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CSBG Organizational Standards

Organized into three thematic groups

**Maximum Feasible Participation**
- Consumer input and involvement
- Community engagement
- Community assessment

**Vision and Direction**
- Organizational leadership
- Board governance
- Strategic planning

**Operations and Accountability**
- Human resource management
- Financial operations and oversight
- Data and analysis
A Framework for Achieving Excellence in Community Action

The Community Action Standards of Excellence are distributed among seven Categories of Excellence creating a management framework.
What Are the Community Action Standards of Excellence?

• The Community Action Standards of Excellence represent 35 of the very best practices of the very best agencies.

• They represent real-world administrative and operational benchmarks that every agency can strive for.
CSBG Organizational Standards

Organized into three thematic groups

**Maximum Feasible Participation**
- Consumer input and involvement
- Community engagement
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**Vision and Direction**
- Organizational leadership
- Board governance
- Strategic planning

**Operations and Accountability**
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Standard 4.1

The governing board has reviewed the organization’s mission statement within the past 5 years and assured that:

1. The mission addresses poverty; and

2. The organization’s programs and services are in alignment with the mission.
4.1 Interpretation: The board has reviewed...within the last 5 years...and assured

- This standard will typically require action (a formal review) by the full board, not just a committee;
- The 5 year period starts from the last time of the board review, not when the agency was monitored
- “Assured” may require a formal board motion that indicates the board agrees (1) that the mission addresses poverty, and (2) programs and services are aligned with the mission
4.1 Interpretation: The mission addresses poverty

• The mission does not have to include the word “poverty” but it does need to clearly address poverty as an issue (e.g. the causes and conditions of poverty)
4.1 Interpretation: Programs and services are in alignment with the mission

• Does your mission clearly articulate:
  --The primary programs and services your agency provides?
  --The anti-poverty outcomes you want to achieve?

• Can your clearly define your agency’s “core business areas” (e.g. workforce development, early childhood, housing)?

• Can you “draw a line” from your programs and services to connect them with your mission?
ROMA Components of the Mission

- **Population** – Who is the agency serving?
- **Services** – What services are being provided?
- **Outcomes** – Are they clearly stated? Can you tell what will change?
- **Relationships/Partnerships** – Is there any identification with other organizations that show connections that help the agency further its mission?
4.1 Documentation

- Minutes from a board meeting or retreat that clearly indicate (1) the date of the review; (2) affirmation that the mission address poverty; and (3) affirmation that the programs and services are aligned with the mission;
- Summary document describing how the board met the standard signed by the ED/CEO and board chair; or
- Strategic planning document describing how the board met the standard
Agency Management - Planning

- Community Assessment
- Agency Priorities
- Outcomes & Indicators
- Services & Activities

4.1 Resources

• See pages 24-30 of the Partnership’s “A Comprehensive Guide to Community Action Strategic Planning” for an extended discussion of how to review the mission and alignment of programs and services

• See Module Two of the ROMA curriculum, “The Agency’s Mission”

Standard 4.2

The organization’s Community Action Plan is outcome-based, anti-poverty focused, and ties directly to the community assessment.
4.2 Interpretation

• “Outcome-based” means the agency should distinguish between outputs and outcomes

• “Anti-poverty focused” means programs and services should primarily serve people with low incomes (at or near the Federal Poverty Level)

• “Ties directly to the community assessment” means the majority of the agency’s programs and services should address needs identified in the community assessment

• Compliance will likely require you to meet all three of the above components
4.2 Documentation

• The Community Action Plan format may not clearly “map” to the three requirements of the standard. One option is to develop a brief narrative that explains how your agency is in compliance with examples for each requirement.

• Documentation could also include a copy of the Community Action Plan and community assessment.
4.2 Resources

• Information Memorandum 49: Program Challenges, Responsibilities and Strategies
• Modules 3 and 7 of the Introduction to ROMA Curriculum 5.0
• The Partnership and NASCSP are developing a guide on how the community assessment, strategic plan, and Community Action Plan are connected
Standard 4.3

The organization’s Community Action Plan and strategic plan document the continuous use of the full Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) cycle or comparable system (assessment, planning, implementation, achievement of results, and evaluation). In addition, the organization documents having used the services of a ROMA-certified trainer (or equivalent) to assist in implementation.
4.3 Interpretation: ...document the continuous use of the full ROMA cycle

• Agencies must show use of the ROMA cycle for both the Community Action Plan and Strategic Plan that includes:
  --Assessment
  --Planning
  --Implementation
  --Achievement of results
  --Evaluation

• This typically means both planning processes have mapped out how they will go through the ROMA cycle
4.3 Interpretation: ...documents having used the services of a ROMA-certified trainer to assist in implementation

• This includes a ROMA Certified Trainer or Implementer

• This typically means the ROMA trainer can review or otherwise support the implementation process – not that they have to develop either plan or be involved in every stage of its development
4.3 Documentation

• The Community Action Plan format may not clearly “map” to every stage of the ROMA cycle. One option is to develop a brief narrative on how the CAP addresses each stage.

• The strategic plan should include a description of how the agency will apply each stage of the ROMA cycle.

