

CSBG Annual Report

Program Name: Community Services Block Grant

Grantee Name: NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Report Name: CSBG Annual Report

Report Period: 10/01/2022 to 09/30/2023

Report Status: Submitted

Report Sections

- 1. Section A - Module 1 - State Administration*
- 2. Section B - Statewide Goals and Accomplishments*
- 3. Section C - CSBG Eligible Entity Update*
- 4. Section D - Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities*
- 5. Section E - State Use of Funds*
- 6. Section F - State Training and Technical Assistance*
- 7. Section G - State Linkages and Communication*
- 8. Section H - Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal Controls*
- 9. Section I - Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System*

Section A - Module 1 - State Administration

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 08/31/2024
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
<p>Note: The reporting timeframes for all information in the administrative module is based on the Federal Fiscal Year, which runs from October 1 of a given calendar year until September 30 of the following calendar year. When completing the annual report, respondents will first indicate the Federal Fiscal Year for which the state is submitting data. The Online Data Collection (OLDC) system will then auto-populate the administrative module with information from the appropriate year (year 1 or year 2) in the accepted CSBG State Plan. States will be able to update information in these sections, as necessary.</p>	
SECTION A CSBG LEAD Agency, CSBG Authorized Official, CSBG Point of Contact	
A1. Review and update (as applicable) the following information in relation to the lead agency designated to administer the CSBG in the State, as required by Section 676(a) of the CSBG Act.	
A1a. Lead Agency North Dakota Department of Commerce	
A1.b. Cabinet or administrative department of this lead agency	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Community Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Human Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Social Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Governors Office	
<input type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department	
<input type="radio"/> Other, describe	
A1c. Cabinet or Administrative Department Name: Provide the name of the cabinet or administrative department of the CSBG authorized official Division of Community Services	
A1d. Authorized official of the lead agency : Instructional note: The authorized official could be the director, secretary, commissioner etc. as assigned in the designation letter (attached under item 1.3). The authorized official is the person indicated as authorized representative on the SF-424M.	
Name Maria Effertz	Title Division Director
A1e. Street address 1600 East Century Avenue, Suite 6	
A1f. City Bismarck	A1g. State ND
A1h. Zip 58503	
A1i. Telephone (701) 328-5300	Extension
A1j. Fax (701) 328-5320	A1k. Email effertz@nd.gov
A1l. Lead agency website https://www.commerce.nd.gov/community-services	
A.2. Please check additional programs administered by the State CSBG Lead Agency during the reporting year (FFY)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)	
<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Agriculture Programs	
Specify	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Programs	
Specify CDBG, CDBG-CV, ESG, ESG-CV	
<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Labor	
Specify	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, Describe	
If yes, Please list below:	

Section B - Statewide Goals and Accomplishments

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492	
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 08/31/2024	
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module		
SECTION B Statewide Goals and Accomplishments		
B.1. Progress on State Plan Goals: Describe progress in meeting the State's CSBG-specific goals for State administration of CSBG under this State Plan.		
State Plan Goals: Select the status that best fits the current status of your CSBG state goals as provided in your CSBG State Plan, and provide additional details. The goals of the State CSBG office are: 1. Distribution of funds to eligible entities in compliance with all program regulations. 2. Complete reporting requirements and data collection for the CSBG program within the required timeframes. 3. Monitoring of eligible entities to ensure all regulations and compliance requirements are met. 4. To provide training and technical assistance to assist eligible entities in complying with CSBG regulations, program objectives, ROMA, and Organizational Standards.		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> All Goals Accomplished		
Describe how all goals were accomplished, including outcomes: In FY2023 the State distributed FY2023 CSBG funds to all 7 of our eligible entities in a timely & compliant manner. The State used the new funding formula from the 2020 census data, approved in 2022, for the distribution. The State monitoring requires that each agency must be monitored every other year, so this year the State monitored three agencies. The state requested documents prior to the visit and once on-site provided feedback to each agency. All monitored agencies were in compliance with their agency specific program requirements and financials. Upon completion of the on-site monitoring visit the State completed a guide which goes through the programs and client files monitored. Finally, the State and State Association conducted quarterly training for the agencies going over time sensitive material along with CSBG regulations, Organizational Standards, board requirements and other seasonal updates.		
<input type="radio"/> Goals Partially Accomplished		
Describe which goals were met and how, and provide an update on goals that have not yet been met:		
<input type="radio"/> Not Accomplished		
Explain why goals were not met:		
<i>Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 1Sa(i) and will be used in assessing overall progress in meeting State goals.</i>		
B.2. CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction Targets: In the table below, provide the State's most recent target for CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction during the performance period (FFY).		
Prior Year Target	Most Recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) Score	Future Target
73	76	76
Instructional Note: Because the CSBG State Plan may cover two fiscal years, annual updates related to CSBG Eligible Entity satisfaction should be provided in this annual report. The State's target score will indicate improvement or maintenance of the State's Overall Satisfaction score from the most recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) survey of the State's CSBG Eligible Entities. States that did not receive ACSI scores (i.e. States with only a single CSBG Eligible Entity) should not complete Item B.2, but should provide narrative descriptions of other sources of customer feedback and the State's response to that feedback in question B.3. For more information on the ACSI and establishment of targets, see CSBG Information Memorandum #150 Use of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) to Improve Network Effectiveness.		
B.3. CSBG Eligibility Entity Feedback and Involvement: How has the State considered feedback from CSBG Eligible Entities, OCS, public hearings, and other sources, and/or customer satisfaction surveys such as the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)? What actions have been taken as a result of this feedback?		
Every quarter the State attends meetings with the Executive Directors, State Association, and other staff to discuss CSBG updates and answers questions the agencies have. The recent submitted CSBG State Plan allowed for the agencies to provide valuable input and to attend the public hearing. This allows for clarity and transparency from the State to the agency level on what the objectives are and how the State plans to meet those with the buy in from the agencies. Practical incorporations from feedback have been major updates to our Annual Report TTA & Organizational Standard processes. The Org Standards have been transitioned to 100% online and the platform we use took advice directly from the agencies on what they see as areas that would help them be more productive in completing that process. Annual Report TTA has vastly improved with the help from our federal partners (NASCS and OCS), we brought in NASCS staff to do one-on-one smartform training to help demystify that process. This has been extremely beneficial.		
B.4. State Management Accomplishment: Describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during the reporting year (FFY). Provide examples of how administrative or leadership actions led to improvements in efficiency, accountability, or quality of services and strategies.		
I have two: The first accomplishment achieved by the State office was working with our agencies to spend down our entire CSBG Cares allocation. During the year the State had several calls with our agencies to discuss spending opportunities and issues each agency was experiencing. Each agency provided transparency to the State on their ability to spend down their specific allocation. The State helped provide options and eligible activities to regions that were struggling, and with the collaborative effort each agency was able to spend considerable amounts of Cares funds which directly impacted the citizens of our State from the covid pandemic. The second was completing the State Plan. This was my first year completing the CSBG State Plan and the State worked with our agencies to provide feedback and insight into what should be included in this plan. We had several participants in the public hearing, agency participation to community level.		
B.5. CSBG Eligible Entity Management Accomplishments:		

