

Appendix 1
CSBG State Accountability Measure Crosswalk/ACSI Measures Highlighted

Note: This table is provided to assist in cross-referencing the State Accountability Measures (as published in CSBG IM-144 on October 2, 2015) with related questions in the CSBG Model State Plan (OMB No: 0970-0382), and the proposed CSBG Annual Report, Module 1, State Administration (60-day comment version as published June 17, 2016). Accountability Measures and Questions that are directly relevant to the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) are highlighted in yellow. If no question related to a specific Accountability Measure is included in either the State Plan or the Annual Report, the related cell in the table is left blank.

Accountability Measure	Related Question in Model State Plan	Related Question in Proposed Annual Report
1Sa (i) - The State's Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) State Plan included CSBG-specific goals and strategies for State administration of CSBG.	3.2 - Describe the State's CSBG-specific goals for State administration of CSBG under this State Plan.	B1 - Describe progress in meeting the State's CSBG-specific goals for State administration of CSBG under this State Plan.
1Sa (ii) - The State's Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) State Plan explained specific steps the State took in developing the State plan to involve the eligible entities.	3.4a - Describe the specific steps the State took in developing the State Plan to involve the eligible entities.	
1Sb (i) - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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 the extent of eligible entity participation in developing the State plan.	3.4b - How has the State adjusted State Plan development procedures under this State Plan, as compared to past plans, in order 1) to encourage eligible entity participation and 2) to ensure the State Plan reflects input from eligible entities? Any adjustment should be based on the State's analysis of past performance in these areas, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If the State is not making any adjustments, provide further detail.	B3 - How has the State considered feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing and/or customer satisfaction surveys such as the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)? What actions have been taken as a result of this feedback?
1Sb (ii) - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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 how well the State plan reflects the input of the eligible entities.	3.4b - How has the State adjusted State Plan development procedures under this State Plan, as compared to past plans, in order 1) to encourage eligible entity participation and 2) to ensure the State Plan reflects input from eligible entities? Any adjustment should be based on the State's analysis of past performance in these areas, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If the State is not making any adjustments, provide further detail.	B3 - How has the State considered feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing and/or customer satisfaction surveys such as the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)? What actions have been taken as a result of this feedback?
2Sa - The State made funds available to eligible entities within 30 calendar days after the Federal award was provided, or consistently and without interruption.	7.4a - Does the State plan to make funds available to eligible entities no later than 30 calendar days after OCS distributes the Federal award? If no, describe State procedures to ensure funds are made available to eligible entities consistently and without interruption.	E3b - If the State was not able to make CSBG funds available within 30 calendar days after OCS distributed the Federal award, and was not able ensure that funds were made available consistently and without interruption, provide an explanation of the circumstances below along with a description of planned corrective actions.
2Sb - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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.	7.5 - How is the State improving grant and/or contract administration procedures under this State Plan as compared to past plans? Any improvements should be based on analysis of past performance, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If the State is not making any improvements, provide further detail.	
3Sa - The State used its discretionary funds in accordance with the planned strategy and budget outlined in the State plan.	7.9 - Does the State have remainder/discretionary funds? If yes was selected, describe how the State plans to use remainder/discretionary funds in the table below.	E7 - Describe how the State used remainder/discretionary funds.