• The Partnership website has a form for documenting the use of a ROMA Trainer/Implementer
4.3 Resources

- “Utilizing a Strengths-Based Approach to Implement ROMA Throughout the CAA” guide on using a “results orientation” at all levels of the CAA by using strengths-based practices available on the Partnership website in the Toolkit and Publication Library
- “A Comprehensive Guide to Community Action Strategic Planning” that includes use of the ROMA cycle available on the Partnership website in the Toolkit and Publication Library
- “Documenting Standard 4.3” toolkit available on the Partnership website in Organizational Standards
Standard 4.4

The governing board receives an annual update on the success of specific strategies included in the Community Action Plan.
4.4 Interpretation

• Report to the board should “map” from the contents of the Community Action Plan – avoid “rolling up” too much information. Make sure to clarify the difference – if any – between strategies and programs/services.

• “Update on success” implies the report should include data on planned/targeted results compared to actual results.

• In theory, the report can be given at any time. In practice, wait until sufficient outcome data is available.
4.4 Documentation

• Board minutes showing that the board received the report and the date *should* be sufficient

• A copy of the report may be requested in some cases
4.4 Resources

• National Council of Nonprofits “Dashboards for Boards” [https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/tools-resources/dashboards-nonprofits](https://www.councilofnonprofits.org/tools-resources/dashboards-nonprofits)


• The Philanthrophile “How should a nonprofit board track progress?” [https://philanthrophile.wordpress.com/2013/05/29/how-should-a-nonprofit-board-track-progress/](https://philanthrophile.wordpress.com/2013/05/29/how-should-a-nonprofit-board-track-progress/)
Standard 4.5
(Private/Nonprofit Agencies)

The organization has a written succession plan in place for the CEO/ED, approved by the governing board, which contains procedures for covering an emergency/unplanned, short-term absence of 3 months or less, as well as outlines the process for filling a permanent vacancy.
4.5 Interpretation

Requires three components:
• A written succession plan for the CEO/ED
• Approved by the board
• Procedures for (1) an emergency/unplanned, short term absence or 3 months or less, and (2) process for filling a permanent vacancy

Succession plans also typically name interim leaders, identify locations of critical organizational documents, include a communication plan, list important contacts, etc
4.5 Documentation

• Copy of the succession plan that includes the process for short-term absences and permanent vacancies, and

• Board minutes indicating approval of the succession plan

• Public agencies only need to adhere to local government policies and procedures around interim appointments and filling a permanent vacancy
4.5 Resources

• “Preparing for Your Community Action Agency’s Future: Sustainability, Succession & Transition – Part 2 Executive Succession Planning Guide” available on the Partnership website in the Toolkit and Publication Library

• Center for Nonprofit Management “Nonprofit Succession Planning”

• Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City “Nonprofit Executive Succession-Planning Toolkit”
Standard 4.6
(Private/Nonprofit Agencies)

An organization-wide, comprehensive risk assessment has been completed within the past 2 years and reported to the governing board.
4.6 Interpretation

- Must be organization-wide, not just for one or a group of programs/departments
- Must be comprehensive, not just for one function (e.g. finance, human resources)
- Risk assessment results must be reported to the board
4.6 Documentation

• Copy of the risk assessment tool and brief narrative on its use to confirm it was applied to the whole agency and comprehensive
• Board minutes showing the board had been provided a report
• Public agencies just need to comply with local government policies and procedures
4.6 Resources

- Nonprofit Risk Management Center’s Risk Management Portal available on the Partnership’s website in the **Toolkit and Publication Library** and website [www.nonprofitrisk.org](http://www.nonprofitrisk.org)
T/A Guides Toolkits and Webinars for Each of the Nine Categories

• Additional Guidance
  – Definition
  – Compliance
  – Document
• Beyond Compliance
• Resources
• Assessment Scales
Standard 5.2 The organization’s governing board has written procedures that document a democratic selection process for low-income board members adequate to assure that they are representative of the low-income community.

A. Guidance on the Definition and Intent of the Standard

The CSBG Act states that CAA boards must have the tripartite structure noted above, including at least one-third of its membership being democratically selected representatives of the low-income community. Standard 5.2 states that CAA boards need to have written procedures for how this is done in their local organization. It is important to note that the Act states democratically selected, not elected. Once a potential board member is selected, that individual will still need to be elected and seated as the board following the CAA’s bylaws and board policies.

According to IM 82 “the implicit intent of this requirement is to assure that those who currently live in areas served by the agency are represented so that they have a strong voice in agency governance and direction and are able to convey to those they represent the presence and significance of community action in their lives.” All CAA board members have an equal voice and vote in agency governance.

IM 82 continues, “Every effort should be made by eligible entities to assure that board members representing low-income individuals and families:

- Have been selected on the basis of some form of democratic procedure either directly through election, public forum, or, if not possible, through a similar democratic process such as election to a position of responsibility in another significant service or community organization such as a school PTA, a faith-based organization, leadership group, or an advisory board governing council to another low-income service provider;
- Are truly representative of current residents of the geographic area to be served, including racial and ethnic composition, as determined by periodic selection or reselection by the community. Being current should be based on the recent or annual demographics changes as documented in the needs/community assessment. This does not preclude extended service of low-income community representatives on boards but does mean that continued board

B. Guidance on Compliance and Documentation

Documentation may include the written policy itself, board policy or procedure manual, bylaws, minutes, etc.

