

CSBG Annual Report

Program Name: Community Services Block Grant

Grantee Name: NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Report Name: CSBG Annual Report

Report Period: 10/01/2024 to 09/30/2025

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: 08/31/2027
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
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.	
SECTION A CSBG LEAD Agency, CSBG Authorized Official, CSBG Point of Contact	
A.1. 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	
☒ Community Services Department	
☐ Human Services Department	
☐ Social Services Department	
☐ Governors Office	
☐ Community Affairs Department	
☐ 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 Director of Community Services
A1e. Street address 1600 E. Century Ave., Suite 6	
A1f. City Bismarck	A1g. State ND
A1h. Zip 58503	
A1i. Telephone (701) 328-5300	Extension
A1j. Fax	A1k. Email meffertz@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)	
☒ Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)	
☐ Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	
☐ Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)	
☐ U.S. Department of Agriculture Programs	
Specify	
☐ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Programs	
Specify CDBG, ESG, NDHG	
☐ U.S. Department of Labor	
Specify	
☐ 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: 08/31/2027	
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.		
☒ All Goals Accomplished		
Describe how all goals were accomplished, including outcomes: In FY25, the North Dakota CSBG State Office made progress on all four state plan goals. All awarded funds were distributed to eligible entities within the required timeline. To ensure accurate allocation, the State Office prepared a detailed spreadsheet outlining each agency's award amount based on the approved funding formula, which was then provided to the fiscal team to prepare and issue contracts for Executive Director signatures. All reporting requirements and data collection obligations were also completed within the required timeframes. The State Office conducted on-site monitoring of four Community Action Agencies, as well as CAPND, with no findings or corrective actions required. To support ongoing compliance and capacity, the State Office contracted with CAPND to deliver training and technical assistance throughout the year, including quarterly board trainings, annual reporting requirement training, ROMA training, and monthly Executive Director meetings covering updates on state, national, and federal CSBG regulations and program objectives.		
☐ Goals Partially Accomplished		
Describe which goals were met and how, and provide an update on goals that have not yet been met:		
☐ 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
75	93	93
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?		
Feedback from eligible entities and other stakeholders is a top priority for the North Dakota CSBG State Office. The State actively solicits input through both formal and informal channels throughout the program year. Informally, eligible entities are encouraged to share feedback during the completion of key processes such as the CSBG Annual Report, State Plan, and Organizational Standards review with staff communication welcomed via email or direct outreach at any time. Formally, feedback is gathered through monthly CAPND meetings, which provide a consistent forum for agencies to raise concerns, ask questions, and share perspective on program administration. Public hearings are conducted every two years in conjunction with the CSBG State Plan process. The State Office coordinates with the North Dakota Department of Commerce marketing team to broadly distribute hearing notices and ensure all communities have the opportunity to participate. The most recent American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) survey resulted in a score of 93 for the North Dakota CSBG State Office an exceptionally high rating. The State attributes this outcome to clear and consistent processes, regular communication, and robust training and technical assistance provided by both the State Office and the state association (CAPND), which together reduce confusion around program requirements and expectations. Based on this feedback, the State Office has determined that current processes are effective and will continue to be maintained and refined going forward.		
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.		
The reporting year brought one of the more significant challenges the North Dakota CSBG State Office has faced the State's first-ever CAA de-designation. Working through that process made it clear that existing de-designation documents were outdated and, in some cases, too vague to be useful. The State Office updated those materials with the help of OCS and NASCSP, and the process was completed successfully. On the ground, a neighboring		

agency stepped up to take over program delivery for the affected community, which meant residents continued to receive services without interruption. That outcome community needs still being met despite a difficult transition is something the State Office is proud of. The State Office also updated the CSBG Program Guide for FFY 20262027, giving eligible entities clearer direction heading into the new funding year.

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.

Region 5: SENDCAA Career Coach Program (Fargo) SENDCAA's Career Coach Program had a strong year. Multiple clients completed CNA certification, secured employment, and moved toward real financial stability, and the program's success wasn't accidental. Staff stayed ahead of barriers like transportation, childcare costs, and licensing exam fees by connecting clients to partner resources before those issues became dead ends. SENDCAA also runs a licensed childcare center alongside its employment services, which meant families could address multiple needs through one agency they already trusted. The outcomes speak for themselves, but the process behind them is what makes this a management accomplishment worth highlighting.