Describe three notable management accomplishments achieved by CSBG Eligible Entities in your state during the reporting year (FFY). Describe how responsible, informed leadership and effective, efficient processes led to high-quality, accessible, and well-managed services and strategies.

The 2023 Statewide Needs Assessment is a primary example of the exceptional leadership demonstrated at both the agency and state association levels. Eligible entities actively promoted the assessment, contributed valuable feedback during survey creation, and engaged with the community on getting results. As a result of this collaborative effort, the 2023 needs assessment achieved success. During this fiscal year our eligible entities not only utilized their FY23 regular CSBG funds but also effectively spent down their CSBG Cares funds. Their dedication and urgency in meeting community needs were commendable. The State, State Association, and eligible entities maintained constant communication, providing crucial assistance based on federal guidance and program requirements. The successful utilization of our Cares allotment can be directly attributed to the commitment and leadership of eligible entity staff. Board Trainings. CAPND continues to see steady and slightly increased participation in quarterly Board trainings by Board members from the local CAAs. By consistently organizing and promoting attendance at these sessions, management demonstrates a commitment to fostering a well-informed and engaged Board of Directors. These training sessions provide board members with crucial updates on relevant laws, regulations, best practices, and industry trends, equipping them with the knowledge and insights necessary to make informed decisions aligned with the organization's mission and goals. Lastly, in 2023, our State, State Association, and eligible entities continued to evolve our data management software system. Agency leaders provided valuable feedback, contributing to the development of organizational standards and enhancing data cohesion. The overall network has undergone a significant shift towards embracing a data culture, affirming its dedication to harnessing data to drive decision-making, foster innovation, and enhance outcomes. Central to this transformation is the increased utilization and streamlined mapping of CAP60, our robust client tracking system. This strategic adoption of CAP60 across the Network underscores managements commitment to ensuring consistent, reliable data collection on client demographics, services rendered, outcomes achieved, and other pertinent metrics.

B.6. Innovative Solutions Highlights:

Provide at least three examples of ways in which a CSBG Eligible Entity addressed a cause or condition of poverty in the community using an innovative or creative approach. Provide the agency name, local partners involved, outcomes, and specific information on how CSBG funds were used to support implementation.

Whole Family Program. CAPND implemented a soft-launch of the Whole Family Program with plans to expand into full implementation in 2024. Whole Family addresses the entire family and addresses core concepts that work to build social and economic mobility. The hallmarks of the Whole Family Program include: center on families, integrate services, remove barriers, incorporate coaching, and more. Each CAA is participating in the program and will be able to produce measurable outcomes. Affordable Connectivity Program. As a Network, CAPND implemented the Affordable Connectivity Program with funding from the FCC. The program is an innovative approach to helping families and individual bridge the digital divide by providing eligible household with access to affordable broadband internet service. Ernies Place in Grand Forks. Extensive planning and work was done in 2023 to meet the goal of opening Ernies Place in 2024. Ernies will be a transitional housing for homeless youth ages 18-24 in North Dakota and Minnesota. Programs and services will be adaptable to each youth's needs and may include transitional housing, budgeting, employment skills, basic life skills, education assistance and housing stability training.

