

## Appendix 2

### STATE ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

These measures are tied to the critical activities required by the CSBG Act and laid out in the State plan. They are an indication of *how efficiently* and *effectively* the State implemented the elements of the State plan, and *what impact* the State's efforts had on the performance of local eligible entities. The "performance period" for each of the measures is generally the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). These measures apply to the States' interactions with all eligible entities.

#### **Development of the State Plan**

*During the performance period...*

- 1Sa. The State's Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) State Plan
- i. included CSBG-specific goals and strategies<sup>1</sup> for State administration of CSBG; and
  - ii. explained specific steps the State took in developing the State plan to involve the eligible entities.
- 1Sb. Using data from a nationally administered survey<sup>2</sup> of eligible entities, and feedback from OCS and other sources, the State adjusted its plan (in the next State plan submission), as appropriate, to improve performance regarding:
- i. the extent of eligible entity participation in developing the State plan; and
  - ii. how well the State plan reflects the input of the eligible entities.<sup>3</sup>

#### **Implementation of the State Plan**

##### Distribution of Funds

*During the performance period...*

- 2Sa. The State made funds available to eligible entities within 30 calendar days after the Federal award was provided, or consistently and without interruption.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Goals are related to statewide administration of CSBG; strategies are activities that support specific goals and are related to the content areas of the Model State Plan. For example, a goal might be that all eligible entities are using a statewide data system by 2017; the strategies supporting this goal might include allocation of discretionary/remainder funds for IT purchases and/or data system training and technical assistance for eligible entities. In the State's Model State Plan, these strategies would be detailed in Section 7, Use of Funds and Section 8, Training and Technical Assistance, respectively. Another example of a goal might be to increase employment opportunities for CSBG participants. Strategies supporting this goal might include collaborating with State workforce partners to participate in a Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Combined State Plan (as described in Section 9 of the State plan) and/or distributing articles on workforce opportunities as part of a communication plan (described in Section 9). A final example of a goal might be to support eligible entities in meeting all organizational standards; a strategy supporting this goal could be targeted training and technical assistance (as described in Section 8).

<sup>2</sup> OCS will use the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), OMB-approved methodology.

<sup>3</sup> State Accountability Measures 1Sb, 2Sb, 3Sb, 3Sd, 4Sb, and 7Sb are measures of eligible entity satisfaction with the state's performance of critical elements of the State plan.

<sup>4</sup> This measure does not apply to funds distributed by OCS as small, irregular allotments, such as those distributed during a continuing resolution budget period.

- 2Sb. Using data from a nationally administered survey<sup>5</sup> of eligible entities and feedback from OCS and other sources, the State adjusted its plan (in the next State plan submission), as appropriate, to improve the quality of grant and/or contract administration.

#### Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds

##### *During the performance period...*

- 3Sa. The State used its discretionary funds in accordance with the planned strategy and budget outlined in the State plan.<sup>6</sup>
- 3Sb. Using data from a nationally administered survey<sup>7</sup> of eligible entities, and feedback from OCS and other sources, the State adjusted its plan (in the next State plan submission), as appropriate, to improve its use of remainder/discretionary funds.
- 3Sc. The State completed the training and technical assistance activities specified in its State plan, and/or made appropriate adjustments in response to unanticipated emergency needs.<sup>8</sup>
- 3Sd. Using data from a nationally administered survey<sup>9</sup> of eligible entities, and feedback from OCS and other sources, the State adjusted its plan (in the next State plan submission), as appropriate, to improve the training and technical assistance provided to the eligible entities.

#### Grantee Monitoring and Corrective Action

##### *During the performance period...*

- 4Sa. The State...
- i. conducted monitoring activities as directed by the CSBG Act and outlined in the State plan;
  - ii. disseminated monitoring reports to local entities within 60 calendar days; and
  - iii. reported eligible entities on Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs)<sup>10</sup> to OCS within 30 calendar days of the State approving the QIP.<sup>11</sup>
- 4Sb. Using data from a nationally administered survey<sup>12</sup> of eligible entities, and feedback from OCS and other sources, the State adjusted its plan (in the next State plan submission), as appropriate, to improve its monitoring activities.
- 4Sc. Percent of eligible entities resolved identified findings/deficiencies within the schedule, agreed upon by the State and eligible entity, outlined in the Quality Improvement Plan (QIP).<sup>13</sup>
- 4Sd. From all eligible entity single audits that require a management decision, the percent<sup>14</sup> that the State issued a management decision within six months of acceptance of the audit report by the FAC (Federal Audit Clearinghouse).<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> OCS will use the ACSI, OMB-approved methodology.

<sup>6</sup> This will be a semi-annual measure in the future, possibly FY 2017.

<sup>7</sup> OCS will use the ACSI, OMB-approved methodology.

<sup>8</sup> This will be a semi-annual measure in the future, possibly FY 2017.

<sup>9</sup> OCS will use the ACSI, OMB-approved methodology.

<sup>10</sup> Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) are described in section 678C of the CSBG Act.

<sup>11</sup> This will be a semi-annual measure in the future, possibly FY 2017.

<sup>12</sup> OCS will use the ACSI, OMB-approved methodology.

<sup>13</sup> This will be a semi-annual measure in the future, possibly FY 2017.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting*During the performance period...*

- 5S. The State submitted to:
- i. OCS the State's CSBG Annual Report by the OCS-established deadline;<sup>16</sup>
  - ii. each eligible entity written feedback regarding the entity's performance in meeting ROMA goals, as measured through National Performance Indicator (NPI) data, within 60 calendar days of submitting the State's Annual Report; and
  - iii. the eligible entities and State Community Action association information about performance on the State accountability measures, within 60 calendar days of getting feedback from OCS.

Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities*During the performance period...*

- 6Sa. "x" percent<sup>17</sup> of eligible entities in the State met all the State-adopted organizational standards.
- 6Sb. The State had in place Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs) and/or Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) for all eligible entities with unmet standards.<sup>18</sup>

State Linkages and Communication*During the performance period...*

- 7Sa. The State provided both quantitative data and examples of how the State CSBG office maintained and created linkages within State government to assure the effective delivery of services to low-income people and communities.
- 7Sb. Using data from a nationally administered survey<sup>19</sup> of eligible entities, and feedback from OCS and other sources, the State adjusted its plan (in the next State plan submission), as appropriate, to improve its communication efforts.

Eligible Entity Satisfaction*During the performance period...*

- 8S. By 20xx, the State achieved/maintained an Overall Satisfaction score of "x".<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The goal for this measure is 100 percent compliance. The State will establish a baseline percentage in the first year and, if the percentage is less than 100 percent, will track improvement in subsequent years.

<sup>15</sup> As required by 45 CFR 75.521, Management Decisions.

<sup>16</sup> The annual report includes information such as CSBG program data, National Performance Indicators (NPIs) data, and information on State administration of CSBG, and State performance on CSBG Accountability Measures.

<sup>17</sup> The State will establish a baseline percentage in the first year and, if the percentage is less than 100 percent, will set targets for improvement in subsequent years.

<sup>18</sup> If the State, according to the State's corrective action procedures, does not plan to put a QIP in place for an eligible entity with one or more unmet organizational standards, the State should institute a TAP to support the entity in meeting the standard(s).

<sup>19</sup> OCS will use the ACSI, OMB-approved methodology.

<sup>20</sup> OCS will use the ACSI. The State will propose a target score in the CSBG State plan, which will be based on the results of the most recent ACSI survey of the State's eligible entities.