

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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)

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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. X% 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. X% 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. X% 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. X% 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. X% 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. X% 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>

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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>

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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>

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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>

DRAFT

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

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) 9Sc. State agency reports the number of established linkages between governmental and other social services programs. <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>

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
1F. State Plan Review and Acceptance Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Plan OCS Internal Procedures 	1Fa. Number of State Plans reviewed and accepted within 60 business days of receipt of the complete State Plan. <i>If less than 100%, the next year's goal should be an increase until 100% is reached (and maintained). In the event the State Plan is incomplete a full response and information request will be provided to the State within this timeframe and a Plan will be accepted within 15 days after receipt of needed information.</i>	1Fa. Number of State Plans reviewed and accepted within 60 business days of receipt of the complete State Plan. <i>If less than 100%, the next year's goal should be an increase until 100% is reached (and maintained). In the event the State Plan is incomplete a full response and information request will be provided to the State within this timeframe and a Plan will be accepted within 15 days after receipt of needed information.</i>	1Fa. Number of State Plans reviewed and accepted within 60 business days of receipt of the complete State Plan. <i>If less than 100%, the next year's goal should be an increase until 100% is reached (and maintained). In the event the State Plan is incomplete a full response and information request will be provided to the State within this timeframe and a Plan will be accepted within 15 days after receipt of needed information.</i>
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
2F. Distribution of Funds Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OCS Internal Procedures 	2Fa. ACF distributes CSBG funds to State, Tribes, and Territories within 15 business days of OMB and Department apportionment of funds and acceptance of State Plan. Measure will be the number of States for which this is true, and the goal should be all jurisdictions.	2Fa. ACF distributes CSBG funds to State, Tribes, and Territories within 15 business days of OMB and Department apportionment of funds and acceptance of State Plan. Measure will be the number of States for which this is true, and the goal should be all jurisdictions.	2Fa. ACF distributes CSBG funds to State, Tribes, and Territories within 15 business days of OMB and Department apportionment of funds and acceptance of State Plan. Measure will be the number of States for which this is true, and the goal should be all jurisdictions.
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
3F. Grant Monitoring and Corrective Action Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Annual Report OCS Internal Procedures 	3Fa. X% of draft State Assessment Reports sent within 60 calendar days of State Assessment site visit. <i>The percentage will be determined by the base year and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</i> 3Fb X% of State Corrective Action Plans accepted by OCS within 30 days from State submission. 3Fc. X% of States meeting the agreed upon schedule to resolve corrective action plans required by OCS as a result of State Assessments. <i>The percentage will be based on the number of corrective action plans to be completed each Federal Fiscal Year. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</i> 3Fd. X% of States that have repeat audit findings. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will decrease over time until it reaches zero.	3Fa. X% of draft State Assessment Reports sent within 60 calendar days of State Assessment site visit. <i>The percentage will be determined by the base year and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</i> 3Fb X% of State Corrective Action Plans accepted by OCS within 30 days from State submission. 3Fc. X% of States meeting the agreed upon schedule to resolve corrective action plans required by OCS as a result of State Assessments. <i>The percentage will be based on the number of corrective action plans to be completed each Federal Fiscal Year. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</i> 3Fd. X% of States that have repeat audit findings. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will decrease over time until it reaches zero.	3Fa. X% of draft State Assessment Reports sent within 60 calendar days of State Assessment site visit. <i>The percentage will be determined by the base year and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</i> 3Fb X% of State Corrective Action Plans accepted by OCS within 30 days from State submission. 3Fc. X% of States meeting the agreed upon schedule to resolve corrective action plans required by OCS as a result of State Assessments. <i>The percentage will be based on the number of corrective action plans to be completed each Federal Fiscal Year. . The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</i> 3Fd. X% of States that have repeat audit findings. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will decrease over time until it reaches zero.

