in place corrective action plans for Eligible Entities meeting less than 100% of organizational standards (Yes/No) [NOTE: By FY2017, all Eligible Entities are expected to meet all organizational standards.]</p>

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED

MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
<p>7S. Training and Technical Assistance</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Plan 	<p>7Sa. The State has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that is publicly available. (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sb. The State has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that includes consultation with the Eligible Entities and CAA State Association regarding potential T/TA needs (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sc. The State has included plans for T/TA in the State Plan submitted to OCS that includes T/TA on organizational standards, as needed (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sd. The State provides training to State CSBG Monitoring Staff to increase their ability to provide T/TA (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Se. The State provides training to eligible entities on organizational standards (Yes/No)</p>	<p>7Sa. The State has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that is publicly available. (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sb. The State has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that includes consultation with the Eligible Entities and CAA State Association regarding potential T/TA needs (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sc. The State has included plans for T/TA in the State Plan submitted to OCS that includes T/TA on organizational standards, as needed (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sd. The State provides training to State CSBG Monitoring Staff to increase their ability to provide T/TA (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Se. The State provides training to eligible entities on organizational standards (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sf. The State provides T/TA in organizational standards areas that are met by fewer than 30% of the eligible entities (Yes/No)</p>	<p>7Sa. The State has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that is publicly available. (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sb. The State has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that includes consultation with the Eligible Entities and CAA State Association regarding potential T/TA needs (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sc. The State has included plans for T/TA in the State Plan submitted to OCS that includes T/TA on organizational standards, as needed (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sd. The State provides training to State CSBG Monitoring Staff to increase their ability to provide T/TA (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Se. The State provides training to eligible entities on organizational standards (Yes/No)</p> <p>7Sf. The State provides T/TA in organizational standards areas that are met by fewer than 20% of the eligible entities (Yes/No) [NOTE: FY2017 has a lower threshold (20%) than FY2016 (30%).]</p>

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED			
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
8S. Communications Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Annual Report 		8Sa. The State demonstrates communication to Eligible Entities through various mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newsletters, blogs, or other forms of mass communication (Yes/No) Advisory group meetings (Yes/No) Meetings with State CAA Associations (Yes/No) Annual Reports (Yes/No) Information Memorandum or other formal Guidance Documents (Yes/No) <p><i>The goal is to have at least two different forms of communication on a quarterly basis.</i></p>	8Sa. The State demonstrates communication to Eligible Entities through various mechanisms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newsletters, blogs, or other forms of mass communication (Yes/No) Advisory group meetings (Yes/No) Meetings with State CAA Associations (Yes/No) Annual Reports (Yes/No) Information Memorandum or other formal Guidance Documents (Yes/No) <p><i>The goal is to have at least two different forms of communication on a quarterly basis.</i></p>
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
9S. Community Engagement Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Annual Report (narrative) IS 		9Sa. State agency describes the impact of existing partnerships and collaborations between State (government) agencies and the private sector (either nonprofit or for-profit entities) established to assist CSBG target population. (Yes/No). <p><i>Partnerships are considered to be mutually beneficial arrangements wherein each entity contributes and/or receives: time, effort, expertise and/or resources. These could be documented through MOUs, contracts, agreements, documented outcomes, etc. This does not require that all partnerships are documented.</i></p> 9Sb. The State Plan provides examples of how the State coordinated linkages across related social services programs within their State to maintain or improve effective delivery of services to low-income people (assurances) as measured by the number of State programs that are linked or other measure of effectiveness. (Yes/No)	9Sa. State agency describes the impact of existing partnerships and collaborations between State (government) agencies and the private sector (either nonprofit or for-profit entities) established to assist CSBG target population. (Yes/No). <p><i>Partnerships are considered to be mutually beneficial arrangements wherein each entity contributes and/or receives: time, effort, expertise and/or resources. These could be documented through MOUs, contracts, agreements, documented outcomes, etc. This does not require that all partnerships are documented.</i></p> 9Sb. The State Plan provides examples of how the State coordinated linkages across related social services programs within their State to maintain or improve effective delivery of services to low-income people (assurances) as measured by the number of State programs that are linked or other measure of effectiveness. (Yes/No) <p>9Sc. State agency reports the number of established linkages between governmental and other social services programs.</p> <p><i>Linkages encompass strategies and activities developed to fill identified gaps in social services through coordinated planning, data and information sharing protocols, referral of clients among social service providers to create a comprehensive service package, or participation in coalitions and alliances that support CSBG anti-poverty goals and initiatives</i></p>