Section C - CSBG Eligible Entity Update

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services			OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492		
CSBG Annual Report			Expiration Date: 08/31/2024		
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module					
SECTION C CSBG Eligible Entity Update					
<p>C.1. CSBG Eligible Entities: The table below includes a list of CSBG eligible entities receiving 90 percent funds within the state, as reported within the CSBG State Plan for this reporting period. Did the list of eligible entities change during the reporting year (FFY)? If yes, briefly describe the changes. Please also update the Master List prior to the submission of your next CSBG State Plan. If the eligible entity was designated or re-designated, de-designated or voluntarily relinquished, or merged with another eligible entity(ies), provide additional details in the next submission of the CSBG State Plan.</p>					
CSBG Eligible Entity	Geographical Area Served by County (Provide all counties)	Public or Non Profit	Type of Entity (Choose all that apply)	A change occurred during the reporting period (FFY)	Briefly describe changes
Community Action Partnership Region I & VIII	Divide County, Williams County, McKenzie County, Golden Valley County, Billings County, Dunn County, Stark County, Slope County, Hettinger County, Bowman County, Adams County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	Burke County, Renville County, Bottineau County, Mountrail County, Ward County, McHenry County, Pierce County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	
Dakota Prairie Community Action	Rolette County, Towner County, Cavalier County, Ramsey County, Benson County, Eddy County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	Pembina County, Walsh County, Nelson County, Grand Forks County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	

Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	Steel County, Traill County, Cass County, Ransom County, Sargent County, Richland County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	
Community Action Region VI, Inc.	Wells County, Foster County, Griggs County, Stutsman County, Barnes County, Logan County, Lamoure County, McIntosh County, Dickey County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	
Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	Mercer County, McLean County, Sheridan County, Oliver County, Burleigh County, Kidder County, Morton County, Grant County, Sioux County, Emmons County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	<input type="radio"/> Yes, please describe <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Designated or re-designated <input type="radio"/> Designated or voluntarily relinquished <input type="radio"/> Merged	

C.2. Total number of CSBG eligible entities:

7

Instructional Note:

Limited Purpose Agency refers to a CSBG Eligible Entity that was designated as a limited purpose agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year 1981, that served the general purposes of a community action agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act; did not lose its designation as a limited purpose agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act as a result of failure to comply with that Act and that has not lost its designation as an CSBG Eligible Entity under the CSBG Act.

Instructional Note:

90 Percent funds are the funds a State provides to CSBG Eligible Entities to carry out the purposes of the CSBG Act, as described under section 675C of the CSBG Act. A State must provide "no less than 90 percent" of their CSBG allocation, under Section 675B, to the CSBG Eligible Entities.

Section D - Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492			
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 08/31/2024			
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module				
SECTION D Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities				
<p>Note: Reference CSBG Information Memorandum #138 State Establishment of Organizational Standards for CSBG Eligible Entities</p> <p>D.1. Assessment of Organizational Standards: In the CSBG State Plan, the state indicated whether it would implement the Center of Excellence (COE) organizational standards, a modified version, or an alternative set of standards for its oversight of CSBG:</p> <p>The state's original response is provided below:</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> COE CSBG organizational standards</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Modified version of COE CSBG Organizational Standards</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Alternative set of organizational standards</p> <p>Note: A change to the type of Organizational Standards chosen in the original submission of the CSBG State Plan during the reporting period would require an updated CSBG State Plan.</p> <p>D.1a. Organizational Standards Assessment: Review and update, as applicable, How the State assessed CSBG Eligible Entities against organizational standards, as described in IM 138</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Peer to Peer review (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment / Peer review with State risk analysis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> State - authorized third party validation</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular, on-site CSBG monitoring</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other</p>				
<p>D.1b. Describe the assessment process as implemented by the State. Please describe any changes in the assessment process that occurred since the time of the CSBG State Plan submission. Please note that with the exception of regular on-site CSBG monitoring, all assessment options above may include either on-site or desk review (or a combination). The specific state process should be described in this narrative. For FY2023, all seven agencies chose to submit their organizational standard self-assessment online via our data management software system (CAP60). Once each agency had provided documents and their assessment to all 58 standards, the State went into CAP60 and reviewed each standard and provided document for approval. If the documentation did not meet the standard the agency is required to submit next steps via CAP60. Follow up is made by the State for eventual approval of any unmet standard.</p>				
<p>D.2. Organizational Standards Performance: In the table below, please provide the percentage of CSBG Eligible Entities that met all State-adopted organizational standards in the reporting period (FFY). The target set in the CSBG State Plan is provided in the left-hand column. For more information on the CSBG Organizational Standards, see CSBG Information Memorandum # 138.</p> <p>Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measures 6Sa.</p>				
Total Number of Entities Assessed				
<p>Note: The states should assess all eligible entities unless the state exempted the eligible entities per guidance in IM #138, as originally reported in the CSBG State Plan.</p>				
Total Number of Entities within the State	Number of Entities Exempted	Number of Assessable Entities	Number of Entities Assessed	Delete
7	0	7	7	
Target vs. Actual Performance on the Organizational Standards				
State CSBG Plan Target		Number that Met <u>All</u> (100%) State Standards		
87		2		
<p>Progress Indicators Indicate the number of entities that met the following percentages of Organizational Standards</p>				

Note - While the State targets the percent of CSBG Eligible Entities to meet 100% of the Organizational Standards, targets are not set in the State Plan for 90%, 80%, and 70% progress indicators.	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met all 100% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	7	2	28.57%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 90% and 99% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	7	5	71.43%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 80% and 89% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	7	0	0.00%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 70% and 79% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
7	0	0.00%	
Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met less than 69% of State Standards	Actual Percentage	
7	0	0.00%	

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability measures 6Sa.