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED			
MEASURE	FY2015 Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
<p>4F. Data Collection, Evaluation and Reporting</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OCS Internal Procedures 		<p>4Fa. DSA receives State accountability data updates on a small subset of measures on a semi-annual basis (later quarterly). Performance data updates will focus on progress toward performance management goals. DSA provides timely feedback to the States based on performance data/information received.</p>	<p>4Fa. DSA receives State accountability data updates on a small subset of measures on a semi-annual basis (later quarterly). Performance data updates will focus on progress toward performance management goals. DSA provides timely feedback to the States based on performance data/information received.</p>
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
<p>5F. Organizational Standards</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Plan State Annual Report 	<p>5Fa. Number of States in which X% of local eligible entities meet or exceed 90% of organization standards.</p> <p><i>The targeted percentage would increase over time. The first year would determine the baseline. Example: 40 States in which 80% of local eligible entities met or exceeded 90% of organizational standards.</i></p> <p>5Fb. Number of States that have developed an implementation framework for organizational standards in cooperation with Eligible Entities and the CAA State Association</p> <p>5Fc. Number of States that include organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these standards in their State Plan</p> <p>5Fd. Number of States that include organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards in State contracts with eligible entities</p> <p>5Fe. Number of States that include T/TA related to organizational standards in their State Plan</p>	<p>5Fa. Number of States in which X% of local eligible entities meet or exceed 90% of organization standards.</p> <p><i>The targeted percentage would increase over time. The first year would determine the baseline. Example: 40 States in which 80% of local eligible entities met or exceeded 90% of organizational standards.</i></p> <p>5Fb. Number of States that have developed an implementation framework for the organizational standards in cooperation with Eligible Entities and the CAA State Association</p> <p>5Fc. Number of States that include organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these standards in their State Plan</p> <p>5Fd. Number of States that include organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards in State contracts with eligible entities</p> <p>5Fe. Number of States that include T/TA related to organizational standards in their State Plan</p> <p>5Ff. X% of States with Eligible Entities that improved or sustained (if at the highest level) their level of organizational standards compared with the previous year. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</p> <p>5Fg. Number of States that do not have Corrective Action plans in place for CAAs meeting fewer than 90% of the organizational standards</p>	<p>5Fa. Number of States in which X% of local eligible entities meet or exceed 90% of organization standards.</p> <p><i>The targeted percentage would increase over time. The first year would determine the baseline. Example: 40 States in which 80% of local eligible entities met or exceeded 90% of organizational standard.</i></p> <p>5Fb. Number of States that have developed an implementation framework for the organizational standards in cooperation with Eligible Entities and the CAA State Association</p> <p>5Fc. Number of States that include organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these standards in their State Plan</p> <p>5Fd. Number of States that include organizational standards and the expectation to meet 100% of these Standards in State contracts with eligible entities</p> <p>5Fe. Number of States that include T/TA related to organizational standards in their State Plan</p> <p>5Ff. X% of States with Eligible Entities that improved or sustained (if at the highest level) their level of organizational standards compared with the previous year. The percentage will be determined at the end of FY2015 and will improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.</p> <p>5Fg. Number of States that do not have Corrective Action plans in place for CAAs meeting fewer than 90% of the organizational standards</p>

DRAFT PER FEBRUARY 27, 2014

FEDERAL ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES CONTINUED			
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
6F. Training and Technical Assistance Data Sources: • OCS Internal Procedures	6Fa. OCS has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that includes consultation with eligible entities, State CSBG agencies and CAA State Associations regarding potential T/TA needs (Yes/No) 6Fb. OCS funds priorities outlined in the T/TA Strategic Plan (Yes/No) 6Fc. OCS funds the State Association to provide T/TA (Yes/No) 6Fd. OCS provides or supports training to at least 50% of State CSBG Offices on roles/responsibilities and organizational standards. (Yes/No) 6Fe. Number of States providing or funding T/TA on organizational standards	6Fa. OCS has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that includes consultation with eligible entities, State CSBG agencies and CAA State Associations regarding potential T/TA needs (Yes/No) 6Fb. OCS funds priorities outlined in the T/TA Strategic Plan (Yes/No) 6Fc. OCS funds the State Association to provide T/TA (Yes/No) 6Fd. OCS provides or supports trainings to 75% of State CSBG Offices on roles/responsibilities and organizational standards (Yes/No) [NOTE: FY2016 has a higher percentage (75%) than FY2015 (50%).] 6Fe. At least 75% of States provide or fund T/TA on organizational standards	6Fa. OCS has a Strategic Plan for T/TA that includes consultation with eligible entities, State CSBG agencies and CAA State Associations regarding potential T/TA needs (Yes/No) 6Fb. OCS funds priorities outlined in the T/TA Strategic Plan (Yes/No) 6Fc. OCS funds the State Association to provide T/TA (Yes/No) 6Fd. OCS provides or supports trainings to 95% of State CSBG Offices on roles/responsibilities and organizational standards (Yes/No) [NOTE: FY2017 has a higher percentage (95%) than FY2016 (75%).] 6Fe. At least 90% of States provide or fund T/TA on organizational standards [NOTE: FY2017 has a higher percentage (90%) than FY2016 (75%).]
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
7F. Communications Data Sources: • OCS Internal Procedures	.	7Fa. OCS demonstrates communication to States and Eligible Entities through various mechanisms: • 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) <i>The goal is to have at least two different forms of communication on a quarterly basis.</i>	7Fa. OCS demonstrates communication to States and Eligible Entities through various mechanisms: • 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) <i>The goal is to have at least two different forms of communication on a quarterly basis.</i>
MEASURE	FY2015: Baseline Year	FY2016	FY2017
8F. Partnerships and Collaborations Data Sources: • OCS Internal Procedures			8Fa. Partnerships and collaborations as measured by: • The number of DSA webinars involving other Federal agencies and/or private sector organizations. The baseline will be set annually by an internal DSA Directive and should improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time. • The number of conferences sponsored by other Federal agencies and/or private sector organizations where DSA has an active role (e.g. presentations, workshops). The baseline will be set annually by an internal DSA Directive and should improve or be sustained (if at the highest level) over time.