## Monitoring Objective

Monitoring CSBG Grant Awards ensures that agencies are providing good stewardship of those funds and using them in a manner consistent with their required intent. Monitoring also allows agencies to continually improve outcomes as they strive to adopt high impact strategies to assist in meeting the needs of their communities. Monitoring is also an effective tool for risk mitigation for the agencies themselves.. To successfully assist each agency in fulfilling its mission, IHCDA utilizes a “whole agency” or systems approach centered on collaboration, communication, and partnership. This allows agencies to build capacity over time to more effectively promote and support self-sufficiency among low-income individuals in their communities.

Effective communication, transparency and mutual respect are vital in facilitating a good working relationship between IHCDA and each agency. This relationship should allow IHCDA to provide reasonable program objectives and requirements, assist in developing solutions to problems, share program improvement ideas, and provide information on new developments in the field. IHCDA operates with the basic belief that a team approach is in the best interest of the agencies’ long-term growth and that the monitoring process is one of the mechanisms for this interaction to occur.

To ensure proper communication is achieved the following communication plan will be utilized:

* Keep agencies updated on any changes to the monitoring policies and/or procedures
* Send all monitoring correspondences preliminary and final report to the Executive Director
* Provide the agency with the monitoring timetable for the on-site review, report, follow-up and closeout
* Conduct an entrance and exit conference with Executive Director and key leadership staff
* Meet regularly with the Executive Director during the on-site monitoring review to discuss all standards that are not met, partially met, recommendations and comments
* Be available to the governing board to review the monitoring report, if requested
* Meet with the governing board to review the monitoring report if a quality improvement plan is warranted
* Provide an opportunity for the agency to evaluate the monitoring process and the on-site monitors
* Provide the training and technical assistance contractor with potential topics that could be utilized by the network to enhance agency operations

### **Community Programs Division On-site Monitoring Approach**

Currently, IHCDA monitors its CSBG sub-grantees based upon the criteria established in the CAR Tool at least once during a three-year period and, as needed, after the completion of the first year in which a newly designated entity receives funds through the community service block grant (IM-97). Or when informed that grant funds were terminated for cause under related programs such as Head Start, Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP), or other Federal programs (IM-116).

In addition, IHCDA may monitor agencies after the completion of the first year a new Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer has been hired. This will be based upon whichever is sooner, the completion of the first year or a regularly scheduled CAR monitoring.

## State Monitoring Tool

This tool, or review instrument, is used as an open and transparent document to complete the CSBG CAR monitoring process, which consists of Organizational Standards (OS) developed by the Center of Excellence (COE), Federal regulations, and IHCDA requirements. This monitoring tool will ensure programmatic and financial integrity of the eligible entities receiving CSBG funds. The CAR instrument contains the following parts:

* **Part One:** **Organizational** **Management** *(Sections 1-3; categories 1-9)*, which evaluates the operational performance metric for maximum feasible participation, vision and direction, and operations and accountability.
* **Part Two:** **Organizational** **Analysis** *(Sections 4- 5; categories 10-15)*, which evaluates the fiscal performance metrics, allocations, and accounting to determine solvency.
* **Part Three: Beyond Compliance** *(Section 6, categories 16 & 17),* which evaluates an agencies road to excellence through bonus opportunities and best business practice recommendations.

This tool outlines each **standard** by section (e.g. 1.1 or 2.3.1). Each standard is followed by additional information related to the specific standard:

* **Agency Guidance** is the purpose, tips, clarifications, statute or best practice information on how to interpret the standard, as well as how to successfully demonstrate to the monitor(s) how the agency has met each standard.
* **Authority** identifies the applicable Federal or State requirement imposed by stated or Federal regulation or code, contract, memorandums or policy guidance, other practices or laws governing the standard.
* **Linkage** demonstrates the associationor connection to other standards, national guidance, state policy, agency policy, etc..
* **Monitoring** **Evaluation** will explain the possible concrete or subjective methods used by the IHCDA monitor(s) to see if the agency has met, partially meets or does not meet each standard. However, the standard may just have “Provide” if documentation is only needed to review the standard.
* **Interview** is information regarding compliance or operations obtained from discussion with individuals associated with the process under review.
* **Provide** is the list of materials that may be requested to document compliance with the corresponding standard.

### **Scoring**

A **Value** is assigned to each standard that will allow the IHCDA monitor(s) to supply a **Success Rate** of the monitoring. IHCDA also incorporates additional State recommended standard practices, which are an opportunity for each agency to gain **Bonus Points**. Bonus points will be added to the Success Rate creating an **Overall Performance Score** for the final monitoring report.

### The **Overall Performance Score** indicates the success of the agency in meeting all CAR requirements. This score determines whether the agency meets the States minimum overall performance goal or baseline is ninety-two percent (92%). *Exceptions may be made if the monitoring determines a critical compliance issue which is not supported by the performance score*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Rating** | **Percentage (%)** | **Action** |
| **Needs Improvement**  | 91.99% or below | *Modified Quality Improvement Plan or Quality Improvement Plan* |
| **Average Standing** | 92% to 94% | *Required Action Plan*  |
| **Good Standing** | 95% to 97% | *Required Action Plan* |
| **Excellent Standing** | 98% to100+% | *Required Action Plan* |