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Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report

Agenda

• Review of Core RNG Elements Where Concerns are Focused
• Areas of Interest-Concern
• Areas of Interest-Strengths
Sections for Today

- Community Indicators
- Family/Individual Indicators
- Demographics
  - Report on New Customers
  - Report on All Customers
- State Plan Draft

Opening Comments

- Appreciate the time and effort of all involved to get the project to this point-Thank you!
- Partnership has been involved in various meetings and committees looking at versions of RNG along the way over the past four years
- Partnership has provided feedback at each step along the way
- Feedback here is consistent with concerns raised previously with OCS and NASCSP
CSBG Performance Management Framework

- Organizational Standards
- ROMA First Gen
- ROMA Next Gen
- State and Federal Accountability Measures
- Local/State/National
- Theory of Change

CSBG Annual Report/ROMA Next Generation

- Includes New and Revised NPIs
- Increased Reporting to the States and OCS
- Increased Analysis at State, Local, and Federal Levels
CSBG Annual Report/ROMA Next Generation

- Do some RNG pieces belong better in the Community Assessment?
- Should other components remain at the local level for analysis, rather than be reported up?
- Should some components be better incorporated into planning?
- Would the Network be better served with investments of T/TA at all levels to improve analysis?

Balancing Act

Local Resources and Capacities

Need for a Robust System
ROMA is Not Just About Collecting Data...

Data Analysis

Performance Measurement

Planning and Development

Performance Management

OMB Reporting Timeline

CSBG Annual Report/ROMA Next Generation
Official OMB Clearance Process

60-Day OMB Comment Period
Now through 8/15/16

30-Day OMB Comment Period
TBD Fall 2016

Final OMB Submission for OMB Clearance
TBD Fall 2016
OMB/OCS Feedback

• The Federal Register notice requests feedback on the following:
  1. Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility;
  2. The accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information;
  3. The quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
  4. Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

• We especially invite comments on the content, format, and order of the information in the revised CSBG Annual Report. When reviewing the proposed indicators, consider the following questions:
  – Is this the correct data element to collect?
  – Is there a revised/modified data element that would be more appropriate?
  – Is there a new data element that should be included?

Source: OCS Dear Colleague Letter June 17, 2016 (Emphasis added)
Estimated Time Burden

- States: 164 hours-Four Weeks of an FTE
- CAAs: 242 hours-Six Weeks of an FTE

Community Indicators

Overall Concerns

- Rates
- Numbers and Percents
- Definition of local community? Down to the block or neighborhood?
  - Roll up of data-if not intended to be rolled up, then...
  - Inappropriate use/interpretation of data
  - Comparisons become inappropriate
- Training and Technical Assistance Needs
Community Indicators

Employment (check all NPIs for which CA has outcomes to report)
1. The number (and percent) of jobs created to increase opportunities for people with low income, available in the specified community.
2. The number (and percent) of jobs maintained for people in the specified community.
3. The number (and percent) of “living wage” jobs created in the specified community.
4. The number (and percent) of “living wage” jobs maintained in the specified community.
5. The number (and percent) of jobs in the specified community with a PrevPA package.
6. Other Outcome Indicators

Education and Cognitive Development (check all NPIs for which CA has outcomes to report)
1. The number (and percent) of accessible and affordable educational assets or resources added to the specified community.
2. Percent increase of students in grades K-12 who are meeting grade-level expectations.
3. Percent increase of students at or above the basic reading level in the specified community.
4. Percent increase of students at or above the basic math level in the specified community.
5. Percent increase in the number of high school or high school equivalency graduation rate in the specified community.
6. Percent increase in the number of adults who complete high school education in the specified community.
7. Percent increase in the number of adults with low incomes who graduate from post-secondary education in the specified community.
8. Percent increase in the number of adults who attend post-secondary education in the specified community.
9. Percent increase in the number of adults who graduate from post-secondary education in the specified community.
10. Percent increase in the number of adults who graduate from post-secondary education in the specified community.
11. Other Outcome Indicator

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report-Module 3, Section B Page 37

Community Indicators

Infrastructure and Asset Building (check all NPIs for which CA has outcomes to report)
1. The number (and percent) of accessible, affordable or smoke-free housing units created in the specified community.
2. The number (and percent) of existing assets/residences made accessible to low-income communities in the specified community.
3. The number (and percent) of barrier-free, conditions discussed within a specified community.
4. The number (and percent) of barriers/obstacles discussed within a specified community.
5. Other Outcome Indicator

Housing (check all NPIs for which CA has outcomes to report)
1. The number (and percent) of safe and affordable housing units developed in the specified community.
2. The number (and percent) of safe and affordable housing units maintained through VAMP or other rehabilitation efforts in the specified community.
3. The number (and percent) of safe and affordable housing units whose value and quality were improved through VAMP or other rehabilitation efforts in the specified community.
4. The number (and percent) of shelter beds maintained in the specified community.
5. The number (and percent) of shelter beds maintained in the specified community.
6. Percent decrease in the rate of homelessness in the specified community.
7. Percent decrease in the number of homeless veterans in the specified community.
8. Percent increase in the number of people with low incomes in the specified community.
9. Other Outcome Indicator

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report-Module 3, Section B, Page 38
Does not give #, %, or rates?