Appendix 1
CSBG State Accountability Measure Crosswalk/ACSI Measures Highlighted

Accountability Measure	Related Question in Model State Plan	Related Question in Proposed Annual Report
3Sb - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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.	7.11 - How is the State adjusting the use of remainder/discretionary funds under this State Plan as compared to past plans? Any adjustment should be based on the State's analysis of past performance, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If the State is not making any adjustments, provide further detail.	
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.	8.1 - Describe the State's plan for delivering CSBG-funded training and technical assistance to eligible entities under this State Plan by completing the table below. Add a row for each activity: indicate the timeframe; whether it is training, technical assistance or both; and the topic. (CSBG funding used for this activity is referenced under item 7.9(a), Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds.)	F1 - Describe how the State delivered CSBG-funded training and technical assistance to eligible entities by completing the table.
3Sd - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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.	8.4 - How is the State adjusting the training and technical assistance plan under this State Plan as compared to past plans? Any adjustment should be based on the State's analysis of past performance, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If the State is not making any adjustments, provide further detail.	
4Sa (i) - The State conducted monitoring activities as directed by the CSBG Act and outlined in the State plan.	10.1 - Specify the proposed schedule for planned monitoring visits 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.	H1 - 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.
4Sa (ii) - The State disseminated monitoring reports to local entities within 60 calendar days.	10.3 - According to the State's procedures, by how many calendar days must the State disseminate initial monitoring reports to local entities?	H3 - Were all State monitoring reports distributed to eligible entities within the timeframes outlined in State procedures?
4Sa (iii) - The State reported eligible entities on Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) to OCS within 30 calendar days of the State approving the QIP.	10.6 - Describe the State's process for reporting eligible entities on QIPs to the Office of Community Services within 30 calendar days of the State approving a QIP?	H5 - Did the State report all eligible entities on QIPs to the Office of Community Services within 30 calendar days of the State approving a QIP?
4Sb - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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.	10.14 - How is the State adjusting monitoring procedures in this State Plan as compared to past plans? Any adjustment should be based on the State's analysis of past performance, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If this State is not making any adjustments, provide further detail.	
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).	10.5 - How many eligible entities are currently on Quality Improvement Plans?	4Sc - Were all eligible entities on Quality Improvement Plans resolved within the schedule agreed upon by the State and eligible entity?

Appendix 1
CSBG State Accountability Measure Crosswalk/ACSI Measures Highlighted

Accountability Measure	Related Question in Model State Plan	Related Question in Proposed Annual Report
4Sd - From all eligible entity single audits that require a management decision, the percent that the State issued a management decision within six months of acceptance of the audit report by the FAC (Federal Audit Clearinghouse).	10.12 - Describe State procedures for issuing management decisions for eligible entity single audits, as required by Block Grant regulations applicable to CSBG at 45 CFR 75.521. If these procedures are described in the State monitoring protocols attached under item 10.2, indicate the page number.	H7 - Briefly describe any management decisions issued according to State procedures of eligible entity single audit.
5S (i) - The State submitted to OCS the State's CSBG Annual Report by the OCS-established deadline.		<i>Submission to be recorded by online system.</i>
5S (ii) - The State submitted to 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.		TBD
5S (iii) - The State submitted to 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.	9.10 - Describe how the State will provide feedback to local entities and State Community Action Associations regarding performance on State Accountability Measures.	G6 - Describe how the State provided feedback to local entities and State Community Action Associations regarding performance on State Accountability Measures.
6Sa - "x" percent of eligible entities in the State met all the State-adopted organizational standards.		D2 - Please provide the percentage of eligible entities that met all State-adopted organizational standards in the reporting period.
6Sb - The State had in place Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs) and/or Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) for all eligible entities with unmet standards. ¹⁸	8.2 - Does the State have in place Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs) or Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) for all eligible entities with unmet organizational standards, if appropriate?	D3a - If the State identified eligible entities with unmet organizational standards for which it was determined that TAPs or QIPs would not be appropriate, please provide a narrative explanation.
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.	9.1 - Describe the linkages and coordination at the State level that the State plans to create or maintain to ensure increased access to CSBG services to low-income people and communities under this State Plan and avoid duplication of services (as required by the assurance under Section 676(b)(5)). Describe or attach additional information as needed.	G1 - Please review and confirm all areas for linkage and coordination outlined in the CSBG State Plan.
7Sb - Using data from a nationally administered survey 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.	9.11 - How is the State adjusting the Communication plan in this State Plan as compared to past plans? Any adjustment should be based on the State's analysis of past performance, and should consider feedback from eligible entities, OCS, and other sources, such as the public hearing. If the State is not making any adjustments, provide further detail.	
8S - By 20xx, the State achieved/maintained an Overall Satisfaction score of "x".	3.5 - Provide the State's target for eligible entity Overall Satisfaction during the performance period: ____.	B2 - Provide the State's most recent target for eligible entity Overall Satisfaction during the performance period.