2. Region 6: Community Action in Jamestown Region 6 put CSBG dollars to work across a wide rural service area and has the numbers to show for it. In 2025, the agency distributed 2,055 food baskets, helped 153 households avoid utility shutoffs through Energy Share, provided intensive case management to 70 households, and made sure 96 students had school supplies at the start of the year. That kind of reach doesn't happen without strong systems and good coordination. Region 6 is an example of an agency that knows its community, manages its programs well, and consistently delivers.

3. Region 2: CAP Minot Representative Payee Program CAP Minot saw a gap in services and built something to fill it. There are very few Representative Payee providers in region 2, and for people with disabilities or mental health conditions who need a payee to access their own income, that gap is serious. CAP Minot serves around 50 households through this program, handling bill payment and budgeting to keep people housed and financially stable. The program is funded through a combination of client payee fees and CSBG dollars, which keeps it sustainable. It's a practical, well-run program that addresses a real need and that's exactly what good agency management looks like.

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.

1. Region 5: Derrick (Fargo) Partners: Local hospital, Job Service ND, local bus service Derrick came in wanting a forklift certification. SENDCAA's Career Coach helped him get that and then kept going. Staff helped him land a hospital job, navigate SSDI, secure legal representation, and eventually connect with a local bus service to start working toward his CDL. CSBG funds supported the Career Coach position and wraparound services. The innovation is in the follow-through treating job placement as a starting point rather than the finish line.

2. Region 8: Lexy (Belfield) Partners: St. Vincent de Paul, local utility provider Lexy was facing a summer utility shutoff outside of LIHEAP's coverage window. Staff didn't wait. They submitted an Energy Share application, contacted the utility provider directly to hold the disconnection, and coordinated with St. Vincent de Paul to cover the remaining balance. Crisis avoided before it happened. CSBG funds supported Energy Share and the case management behind this rapid, coordinated response.

3. Region 2: Rachel (Minot) Partners: Emergency food pantry Rachel came in during the holidays after a medical emergency wiped out her income. CAP Minot's Christmas Program helped her select gifts for her kids including her daughter whose birthday falls near Christmas. Staff set aside extra birthday items and sent her home with cake mix and frosting from the pantry so her daughter could have a real birthday celebration. CSBG funds supported the Christmas Program and emergency pantry. The innovation here is simple: staff paid attention to the details that made this family feel seen, not just served.

Section C - CSBG Eligible Entity Update

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services				OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492	
CSBG Annual Report				Expiration Date: 08/31/2027	
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module					
SECTION C CSBG Eligible Entity Update					
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.					
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	☐ Yes, please describe ☒ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☐ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ 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	☐ Yes, please describe ☒ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☐ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ Merged	
Dakota Prairie Community Action	Roulette County, Towner County, Cavalier County, Ramsey County, Benson County, Eddy County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	☐ Yes, please describe ☒ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☐ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ Merged	
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	Pembina County, Walsh County, Nelson County, Grand Forks County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	☐ Yes, please describe ☐ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☒ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ Merged	Red River Valley Community Action Board voted unanimously to voluntary relinquish all CSBG funds from FY25 and beyond. Community Action Region VI, Inc. has taken over all CSBG funding and program leadership in

					Region 4.
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	Steel County, Traill County, Cass County, Ransom County, Sargent County, Richland County	Non-Profit	Community Action Agency	☐ Yes, please describe ☒ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☐ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ 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	☒ Yes, please describe ☐ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☐ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ Merged	Region VI has taken over all Region 4 CSBG allocations and program leadership.
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	☐ Yes, please describe ☒ No ☐ Designated or re-designated ☐ Designated or voluntarily relinquished ☐ 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: 08/31/2027

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

**SECTION D
Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities**

Note:Reference CSBG Information Memorandum #138 State Establishment of Organizational Standards for CSBG Eligible Entities

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:

The state's original response is provided below:

☒ COE CSBG organizational standards

☐ Modified version of COE CSBG Organizational Standards

☐ Alternative set of organizational standards

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.

