

APPENDIX A: CSBG Annual Report, Network Feedback and Modifications

Module 1: State Administration

Summary of Feedback:

- Clarification should be provided on the timing and expectations for target setting related to the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) survey.
- Opportunities to summarize accomplishments in one place should be provided.
- Timeframes for financial reporting (e.g. Federal fiscal year vs. State fiscal year or calendar year) should be clarified.
- Tables seeking “brief updates” on monitoring should be clarified to ensure that States do not have to summarize the full monitoring visit.

What has Been Modified:

- The table on the ACSI survey was updated to clarify the ACSI will be conducted once every two years. In addition, a note was added indicating that OCS plans to issue additional guidance on target setting for ACSI in the form of an information memorandum.
- A section for a summary analysis of major changes and accomplishments was added. Additional tools and assistance for completing this section will be made available.
- Timeframes for financial reporting were clarified to indicate the State Administration Module will use the Federal fiscal year as the reporting time frame, other Modules completed by the eligible entities will allow more flexibility.
- The table on monitoring visits was edited so that states will only be required to describe the purpose of a monitoring visit, not the full methodology or findings.

Module 2: Agency Expenditures, Capacity, Resources

Summary of Feedback:

- In the “CSBG Expenditures” section, it was recommended that CSBG expenditure categories should match the domains throughout all reports.
- In the “Agency Capacity” section it was recommended that the credentials listed should capture weatherization credentials.
- Respondents recommended that the agency capacity report should capture the number of partnerships.

What has Been Modified:

- Agencies will be asked to identify the reporting period.
- Domains were revised to align with the services list, strategies list, and CSBG statute.
- Funds used for Administration was moved as a separate line item.
- The Agency Capacity report was revised and moved.
- Refinement of data collection on partnership to clarify eligible entities should report partnerships that contribute to expanding the agency’s capacity.

Module 3: Community Level

Summary of Feedback:

- Some NPIs are not reflective of CAA work and beyond the scope of a CAA; hard to show the correlation between improvements and CAA work.

- Data for some NPIs is not available; baseline requirement is not reasonable.
- Statements indicated concerns that one CAA alone can't achieve some of the community level NPIs listed.
- Some respondents expressed fear of being dropped from the network if an agency does not report community results; fear, too, of reporting small numbers on some of the NPIs.
- The question requiring an agency to explain why it does not do community level work is inappropriate.
- It was recommended that "Community Level Efforts in Progress" templates were too complicated and should be streamlined.
- Clearer definitions of independent, partnership, collective impact were recommended.
- There is some new uncertainty from respondents on how efforts that fold or take a different direction are reported.
- For the "Collective Impact Reporting Tool", some respondents feel it will be very difficult or impossible to accurately measure behavioral and systems change.
- There were recommendations to merge the "Community Level Strategies" list with Community in Progress tool.

What has Been Modified:

- Agencies will indicate on the "Community Level Status Page" whether the initiative has a numeric baseline, has no numeric baseline, or is working to establish a numeric baseline. Agencies are encouraged to provide the baseline number and source when it is available, feasible, and reasonable to collect and track. If this information is not available, agencies will provide a narrative explaining the reason for the initiative and how change will be measured and tracked.
- The question asking agencies to report why they do not do community level work was removed.
- Report was modified and simplified so that it collects basic information on all community level initiatives the CAA has sent outcomes for.
- Created the new "Community Level Initiatives Home Page" which lists ongoing initiatives, and initiatives completed during the reporting period. This page will serve as the starting place for updating information on current initiatives, adding new initiatives, and will track initiatives completed during the reporting period.
- Created the new "Community Level Status Page" which provides valuable information about community initiatives during the reporting period. Information on the Initiative's Ultimate Expected Outcome, Target Community, Baseline, Initiative Year and Duration, Strategies, involvement in Partnerships and Collective Impact, and final reporting on Outcomes are entered on this page.
- The Strategies Report was modified to be reported on via a popup menu in the "Community Level Status Page".
- Target community and baseline data entered on the "Community Level Status Page" will auto populate on the Community Level National Performance Indicator (NPI) data entry form.
- The modifications better showcase the connection between strategies and outcomes, demonstrate how initiatives would be reported on over time, and where information would carry over from year to year.
- Revised a number of the Community NPIs based on feedback, (contact NASCSP for comparison document if needed).
- Deleted Education and Health from the Infrastructure and Asset Building domain to streamline and reduce duplication with other domains.

Module 4: Individual and Family Level

Summary of Feedback

- Extensive comments and confusion on Baseline reporting; a mixture of comments that saw value and those that did not.
- Respondents expressed concerns with systems capacity (securing an unduplicated count of customers and maintaining client history), data interoperability, and costs.
- Respondents were concerned with how we would define “new” customers.
- Respondents incorrectly thought we were suggesting comparing the Baseline Characteristics report with another point in time report and expressed concern.
- It was recommended to add “Not Reported” to every category of the Characteristics report.
- There was a suggestion the Network should research how other Federal funders collect data on gender categories to be inclusive, respectful and provide definitions if additional categories are added and/or “other” are kept.
- Respondents provided positive comments on removing “Individual and Family” outputs from the NPI list.
- Respondents expressed concerns with follow-up requirements for job retention.
- Confusion about reporting on every indicator and whether or not agencies can or should report on services if it is not funded by CSBG.
- Clarification was requested and concerns were expressed around Stability Measure options (i.e. the purpose, etc.).
- Respondents questioned how to define “achieve and maintain capacity to meet basic needs and how “living wage” is to be calculated.
- It was recommended to align definitions and categories to match with other programs such as WIOA, HUD, and Head Start.
- Network expressed concerns about tracking over time (i.e. 90 or 180 days job retention).
- Concerns around measuring and defining services.
- It was recommended that “other” option be added to each Individual/Family NPI domain.

What has Been Modified:

- For clarity and understanding the name of the “Baseline Characteristics Report” has been changed to “Characteristics for New Individuals and Households”.
- The New Characteristics Report will not be used to compare with later point in time data.
- “Characteristics for New Individuals and Households” shortened to capture key information in 11 categories.
- In the “New and the All Characteristics Report” Unknown/not reported was added as a data point to each category.
- Changes to the New and the All Characteristics Report were made to address concerns about not all agencies being able to capture data and produce an unduplicated count (i.e. WIC clients in an agency may not be added to the main agency data system and unduplicated) agencies can report the estimated total number of individuals/households not included in Characteristic report and indicate which programs are not included.
- An Individual and Family NPI Landing page was created to provide an easy pick list for agencies to identify the NPI that links up with their goals and outcomes. Agencies will then be guided to the particular NPI and fill in the information needed for that particular measure.
- Revised a number of the Family/Individual NPI based on feedback (contact NASCSP for comparison document if needed).
- Selected the two stability measures with more positive comments and added them to the NPI list.

Overarching Clarifications:

Flexibility and Customization: As has been the case with the CSBG Information Survey, agencies are not required to report on every data element in ROMA Next Generation. Local agencies will only report on the NPIs, Services, and Strategies that relate to their specific work as set out in agency strategic plans, Community Action Plans and other planning documents. In most modules the options are a menu to pick from and not required fields.

Customer Characteristic and Data Collection: In reference to customer characteristic data points, we recognize there may be circumstance where agencies only collect limited information and will not be able to report on all characteristics for all clients. Programs should be designed to provide quality services and not designed around data collection requirements. We expect over time that agencies will find methods and adjust policies that allow for the appropriate data points to be collected so they may produce solid unduplicated counts that aid them in local analysis and learning what works and under what conditions.