D.2a. In the space below, please identify the challenges and factors contributing to the difference between the target and actual results provided in the top row of Table D.2. (above)

The State did not have realistic expectations for all agencies. The number of agencies who have met all 58 of 58 is two, but all seven of the agencies have met at minimum 95% of the 58 standards. One factor in a few of the agencies not meeting the complete 58 is risk assessments. These are completed every two years, and several agencies did not complete this during the year. The State will work with the Directors to accomplish this process.

D.2b. Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category.

In the table below, provide the number of eligible entities that met each category of the Organizational Standards. The percentage that met all standards in each category will be automatically calculated and totaled in the bottom row.

Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category			
Category	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met all Standards in Category	Actual Percentage
1. Consumer Input and Involvement	7	6	85.71%
2. Community Engagement	7	6	85.71%
3. Community Assessment	7	7	100.00%
4. Organizational Leadership	7	6	85.71%
5. Board Governance	7	7	100.00%
6. Strategic Planning	7	5	71.43%
7. Human Resource Management	7	7	100.00%
8. Financial Operations & Oversight	7	7	100.00%
9. Data & Analysis	7	7	100.00%

D.3. Technical Assistance Plans for Unmet Organizational Standards:

As outlined in IM 138, states are expected to develop a Technical Assistance Plan (TAP) where needed to assist an eligible entity to meet the standard in a reasonable timeframe. Did the state develop any TAPs specifically for eligible entities with unmet organizational standards to assist in meeting the standard(s) in a reasonable timeframe?

Did the state develop any TAPs specifically for eligible entities with unmet organizational standards to assist in meeting the standard(s) in a reasonable timeframe? Yes No

If yes, how many eligible entities are on a TAP, specifically for unmet organizational standards? Provide a numerical amount between 0 - 99. 0

D.3.a. If the State identified CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards for which it was determined that TAPs or QIPs would not be appropriate, please provide a narrative explanation below.

Yes No

The State has once again not determined TAPs or QIPs to be inappropriate but do require all CAAs to submit action plans to meet all Organizational Standards. This process is done via CAP60, where they provide a written action plan to meet the current unmet standard. The State follows up with the CAA on what the plan is, then the agency will follow through on their action plan to satisfy the standard.

Note: D.3. is associated with State Accountability Measure 6Sb.

For additional information on corrective action and the circumstances under which a State may establish TAPs and QIPs, see IM-138, Pages 5-6

Section E - State Use of Funds

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 08/31/2024

Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module

SECTION E State Use of Funds

Note: The purpose of this section is to report on the funds received and spent during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY), October 1 - September 30. Please review the final award letter received during the Federal Fiscal Year for the reporting period and the Federal Financial Report (FFR) submitted using standard form 425 (SF-425) for this for this reporting period. Please ensure that any allocations, obligations, and carry-over amounts reported below are for funds awarded in this federal fiscal year and are reconciled with the amounts reported in the FFR. An electronic version of the FFR is available for reference on the following web address:

CSBG Eligible Entity Allocation (90 Percent Funds) [Section 675C(a) of the CSBG Act]

E.1. State Distribution Formula:

Did the State institute any changes in the distribution formula for the CSBG Eligible Entities during the reporting period covered by this report?

- Yes
 No

E.1.a If yes please describe any specific changes and describe how the state complied with assurances provided in Question 14.8 of the CSBG State Plan as required under Section 676(b)(8) of the CSBG Act.

The State adopted new base allocation amounts and incorporated current Census data for the new funding formula that have been in use starting FY2023. The new formula uses a base of \$165,000 for each of the eight regions of the state as the base allocation. The remaining funds are distributed to the eligible entities based upon the distribution of low-income population across each service area using figures from the 2020 US Census as reflected in the ACS poverty estimates released in 2022.

E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation and Expenditures:

Using the table below, specify the actual allocation of 90 percent of CSBG funds to CSBG Eligible Entities, as described under Section 675C(a) of the CSBG Act. This table must be based on actual dollars allocated, obligated to, and expended (liquidated) for each CSBG Eligible Entity during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). For each Eligible Entity receiving CSBG funds, provide the Funding Amount allocated to the CSBG Eligible Entity during the FFY.

Note: The Amount Allocated and the Amount Obligated are going to be an exact match the majority of the time. Amounts expended (liquidated) should reflect actual payments made to eligible entities.

Planned vs Actual CSBG 90 Percent Funds

CSBG Eligible Entity	Planned Allocations	Actual			Carryover Expenditures
	Funding Amount (\$)	Amount of Allocations (Based on State Formula)	Amount of Obligations	Expenditures	
Community Action Partnership Region I & VIII	535,102	545,029	545,029	256,492	108,527
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	392,833	403,860	403,860	164,350	16,891
Dakota Prairie Community Action	387,365	398,127	398,127	167,375	167,375
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	467,998	482,664	482,664	409,446	51,991
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	711,596	738,052	738,052	501,314	92,647
Community Action Region VI,	297,505	303,918	303,918	180,451	41,008

Inc.					
Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	498,028	514,146	514,146	252,723	22,692
Total	3,290,427	3,385,796	3,385,796	1,932,151	501,131

E.3. Actual Distribution Timeframe:

Did the state make funds available to CSBG eligible entities no later than 30 days after OCS distributed the Federal award? Yes No

E.3a. If no, did the State implement procedures to ensure funds were made available to CSBG Eligible Entities consistently and without interruption? Yes No

E.3b. 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.

Note: Item E.3 is associated with State Accountability Measure 2Sa.