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

☐ Peer to Peer review (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)

☒ Self-assessment (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)

☐ Self-assessment / Peer review with State risk analysis

☐ State - authorized third party validation

☒ Regular, on-site CSBG monitoring

☐ Other

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.
The North Dakota CSBG State Office assesses Organizational Standards through CAP60, a web-based platform in which each eligible entity has its own secure login and dashboard. Agencies conduct a self-assessment of all 58 Organizational Standards, uploading supporting documentation for each standard and indicating whether it has been met or not met. Once an agency completes its self-assessment, the State Office is notified and conducts an independent review of all submitted documentation to verify each determination. If a standard is marked as not met, the State Office follows up directly with the agency to obtain a plan outlining how and when the standard will be achieved. Upon completing the review of all agencies, the State Office exports each agency's CAP60 file and calculates the percentage of met versus unmet standards. Results and any required follow-up items are communicated back to each agency. There were no changes to the assessment process during the reporting year from what was described in the CSBG State Plan.

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.

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

Total Number of Entities Assessed				

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.

Total Number of Entities within the State	Number of Entities Exempted	Number of Assessable Entities	Number of Entities Assessed	Delete
7	1	6	6	

Target vs. Actual Performance on the Organizational Standards

State CSBG Plan Target	Number that Met <u>All</u> (100%) State Standards
87	4

Progress Indicators			
Indicate the number of entities that met the following percentages of Organizational Standards			
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%, <u>and</u> 70% progress indicators.	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met all <u>100%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	6	4	66.67%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between <u>90%</u> and <u>99%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	6	2	33.33%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between <u>80%</u> and <u>89%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	6	0	0.00%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between <u>70%</u> and <u>79%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	6	0	0.00%
Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met less than <u>69%</u> of State Standards	Actual Percentage	
6	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) Some of the factors were similar to last year with audits completing on time and board meetings happening prior to the submission of the organizational standards. The newer factors were along the lines of staffing capacity.			
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	6	6	100.00%
2. Community Engagement	6	6	100.00%
3. Community Assessment	6	6	100.00%
4. Organizational Leadership	6	5	83.33%
5. Board Governance	6	6	100.00%
6. Strategic Planning	6	6	100.00%
7. Human Resource Management	6	6	100.00%
8. Financial Operations & Oversight	6	5	83.33%
9. Data & Analysis	6	6	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			
As was mentioned earlier, each agency that had unmet standards provided, within their self-assessment process, explanations of why it was unmet and their plans going forward to meet that standard and ways the state office can provide any assistance.			
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: 08/31/2027

**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 CBSG Act.

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	537,244	545,029	545,029	480,216	64,812
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	395,213	403,860	403,860	351,089	52,770
Dakota Prairie Community Action	389,687	398,137	398,137	222,175	175,952
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	471,164	482,664	482,664	306,771	175,893
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	717,306	738,052	738,052	634,566	103,486
Community Action Region VI, Inc.	298,889	303,918	303,918	220,019	83,899

Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	501,507	514,146	514,146	286,483	227,663
Total	3,311,010	3,385,806	3,385,806	2,501,319	884,475

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	66,252	\$121,847

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 Equivalents (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	\$62,900.00	\$62,900.00	\$28,481.00	\$34,419.00	Training and technical assistance put forth by CAPND ie., Needs Assessment, ROMA, Annual Report, Org Standards, Board Trainings.
b. Coordination of State-operated programs and/or local programs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
c. Statewide coordination and communication among eligible entities	\$100,000.00	\$104,000.00	\$104,000.00	\$0.00	\$104,000.00	Funds granted to CAPND for TTA & agency coordination of programs. Cap60 scholarships / other scholarships.
d. Analysis of distribution of CSBG funds to determine if targeting greatest need	\$10,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00	Statewide Needs Assessment.
e. Asset-building programs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
f. Innovative programs/activities by eligible entities or other neighborhood groups	\$50,057.00	\$3,100.00	\$3,100.00	\$0.00	\$3,100.00	Agency level programs (Backpack for kids). Christmas gifts baskets.
g. State charity tax credits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
h. Other activities, Specify	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Totals	\$180,057.00	\$185,000.00	\$185,000	\$28,481	\$156,519	

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)

All agencies are recipients of what the dollars produce at CAPND throughout the year. A few (two) would be recipients of funds directly tied to

☐ 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)	\$3,385,806	\$2,501,319
E.9b. State Administrative Costs	\$188,099	\$66,252
E.9c. Remainder/Discretionary Funds	\$185,000	\$28,481
E.9d. Total Obligations in FY	\$3,758,905	\$2,596,052

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	\$3,758,905
E.10b. Total Expenditures	\$2,596,052
E.10c. Unobligated Balance from the FFY	\$1,155,942
E.10d. Total Award Amount	\$3,761,999