CAAs are encouraged to keep this process straightforward and not to incorporate something too complex. Examples of democratic selection procedures include:

C. Beyond Compliance: Benchmarking Organizational Performance

Having true representation from the low-income community is an important element of a CAA's governance structure. Working to ensure that all board committees (beyond committees that have decision making authority which are already required to maintain the structure) have a tripartite structure can help a CAA move beyond compliance toward excellence. In addition, incorporating advisory committees that engage low-income residents can also be an additional voice to the table.

D. Resources

As with the first standard in this category, this requirement is not new. Such procedures may be written in the agency’s bylaws (and under some states’ CSBG laws or regulations, may be required to insert it into the CAA’s bylaws), procedure manuals, or other document to meet this Standards.

http://caplaw.org/resources/PublicationDocuments/TopNotchToolkit.html

Information Memorandum (IM) 82: Tripartite Boards. Issued March 23, 2005
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/oic/resources/im-82-tripartite-boards

Toolkit Sections

Disclosure: Conflict of interest policy should require disclosure.

Obtain the facts.

Hold board meeting.

Make good faith determinations. Transactions in both fair to the CAA and in its best interests.

Document the transaction. Reflect decision process, data relied on and rationale in the meeting minutes.

Monitor and assess. Over time to assess transaction outcomes in the CAA’s best interests.

SOURCE: CAP/AA’S TOOLKIT FOR TOP-NOTCH CAA’S
## Assessment Scales

- For Internal Use by CAAs Only
- Moving Beyond Compliance
- Accompanying webinars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Advancing</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1</strong></td>
<td>Our bylaws do not reference the tripartite structure.</td>
<td>Our bylaws reference the tripartite structure but the board does not reflect this.</td>
<td>The organization's governing board is structured in compliance with the CSBG Act: 1. At least one third democratically-selected representatives of the low-income community; 2. One-third local elected officials (or their representatives) and; 3. The remaining membership from major groups and interests in the community.</td>
<td>Our low income board seats are filled with people living in low-income communities, standing committees that have the power to act on behalf of the board (such as the executive committee) have a tripartite structure.</td>
<td>Our board and each standing committee reflect the tripartite nature of the board structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
<td>We do not have a written democratic selection process and the board does not have 1/3 of its membership coming from the low-income community</td>
<td>We do not have a written democratic selection process but the board is seated with 1/3 being representatives of the low-income community.</td>
<td>The organization's governing board has written procedures that document a democratic selection process for low-income board members adequate to assure that they are representative of the low-income community.</td>
<td>Our written procedures for selection is followed and reviewed by the board (or appropriate committee) every five years to assess its success and modified as needed.</td>
<td>Our written procedures are reviewed prior to each board election cycle to ensure that the process is inclusive and is reaching the intended low-income community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3</strong></td>
<td>It has been more than 10 years since our bylaws were reviewed by an attorney, or never reviewed by an attorney.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an attorney in between 5-10 years ago.</td>
<td>The organization's bylaws have been reviewed by an attorney within the past 5 years.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an outside attorney familiar with the state's nonprofit law within the past 5 years.</td>
<td>Our bylaws have been reviewed by an outside attorney familiar with the state's nonprofit law within the past 5 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
www.communityactionpartnership.com
Boards of Directors/Advisory Boards

• Handouts
• Videos

Community Action Agency Boards of Directors and the CSBG Organizational Standards

The Boards of Directors plays a unique and important role in the life of a Community Action Agency. While staff members transition, founding directors retire, and programs change, the board offers consistency in purpose, intent, and responsibility. The governing board acts as a body, not as individuals, and its members are bound by the Duties of Care, Loyalty, and Obedience, bearing legal liability for their individual actions as well as those of the corporation.
Community Action Partnership
YouTube Channel-Board Videos

COE-developed CSBG Organizational Standards - What Do Boards Need To Know?
by Community Action Partnership • 10 videos • Updated yesterday

This series of 10 videos are designed to introduce governing boards of Private (nonprofit) Community Action Agencies to the COE-developed CSBG Organizational Standards. For more information on the Organizational Standards please visit http://sta... more

1. Standards for Boards Introduction
   by Community Action Partnership
   11:36

2. Standards for Boards - Consumer Input and Involvement
   by Community Action Partnership
   3:55

3. Standards for Boards - Community Engagement
   by Community Action Partnership
   7:04

4. Standards for Boards - Community Assessment
   by Community Action Partnership
   6:26

5. Standards for Boards - Organizational Leadership
   by Community Action Partnership
   11:59
CSBG T/TA Resource Center

- [www.csbgtta.org](http://www.csbgtta.org)
- **Many more toolkits, webinars, and print resources**
- Consultant Bank
- Training Calendar
- Discussion Forum
- Shared Calendar
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