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report Module 3, Section B, Page 39
### Reporting Tools

- **In situations where the baseline is not available,** agencies must provide a narrative justifying the need for the initiative...
- **The baseline data will not be aggregated to the state and national level...**

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report
Reporting on Stability

The following outcome indicators answer the following commonly asked question: “How many people (or families) are ‘better off/lives improved’ because of CAAEs work?”

Stability is defined as the unduplicated number of people who achieve one or more positive outcomes as identified by the NPIs across all domains.

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual ReportReport-Module 4, Section C, Page 65

CSBG Organizational Standards

- Which set of Standards will the State Use
- How States will Assess

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report, Module 1, Section D, Page 8

CSBG Organizational Standards

- Concerns:
  - Single Metric 100%
  - % that Met All Standards
  - Is this reasonable?
  - Other metrics?

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report, Module 1, Section D, Page 9
Draft CSBG Annual Report
CSBG Organizational Standards

TAP and QIPs

DRAFT CSBG Annual Report
Corrective Action

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report, Module 1, Section H, Page 21
## Community Action Partnership

**Concerns/Questions**

- Elements that are not being rolled up to report to OCS, do they need to be reported to the State?

- Social Indicators Included in Community Section, are they better included in Community Needs Assessments?
  - Rates at small levels are meaningless
  - % are meaningless
Community Action Partnership
Concerns/Questions

• 180 Days
• Challenging without funding to track and follow for most CAAs

Module 4, Section C: Individual and Family NPIs - Data Entry Form

Note: Tracking outcomes for 180 days is the standard that agencies are expected to work toward. The time frame of 180 days is intended to allow agencies with current limited capacity to report on the same time frame and to encourage quarterly review of data. The expectation is that agencies will eventually report on the 180 day indicator. These indicators would only be reported by those in a case management program or similar intervention program where appropriate (e.g., Length of Stay tracking).

When reporting on indicators related to living wage, agencies can provide their own definition or select from national or locally-defined models. Please indicate the living wage definition used in the General Comment box.

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report

Module 4, Section A: Characteristics for NEW Individuals and Households - Data Entry Form

• Will states and OCS really get the data they hope for?
• How and by whom will it be used?
• If for local-only...then T/TA issue, not a reporting one
• How will “New” be defined consistently?
• Potential for large communities to skew statewide rolled up data

Source: FRN#1 - CSBG Annual Report
Other Concerns

• Public CAAs with Sub-Grantees and Private CAAs with Delegate Agencies
  – Data systems of sub-grantees, lack of control
  – 180 days
• Public CAA Data Systems
  – Less control to make changes to data systems
  – Data systems often built for larger departments

Strengths

• Family and Individual Indicators
  – Exception: 180 Days
• Counts of Services and Strategies
• Expanded All Demographics Report
Other Thoughts

- Data without consistency leaves it open to wide misinterpretation
- Implementation of even a scaled down model of what is proposed without T/TA for CAAs and State CSBG Offices is a big concern
- Collective Impact is not the responsibility of one network and while CAAs can be a backbone organization, the true nature of true Collective Impact is often beyond many local CAAs’ capacity and funding
- Why aggregate and roll up data if we are not going to use it?
- There is a concern we will look ineffective as defined by the indicators that will be attributed to the Network
- There were many compromises along the way as the Network developed the CSBG Organizational Standards

Other Thoughts

- Each CAA is unique and remains that way through the CSBG Act
- The State’s monitoring role is to ensure the agency is operating within the established financial and programmatic guidelines
- The CAA decides the mix of services and strategies it provides to effect change in their local community
- CSBG and Community Action serve the poorest families in our communities <125% of poverty; many customers are <50% of poverty.
- Movement toward self-sufficiency and economic security
- Stability and a life of dignity is
Next Steps

• Feedback will be submitted to OCS/OMB by August 15 by Partnership staff.
• Talking Points will be developed and may be utilized by those that have an interest in doing so.
• We are interested in seeing the feedback you provide to OCS/OMB as well as hearing your feedback on what was shared today.
• We hope you will provide feedback to OCS/OMB.

Resources-NASCSP’s Content Template
Resources

Source: NASCSP and OCS

Other Questions?
Upcoming Training

WEBINARS
Assessing the Use of Debt (Loans) in Community Development: Upsides and Downsides
July 27th
2:00 ET/1:00 CT/12:00 MT/11:00 PT

National Trends in Poverty
July 28, 2016
1:00 ET/12:00 CT/11:00 MT/10:00 PT

Decreasing Family Homelessness
September 14, 2016
2:00 ET/1:00 CT/12:00 MT/11:00 PT

Annual Community Action Partnership Convention
Austin, TX
August 30-September 2, 2016
JW Marriott
#Promise2016

Contacts

Denise L. Harlow, CCAP
Chief Executive Officer
dharlow@communityactionpartnership.com

Jarle Crocker, PhD
Director of Training and Technical Assistance
jcrocker@communityactionpartnership.com