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: 08/31/2027			
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module				
SECTION F Training, Technical Assistance, or Both				
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. (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.) Note: F.1 is associated with State Accountability Measure 3Sc				
Training and Technical Assistance				
Training	Topic	Actual Dates	Brief Description	Delete
		Start Date	End Date	
Training	Governance/Tripartite Boards	01/01/2025	12/31/2025	Quarterly Board trainings for all CAA board members. Conducted by CAPND and the CSBG State Office.
Both	Organizational Standards - General	01/01/2026	12/31/2025	Technical assistance provided by CAPND, training of CAP60 dashboard and outcome mapping.
Technical Assistance	Reporting	01/01/2026	12/31/2025	Federal training and technical assistance provided throughout the year (OCS & NASCSP) attended by CAA staff.
Training	ROMA	01/01/2026	12/31/2025	Regional CSBG office provides ROMA training for ND CAA's on an annual basis. CAPND coordinates with our CAA's for dates to attend.
F.2. 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.) ☐ CSBG Eligible Entities (if checked, provide the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to receive funds) If checked, provide the expected number of CSBG eligible entities to receive funds ☐ Other community-based organizations ☒ State Community Action Association ☒ Regional CSBG technical assistance provider ☐ National technical assistance provider ☐ Individual consultant(s) ☐ Tribes and Tribal Organizations ☒ Other[Provide the types of organizations]				
WIPFLI				

Section G - State Linkages and Communication

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 08/31/2027
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
SECTION G State Linkages and Communication	
Note: This section describes activities that the State supported with CSBG remainder/discretionary funds, described under Section 675C(b)(1) of the CSBG Act.	
Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 7Sa.	
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.	
☒ State Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) office	
☒ State Weatherization office	
☐ State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) office	
☐ State Head Start office	
☐ State public health office	
☐ State education department	
☐ State Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) agency	
☐ State budget office	
☐ Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	
☐ State child welfare office	
☐ State housing office	
☐ Other	
If Other Describe	
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. Linkages and coordination happen at both the state and local level in North Dakota. On the local side, CAPND does most of the heavy lifting...meeting with community leaders, identifying partnership opportunities, and helping agencies connect residents to resources that go beyond what CSBG alone can provide. At the state level, the CSBG office works closely with the Weatherization Assistance Program. The two programs coordinate on monitoring and share a whole family approach, which helps ensure households are connected to both programs when applicable and that services aren't being duplicated across the two funding streams. The State Office also coordinates with the State Energy Office to avoid duplication of benefits, ensuring that energy-related assistance is targeted appropriately and that households are not receiving overlapping support from multiple programs. The State Office also participates in the Coalition for a Hunger Free North Dakota (CHFND) when possible, staying connected to statewide efforts around food insecurity. No changes were made to linkage and coordination activities from what was outlined in the CSBG State Plan.	G.1a. Attachments
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. 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)). he State Office partners with all six Community Action Agencies across North Dakota, which serve as the on-the-ground delivery point for CSBG services in their regions. At the local level, agencies have built and maintained partnerships that go well beyond what CSBG funding alone can provide. These partnerships span a wide range of programs and organizations; LIHEAP, SNAP, Medicaid, Child Care Assistance, HUD-VASH, Section 8, Weatherization, VA health care, Veterans Service Organizations, landlords, medical providers, school systems, faith-based organizations, and local nonprofits. The goal is straightforward: make sure low-income households are connected to everything available to them, and that services aren't being duplicated across programs. There were no changes to local linkage and coordination activities from what was outlined in the CSBG State Plan.	G.2. Attachments
G.3. CSBG Eligible Entity Linkages and Coordination	
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. The State Office assures that eligible entities are coordinating and maintaining linkages through several oversight activities. The State Office conducts an independent review of each agency's Community Action Plan, which documents the partnerships and linkages the	G.3a. Attachments