Administrative Funds [Section 675C(b)(2) of the CSBG Act]

E.4. What amount of State CSBG funds did the State obligate for administrative activities during the Federal Fiscal Year? The amount must be based on actual dollars allocated during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). If you provided a percentage in Question 7.6, please convert to dollars.

State Administrative Funds

CSBG State Plan Target	Actual Amount of Allocation (The amount allotted for state administrative activities)	Actual Amount Obligated	Actual Amount of Expenditures (The actual amount liquidated through procurement or direct expenditure activities during the FFY through state)	Actual Carryover Expenditures (The actual amount liquidated through procurement or direct expenditure activities from prior year FFY through state)
5	\$188,099	\$188,099	142,971	\$45,128

E.5. How many State staff positions were funded in whole or in part with CSBG funds in the reporting period (FFY)?

Staff Positions Funded

CSBG State Plan	Actual Number
3	1.0

E.6. How many State Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds in the reporting period (FFY)?

State FTEs

CSBG State Plan	Actual Number
1	1.0

Remainder/Discretionary Funds [Section 675C(b) of the CSBG Act]

E.7. Describe how the State used remainder/discretionary funds in the table below

Instructional Note: This table in the administrative report must be based on actual dollars obligated to each budget category using funds awarded in this federal fiscal year. States that do not have remainder/discretionary funds will not complete this item. If a funded activity fits under more than one category in the table, allocate the funds among the categories. For example, if the State provides funds under a contract with the State Community Action Association to provide T/TA to CSBG Eligible Entities and to create a statewide data system, the funds for that contract should be allocated appropriately between Row A and Row C. If an allocation is not possible, the State may allocate the funds to the main category with which the activity is associated.

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measures 3Sa.

Planned vs. Actual Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds

Remainder/Discretionary Funds Uses (See 675C(b)(1) of the CSBG Act)	Planned Allocation	Actual Allocation	Actual Obligation	Actual Expenditure	Actual Carryover Expenditure	Brief Description of Services/activities
--	--------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	------------------------------	--

a. Training/technical assistance to eligible entities	\$20,000.00	\$0.00	36,000			Training and technical assistance for our agencies.
b. Coordination of State-operated programs and/or local programs	\$0.00	\$0.00	0			N/a
c. Statewide coordination and communication among eligible entities	\$100,000.00	\$94,000.00	58,000			Funding for State Association.
d. Analysis of distribution of CSBG funds to determine if targeting greatest need	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	0			N/a
e. Asset-building programs	\$0.00	\$0.00	0			N/a
f. Innovative programs/activities by eligible entities or other neighborhood groups	\$47,313.35	\$0.00	0			N/a
g. State charity tax credits	\$0.00	\$0.00	0			N/a
h. Other activities, Specify	\$0.00	\$94,099.00	94,099			These excess funds will be distributed to agencies who have spent more than 80% of their total allocation from FY2023.
Totals	\$177,313.00	\$188,099.00	\$188,099	\$0	\$0	

E.8. What types of organizations, if any, did the State work with (by grant or contract using remainder/discretionary funds) to carry out some or all of the activities in table E.7. (above)

CSBG Eligible Entities (if checked, include the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to received funds)
(if checked, include the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to received funds)
7

Other community-based organizations

State Community Action Association

Regional CSBG technical assistance provider

National technical assistance provider

Individual consultant

Tribes and Tribal Organizations

Other

If Other Checked

None (the State will carry out activities directly)

E.9. Total Obligations and Expenditures: Total CSBG funds obligated and expended from CSBG funds awarded for the FFY. (Review and confirm from the chart below).

Category	Actual Obligations	Actual Expenditures
E.9a. CSBG Eligible Entities Funds(from State CSBG 90% Formula Funds)	\$3,385,796	\$1,932,151
E.9b. State Administrative Costs	\$188,099	\$142,971
E.9c. Remainder/Discretionary Funds	\$188,099	\$0
E.9d. Total Obligations in FY	\$3,761,994	\$2,075,122

E.10. Total Award Amount and Unobligated Balance: In the table below, provide the unobligated balance for the federal fiscal year. The amount provided should be identical to the unobligated balance of federal funds as reported in LINE H of the FFR for this reporting year. This is the amount that was unobligated and will carry forward to the next federal fiscal year.

Note: The total award amount should be identical to the amount reported in line LINE D of the FFR. If this amount does not reconcile, please review.

Category	Totals
E.10a. Total Obligations	\$3,761,994
E.10b. Total Expenditures	\$2,075,122
E.10c. Unobligated Balance from the FFY	\$712,913
E.10d. Total Award Amount	\$3,385,799