agency has established and how those connections are being used to meet community needs. On-site monitoring visits include a review of each agency's current linkages, and Organizational Standards are reviewed through the CAP60 assessment process to verify that agencies are meeting coordination requirements. Additionally, each agency provides the State Office with a current list of their linkages, including any new partnerships formed during the year. This gives the State Office visibility into how coordination is developing across the network and where gaps may exist. The State Office remains available to assist agencies in developing new connections when needed.	
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. Eligible entities in North Dakota identify service gaps through community needs assessments, client intake forms, and the Community Action Plan process. Once gaps are identified, agencies address them through referrals, one-on-one conversations etc., this approach ensures that clients are not only connected to CSBG-funded services, but to the full range of resources available to them. When a needed service doesn't exist locally, agencies have demonstrated a willingness to build something to fill that gap. This shows up in practice across the state. CAP Minot identified a critical shortage of Representative Payee providers in region 2 and developed a program to fill that void, serving approximately 50 households who would otherwise have no way to safely manage their own income. In Region 8, Community Action identified a gap in summer energy assistance coverage and quickly coordinated alternative funding through Energy Share and a local nonprofit partner to prevent a utility shutoff. In Region 5, SENDCAA identified transportation as a recurring barrier to employment and coordinated donated vehicles for clients who needed them to get to work.	
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 Office supports coordination among eligible entities and the state association by contracting with CAPND and providing discretionary dollars for training and technical assistance activities throughout the year. This funding allows CAPND to serve as the primary training and support resource for all Community Action Agencies in North Dakota. In FY25, CAPND used these funds to deliver board trainings, facilitate CAPND committee work, provide Family Development training, and host the annual CAPND Conference which brings agencies together to share information, build capacity, and strengthen the network statewide. Monthly meetings with Executive Directors also provided a consistent touchpoint for updates on CSBG regulations, program objectives, and emerging issues at the state and federal level. A significant undertaking supported through this partnership is the statewide community needs assessment, conducted in collaboration with North Dakota State University. This assessment gives agencies and the State Office a data-driven foundation for understanding poverty conditions across the state and informs how CSBG resources are targeted and deployed.	
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. The State Office provides regular feedback to eligible entities and CAPND regarding performance through multiple channels. Following each on-site monitoring visit, the State Office meets with program staff and the Executive Director to discuss findings, review areas that are working well, and identify areas where the State Office can provide additional support or assistance. For Organizational Standards, agencies receive real-time feedback as the State Office reviews their submissions. Once the full standards review is complete, the State Office sends a summary via email detailing which standards have been met and which remain unmet. Agencies also receive comprehensive written monitoring reports that include responses to all required questions, a complete review of each section, and any issues or findings that need to be addressed.	
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: 08/31/2027		
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	Other	Onsite Review	08/20/2025	08/20/2025	Fiscal and WX monitoring; no CSBG.	Delete
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	Other	Onsite Review	09/09/2025	09/09/2025	Fiscal and WX monitoring; no CSBG.	
Dakota Prairie Community Action	Full On-site	Onsite Review	09/10/2025	09/10/2025	Fiscal, WX & CSBG monitoring.	
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	Full On-site	Onsite Review	06/17/2025	06/18/2025	Fiscal, WX & CSBG Monitoring.	
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	Other	Onsite Review	08/26/2025	08/26/2025	Fiscal and WX monitoring; no CSBG.	
Community Action Region VI, Inc.	Full On-site	Onsite Review	08/19/2025	08/19/2025	Fiscal, WX & CSBG Monitoring.	
Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	Other	Onsite Review	08/28/2025	08/28/2025	Fiscal and WX monitoring; no CSBG.	
H.2. Monitoring Policies: Were any modifications made to the State's monitoring policies and procedures during the reporting period? ☐ Yes ☒ 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? ☒ Yes ☐ 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? ☐ Yes ☒ 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? ☐ Yes ☒ No						
H.4c. Reporting TAPs: Did the state report all TAPs to the Office of Community Services within 30 calendar days of creation? ☐ Yes ☒ 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	01/02/2026		No	
Community Action Partnership Minot Region	Yes	Yes	02/09/2026		No	
Dakota Prairie Community Action	Yes	Yes	12/30/2025		No	
Red River Valley Community Action Agency	Yes	Yes	04/04/2025		Yes	
Southeastern ND Community Action Agency	Yes	Yes	12/31/2025		No	
Community Action Region VI, Inc.	Yes	Yes	06/19/2025		No	
Community Action Program Region VII, Inc.	Yes	Yes	03/27/2025		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.

The State Office issued a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) for Region 4, Red River Valley Community Action (RRVCA), following a single audit that identified significant findings in two areas. First, the audit found serious concerns within the agency's fiscal department, including an inability to account for the flow of funds. Second, the audit found that the agency's board had vacancies that exceeded the allowable 90-day limit. The agency was required to submit a corrective action plan addressing both findings, including a plan to bring on two new board members. While RRVCA did submit a plan, the agency did not follow through on the required corrective actions. These failures were contributing factors in the subsequent de-designation of Region 4.