Section F - State Training and Technical Assistance

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services			OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492		
CSBG Annual Report			Expiration Date: 08/31/2024		
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module					
SECTION F Training, Technical Assistance, or Both					
<p>F.1. Training and Technical Assistance Plan: Describe how the state delivered CSBG-funded training and technical assistance to CSBG eligible entities by completing the table below. Add a row for each activity: indicate the timeframe; whether it was training, technical assistance, or both; and the topic.</p> <p>(CSBG funding used for this activity is referenced under Item E.7a, Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds. State should also describe any training and technical assistance activities performed directly by state staff, regardless of whether these activities are funded with remainder/discretionary funds.)</p> <p>Note: F.1 is associated with State Accountability Measure 3Sc</p>					
Training and Technical Assistance					
Training	Topic	Actual Dates		Brief Description	Delete
		Start Date	End Date		
Training	Governance/Tripartite Boards	01/01/2023	12/31/2023	Quarterly virtual board training conducted by the State Association and State CSBG office. Dates of trainings: Jan 27, April 28, July 28 & October 27.	X
Both	Organizational Standards - General	01/01/2023	12/31/2023	The State CSBG office worked with the Data Specialist to provide training (one-on-one) and group sessions to ask questions and provide feedback on the new process with CAP60.	X
Technical Assistance	Reporting	01/01/2023	12/31/2023	The State office was available for all questions and concerns with the SmartForms prior to submission of the FY22 & FY23 Annual Reports.	X
Training	ROMA	01/01/2023	12/31/2023	North Dakota's ROMA Certified trainers conducted virtual training sessions for staff.	X
<p>Training and Technical Assistance Organizations: Indicate the types of organizations through which the state provided training and/or technical assistance as described in Item F.1, and briefly describe their involvement? (Check all that apply and provide a narrative where applicable.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CSBG Eligible Entities (if checked, provide the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to receive funds)</p> <p>If checked, provide the expected number of CSBG eligible entities to receive funds 7</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other community-based organizations</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Community Action Association</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Regional CSBG technical assistance provider</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National technical assistance provider</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Individual consultant(s)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Tribes and Tribal Organizations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other[Provide the types of organizations]</p>					

Section G - State Linkages and Communication

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 08/31/2024
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
SECTION G State Linkages and Communication	
<p>Note: This section describes activities that the State supported with CSBG remainder/discretionary funds, described under Section 675C(b)(1) of the CSBG Act.</p> <p>Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 7Sa.</p>	
<p>G.1. State Linkages and Coordination at the State Level: Please review and confirm all areas for linkage and coordination that were outlined in the CSBG State Plan.</p>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) office	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Weatherization office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State Head Start office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State public health office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State education department	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) agency	
<input type="checkbox"/> State budget office	
<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	
<input type="checkbox"/> State child welfare office	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State housing office	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
If Other Describe	
<p>G.1a. Describe the linkages and coordination at the state level that the state created or maintained to ensure increased access to CSBG services by communities and people with low-incomes that avoid duplication of services (as required by the assurance under Section 676(b)(5)) and identified in the CSBG State Plan. Describe or attach additional information as needed and provide a narrative describing activities, including an explanation of any changes from the original CSBG State Plan.</p> <p>The CSBG state office works with the other state lead offices within our Division of Community Services to provide a whole family approach of meeting the clients' needs. As mentioned before, we meet on a weekly basis to keep each other informed on what is happening. Whether it's weatherization, energy, community development we are all seeking to be on the same page of programs and information to eliminate duplication of services and a timelier approach to meeting the needs of our communities.</p>	G.1a. Attachments
<p>G.2. State Linkages and Coordination at the Local Level: Review and update the actual activities for linkages and coordination at the local level that the State created or maintained during the FFY, including an explanation of any changes from the original CSBG State Plan.</p> <p>Include linkages with governmental and other social services, especially antipoverty programs, to assure the effective delivery of and coordination of CSBG services to people with low-income and communities and avoid duplication of services (as required by assurances under Sections 676(b)(5) and (b)(6)).</p> <p>To strengthen the service delivery system for low-income people in ND, the DCS and the CAAs have continued to coordinate and establish linkages with local, regional, and statewide entities to eliminate gaps in services and to avoid duplication of efforts. The state works with Creating a Hunger-Free North Dakota Coalition, by participating on a monthly call to discuss various food-related and services that are occurring across the state. CAA staff utilize information and referrals, case management, and follow-up activities with other entities in order to ensure that the low-income individuals and families are able to access needed services. Some issues such as issues with social security, Medicare, health insurance, etc. cannot be successfully addressed by local efforts. However, the CAA staff attempts to address those needs that they can and work with others who might better be able to address some of those issues.</p>	G.2. Attachments
<p>G.3. CSBG Eligible Entity Linkages and Coordination</p>	
<p>G.3a. State Assurance of CSBG Eligible Entity Linkages and Coordination: Review and update how the State assured that the CSBG Eligible Entities coordinated and established linkages to assure the effective delivery of and coordination of CSBG services to people with low-income and communities and avoid duplication of services (as required by the assurance under Section 676(b)(5)). Attach additional information as needed.</p> <p>Each year the agencies provide the State with a thorough breakdown of their current linkages and desire for new partners through the organizational standards submission and review process, along with their annual community action plan. The agencies program managers work together with other departments to make sure clients are getting access to all their needs and not having to setup several different meetings for issues they are encountering.</p>	G.3a. Attachments
<p>G.3b State Assurance of Eligible Entity Linkages to Fill Service Gaps: Review and update how the CSBG Eligible Entities developed linkages to fill identified gaps in the services, through the provision of information, referrals, case management, and follow-up consultations, according to the assurance under Section 676(b)(3)(B) of the CSBG Act.</p>	

The state has reviewed all agencies actions to keep and gain new linkages to help their communities. All agencies remain focused on identifying and fulfilling the needs of their communities. Through client relationships and other agency partners the possibility of new links or updating current links to their programs are always getting refreshed. The State and agencies are also working diligently to incorporate tribal regions into our discussions to help communities affected by poverty. Tribal relations are a relatively undiscovered area, the State and agencies are building relationships and communication which will build sturdy foundations for helping those areas. The linkages that are created and/or need to be created are discussed during monitoring visits that the State organizes.

G.4. Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Employment and Training Combined Plan Activities (if applicable):
If the State included CSBG employment and training activities as part of a WIOA Combined State Plan, as allowed under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act , provide a brief narrative describing the status of WIOA coordination activities, including web links if available to any publicly accessible combined plans and reports.

Not applicable.

G.5. Coordination among CSBG Eligible Entities and State Community Action Association:
Review and update State activities that took place to support coordination among the CSBG Eligible Entities and the State Community Action Association.

The State Community Action Association (CAPND), the CAA entities and DCS staff maintain an open line of communication. One of the priorities of the state office is to maintain monthly meetings with the state association along with quarterly trainings for agencies and attending regularly scheduled executive meetings. These meetings allow for an open dialogue between all participants, the state updates the executive directors on any programmatic changes that have/will happened and open the floor for all questions to be asked.

G.6. Feedback to CSBG Eligible Entities and State Community Action Association:
Review and update how the State provided feedback to local entities and the State Community Action Association regarding its performance on State Accountability Measures.

No changes to how the State communicates its State Accountability Measures to the eligible entities. The State will provide any OCS feedback to the State Community Action Association and eligible entities within 60 calendar days of the State getting feedback from OCS. The agencies have been receiving periodic updates via email and at their quarterly Executive Directors meetings on the entire process for the annual report. State performance regarding the State Accountability Measures will be provided through an email and then in-person at the next scheduled Executive Director meeting.

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 5S(iii). The measure indicates feedback should be provided within 60 calendar days of the State getting feedback from OCS.

Section H - Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal Controls

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services			OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492			
CSBG Annual Report			Expiration Date: 08/31/2024			
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module						
SECTION H Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal controls						
Monitoring of CSBG Eligible Entities (Section 678B(a) of the CSBG Act)						
H.1. Monitoring Schedule: Update the monitoring Briefly describe the actual monitoring visits conducted during the FFY 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 in the far right column of the table below.						
Instructional Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(i).						
CSBG Eligible Entity	Monitoring Type	Review Type	Monitoring		Brief Description of Purpose Note: If the visit was not a part of the original monitoring plan, provide a brief explanation for the purpose of the visit (e.g. a follow-up regarding a special issue). This section should not be used to outline findings.	Delete
			Start Date	End Date		
Community Action Partnership Region I & VIII	No review					
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	No review					
Dakota Prairie Community Action	Full onsite	Onsite Review	09/06/2023	09/06/2023	Regular, Biannual onsite monitoring.	
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	Full onsite	Onsite Review	09/07/2023	09/07/2023	Regular, Biannual onsite monitoring.	
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	No review					
Community Action Region VI, Inc.	Full onsite	Onsite Review	08/29/2023	08/29/2023	Regular, Biannual onsite monitoring.	
Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	No review					
H.2. Monitoring Policies: Were any modifications made to the State's monitoring policies and procedures during the reporting period? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No						
If changes were made to State monitoring policies and procedures, attach and/or provide a hyperlink to the modified documents.					H.2. Monitoring Policies Attachments	
H.3. Initial Monitoring Reports: Were all State monitoring reports conducted in a manner consistent with State monitoring policies and procedures and disseminated to CSBG Eligible Entities within 60 calendar days? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No						
Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(ii).						
Corrective Action, Termination and Reduction of Funding and Assurance Requirements (Section 678C of the Act)						
H.4. Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs):						
H.4a. Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs): Are there any CSBG eligible entities within the state that are on a TAP due to issues of noncompliance identified during a monitoring review during the FFY? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No						
H.4b. Creating Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs): Did the state work with all monitored CSBG eligible entities with issues of noncompliance to create a TAPs, as necessary? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No						
H.4c. Reporting TAPs: Did the state report all TAPs to the Office of Community Services within 30 calendar days of creation? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No						

H.5. Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs):

H.5a. Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs): Are there any CSBG eligible entities within the state that are on a QIP due to unresolved issues of noncompliance identified in the TAP? Yes No

H.5b. Creating Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs): Did all CSBG eligible entities on Quality Improvement Plans resolve issues of noncompliance within the schedule agreed upon by the state and eligible entity? Yes No

H.5c. Reporting QIPs: Did the state report all CSBG eligible entities with serious deficiencies from a monitoring review to the Office of Community Services within 30 calendar days of the state approving a QIP? Yes No

Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(iii).

Fiscal Controls and Audits

H.6. Single Audit Review: Pass through entities are required by 2 CFR 200.331(f) to verify that every sub-recipient is audited as required by 2 CFR 200.501. In the table below, provide the information of any CSBG eligible entity Single Audits in the Federal Audit Clearinghouse (FAC) submitted during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY).

2 CFR 200.521 requires pass-through entities to provide the management decision for findings related to federal awards the pass-through makes to the sub-recipients. If applicable, provide the information regarding these decisions.

Note: Per 2 CFR 200.501, each eligible entity that receives at least \$750,000 of all federal funds, is required to submit a Single Audit within the FAC annually. A State Management Decision is required within 6 months (2 CFR 200.521(d)), if there is a CSBG finding within the Single Audit.