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: 08/31/2027
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?	
☒ The Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System	
☐ Another performance management system that meets the requirements of Section 678E(b) of the CSBG Act	
☐ 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. There were no changes to ROMA procedures or data collection systems during the reporting period. ROMA training continued to be provided through a regional partnership with neighboring states, with Colorado leading the training effort for North Dakota. CAPND plays an active role in planning and coordinating this training to ensure all Community Action Agencies are prepared to meet ROMA requirements and accurately report outcomes.	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. The State Office contracts with CAPND to deliver ongoing training and technical assistance throughout the year, which includes ROMA training as a core component. Monthly Executive Director meetings provided a consistent touchpoint for agencies to ask questions and receive guidance on ROMA-related reporting and data collection. A notable improvement during the reporting period was the work done through CAPND's data committees, which met to develop consistent data mapping across all Community Action Agencies within CAP60. The State Office participated in this process to provide clarity on what the annual report requires and how agencies should be reporting that information. This collaborative effort helps ensure that data is being collected and reported consistently across the network, improving the quality and comparability of outcomes statewide. The statewide community needs assessment conducted in partnership with NDSU supports the continuous improvement goals of ROMA by providing agencies with current, data-driven information about poverty conditions across North Dakota, informing how agencies identify needs, set goals, and measure outcomes at the local level.	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 State Office reviews eligible entity data for completion, accuracy, and reliability through several procedures. Once SmartForms are received from each Community Action Agency, the State Office reviews all submissions for warnings, errors, and inconsistencies. Any questions or discrepancies are communicated directly to the agency via email for clarification and correction before the data is finalized. In addition to annual report data, all agencies submit monthly fiscal reports to the State Office, which are reviewed for compliance and cross-referenced against State records to ensure figures are consistent and accurate across both systems. CAP60 serves as the primary data hub for client-level data, where agencies input client information, goals, and outcomes throughout the year. The State Office, CAPND, and the agencies work collaboratively to ensure that data mapping, client goals, and reported outcomes are consistent across all agencies and aligned with annual report expectations. CAPND's data committees have been instrumental in this effort, working to standardize how data is entered and reported across the network so that the State Office can be confident in the reliability of what is submitted.	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? ☒ Yes ☐ No	
If yes, Please describe, Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 5S(ii) The State Office will provide written feedback to each CSBG eligible entity regarding their performance in meeting ROMA goals, as measured through National Performance Indicator data, within 60 calendar days of submitting the state's Annual Report. This feedback will be communicated directly to each agency via email and will address their individual performance on NPI data submitted as part of the reporting period.	
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. 1. SENDCAA: Wraparound Service Model SENDCAA recognized that families facing poverty rarely deal	I.5. State and Eligible: Attachments

with a single barrier in isolation. In response, the agency developed a wraparound service model that addresses multiple needs through one coordinated point of contact. When a family of nursing students came to SENDCAA for childcare, staff identified additional barriers including financial strain, lack of health coverage, and the cost of nursing board exams. Rather than addressing only the presenting need, SENDCAA connected the family to Medicaid, Child Care Assistance, and Employment Services to cover exam fees ultimately helping both parents pass their boards and secure nursing positions. This shift toward a more integrated service delivery approach reflects an agency using what it sees in client data to build a more responsive model. 2. SSVF in Region 8: Community Action in Region 8 identified that SSVF funds alone were insufficient to address the most complex veteran cases, particularly those involving long-distance medical care. In response, the agency developed a practice of braiding non-SSVF resources with program funds to fill critical gaps. This approach allowed staff to coordinate neurology appointments in Fargo, cover medical travel costs through partner organizations, and ultimately facilitate a safe out-of-state transition for a veteran with no local support options. 3. Region 2 Addressing Transportation Barriers in Recovery Community Action in Region 2 identified that transportation was a recurring barrier for veterans in recovery, particularly around accessing laundry facilities an added expense and logistical challenge that increased stress and dependence on outside resources. In response, the agency partnered with another veteran-serving organization to secure a washer and dryer for a veteran transitioning out of treatment into permanent housing. This practical, data-informed adjustment reduced transportation costs and supported the veteran's focus on recovery and long-term stability.	
---	--