Eligible Entity	Eligible Entity Required to Report Single Audit in FAC	Eligible Entity Submitted a Single Audit in FAC?	Date Audit was Accepted by Federal Audit ClearingHouse	If Entity did not submit as required, has the state taken steps to ensure compliance?	State Management Decision Required? (As Applicable)	Date Management Decision Issued (As applicable)
Community Action Partnership Region I & VIII	Yes	Yes	01/06/2023	Yes	No	
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	Yes	Yes	01/03/2023	Yes	No	
Dakota Prairie Community Action	Yes	Yes	01/20/2023	Yes	No	
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	Yes	Yes	04/04/2023	Yes	No	
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	Yes	Yes	12/07/2022	Yes	No	
Community Action Region VI, Inc.	Yes	Yes	06/05/2023	Yes	No	
Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	Yes	Yes	03/31/2023	Yes	No	

H.7. Single Audit Management Decisions:

Briefly describe any management decisions issued according to State procedures of CSBG Eligible Entity single audit. Provide the audit finding reference number from the Federal Audit Clearinghouse and describe any required actions and timelines for correction.
N/a

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sd

Section I - Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 01/31/2025
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
SECTION I Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System	
I.1. Performance Management System Participation: Confirm the performance measurement system did the state and CSBG eligible entities use, as required by Section 678E(a) of the CSBG Act and the assurance under Section 676(b)(12) of the CSBG Act?	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> The Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System	
<input type="radio"/> Another performance management system that meets the requirements of Section 678E(b) of the CSBG Act	
<input type="radio"/> An alternative system for measuring performance and results	
I.1a. If ROMA was selected in item I.1, provide an update on any changes in procedures and data collection systems that were initiated or completed in the reporting period. During the reporting year, our agencies continued to utilize CAP60 for data collection, consistent with the previous year. The addition of the Data Specialist position at CAPND in 2022 significantly contributed to enhancing the accuracy and efficiency of our agencies data management. Throughout the reporting period, the data specialist engaged with our agencies on an individual basis, assisting them in aligning agency outcomes with annual report indicators. Additionally, the data specialist facilitated a deeper understanding among agency personnel regarding the Org Standard and the process of implementing annual report data. Notably, the state collaborated closely with the data specialist to manage updates to the CAP60 platform, which was undergoing substantial modifications based on input from the executive director.	I.1a. If ROMA was selected: Attachments
I.1b. If ROMA was not selected in item I.1., describe the system the State used for performance measurement. Provide an update on any changes in procedures and data collection systems that were initiated or completed in the reporting period.	
I.2. State ROMA Support: How did the State support the CSBG Eligible Entities in using the ROMA system or alternative performance measurement system in promoting continuous improvement? For example, describe any data systems improvements, support for community needs assessment, support for strategic planning, data analysis etc. During the fiscal year 2023, the State and CAPND actively supported agencies in their ongoing utilization and enhancement of the ROMA system. Specifically: Region 4 and Region 7: We facilitated hands-on strategic planning training and assistance for these regions, aiding them in finalizing their new strategic plans. Region 8 RPIC: In June, August, and October of 2023, the Region 8 RPIC organized virtual ROMA training sessions. Numerous agencies participated and reaped the benefits of our collaborative efforts. These training sessions served as valuable resources, offering support in various areas such as: Data Systems Improvements, Community Needs Assessment, Strategic Planning and Data Analysis.	I.2. State ROMA Support: Attachments
I.3. State Review of Eligible Entity Data: Describe the procedures and activities the state used to review the ROMA data (i.e. all data from elements of the ROMA cycle) from CSBG Eligible Entities for completion, accuracy, and reliability (e.g. methodology used for validating the data submitted annually by the local agencies). The eligible entities submit monthly financial reports to the CSBG state office and state fiscal team for review and reimbursement. This process ensures transparency regarding the agencies activities, allowing the state to assess their community action plan and compare it to the actual results achieved. Additionally, eligible entities provide regular client data via CAP60. The state reviews this data quarterly, following similar guidelines as the financial reports. Goals being that the agencies mission and direction remain aligned with their original plan.	I.3. State Review of Eligible Entity Data: Attachments
I.4. State Feedback on Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting: State Accountability Measure 5S(ii) requires states to submit written feedback to each CSBG eligible entity 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. Has the state provided each CSBG eligible entity with written, timely (at a minimum within 60 days of the submission) feedback regarding the entity's performance in meeting ROMA goals as measured through national performance data? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If yes, Please describe, Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 5S(ii) Upon each agencies self-assessment and state review of their organizational standards, the state office sends a letter discussing any unmet standards, as guided by ROMA. A summary of unmet standards is included with a request for information about actions being taken to meet the standards and a timeline for completion. The state also offers each agency with unmet standards the opportunity to request training or technical assistance on the standard.	
I.5. State and eligible entity Continuous Improvement. Provide 2-3 examples of changes made by CSBG eligible entities to improve service delivery and enhance impact for individuals, families, and communities with low-incomes based on their in-depth analysis of performance data. All of our eligible entities embraced the challenge of gaining insightful knowledge about their communities through a statewide needs assessment in 2023. This process involved creating focus groups that facilitated guided and structured discussions around community needs. Each agency actively promoted the statewide needs assessment by soliciting individual feedback through surveys and discussions with program managers. The results of this needs assessment were distilled into concise one-sheet summaries, providing valuable insights and focus areas for each agencies future endeavors. High-priority needs identified included rental assistance and food for low-income individuals and families, with affordable dental insurance and health services also ranking prominently. Our agencies were not surprised by these outcomes. But adaptations to already implemented plans are always happening and so are changes to	I.5. State and Eligible: Attachments

address these specific needs and provide assistance to families and individuals. Furthermore, these assessment results serve as a foundation for developing new community action plans in 2023. All agencies are encouraged to leverage this data to make programmatic adjustments and effectively address the primary needs expressed by the community.