



ROMA NG INITIAL COMMENT PERIOD (ICP) QUANTITATIVE SURVEY RESULTS

Weighted Responses

Table of Contents

Community Level Work: Weighted Quantitative Analyses	1
Table 1: Respondents by organization type.....	1
Table 2: Respondents by role played in the organization.....	1
Table 3: Reactions to Community Level Efforts in Progress Report (Weighted)	2
Table 4: Reactions to Community-Level Strategies List (Weighted).....	2
Table 5: Reactions to Community-Level National Performance Indicators (Weighted).....	3
Individual and Family: Weighted Quantitative Analyses	3
Table 1: Respondents by organization type.....	3
Table 2: Respondents by role played in the organization.....	4
Table 3: Reactions to Characteristics Reports (Weighted)	4
Table 4: Reactions to Individual and Family Level Services List (Weighted).....	5
Table 5: Services List: Data Capacity	6
Table 6: Reactions to Individual and Family Level National Performance Indicators (Weighted).....	7
Table 7: Reactions to the Stability Indicator Options (Weighted)	7
Fiscal and Agency Capacity: Weighted Quantitative Analyses	8
Table 1: Respondents by organization type.....	8
Table 2: Respondents by role played in the organization.....	8
Table 3: Reactions to Domains for Reporting CSBG Expenditures (Weighted)	9
Table 4: Reactions to Details on Agency Capacity Expenditures (Weighted).....	9

Community Level Work: Weighted Quantitative Analyses

Table 1 and Table 2 showcase the breakdown of respondents by type of organization represented and the role the respondent plays within their organization by the percent of respondents and the number of respondents. A weighted total of 731 respondents from across all the CSBG Network.

Table 1: Respondents by organization type

Survey 2: Community Level Work			
Organizations responding to survey	Survey Responses	National total of organization's	Response Rate
CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	670	1,027	65.24%
State CSBG Lead Agency	30	56	53.57%
State Association	27	47	57.45%
Others* (NCRT, Vendors, etc)	4		
Total Responses	731		

*Received letters (instead of survey responses) from National Partners, State Associations, CAAs, etc

Table 2: Respondents by role played in the organization

Survey 2: Community Level Work		
What role do you play in your organization?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
State Administrator	5.6%	23
Executive Director – CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	20.3%	83
Planning Director - CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	11.5%	47
Data manager or data systems staff - CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	7.1%	29
Program Director or Senior Staff- CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	31.6%	129
Executive Director – State Association	1.5%	6
Program Director – State Association	2.7%	11
Other (please specify)	19.6%	80
	<i>answered question</i>	408*
	<i>skipped question</i>	10

*does not include weighted responses, as such this only reflects the respondents responsible for entering the data into the survey

Table 3: Reactions to Community Level Efforts in Progress Report (Weighted)

How well does the Community Level Efforts in Progress Report:

Community Level Work	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Total Reporting
Allow you to capture the work you do for communities over time?	12.72%	34.94%	37.43%	10.96%	2.19%	1.75%	684
	87	239	256	75	15	12	
	48%		37%	13%			
Allow you to describe the impact of the work you do independently ?	5.70%	40.20%	36.84%	10.23%	5.26%	1.75%	684
	39	275	252	70	36	12	
	46%		37%	15%			
Allow you to describe the impact of the work you do in partnership with other organizations ?	12.87%	33.77%	37.87%	9.36%	4.68%	1.46%	684
	88	231	259	64	32	10	
	47%		38%	14%			
Allow you to describe the impact of the work you do as part of a Collective Impact Initiative ?	12.57%	32.60%	31.43%	15.20%	4.39%	3.80%	684
	86	223	215	104	30	26	
	45%		31%	20%			

Table 4: Reactions to Community-Level Strategies List (Weighted)

How well does the list of strategies in each domain or section describe all the work you do to ensure communities where people with low-incomes are healthy and offer economic opportunity (Goal 2 & 3)?

Community Level Work	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Total Reporting
Employment	11.06%	47.58%	21.82%	12.88%	3.48%	3.18%	660
	73	314	144	85	23	21	
	59%		22%	16%			
Education and Cognitive Development	9.70%	42.58%	31.36%	9.70%	2.73%	3.94%	660
	64	281	207	64	18	26	
	52%		31%	12%			
Infrastructure and Asset Building	17.42%	28.18%	27.88%	9.55%	13.18%	3.79%	660
	115	186	184	63	87	25	
	46%		28%	23%			
Housing	20.45%	36.21%	25.30%	10.30%	5.30%	2.42%	660
	135	239	167	68	35	16	
	57%		25%	16%			
Health and Social/Behavioral Development	17.73%	35.76%	30.61%	9.55%	3.03%	3.33%	660
	117	236	202	63	20	22	
	53%		31%	13%			
Community Support Services	19.24%	40.00%	24.70%	10.15%	3.33%	2.58%	660
	127	264	163	67	22	17	
	59%		25%	13%			
Emergency Management	9.24%	35.91%	34.09%	11.21%	2.88%	6.67%	660
	61	237	225	74	19	44	
	45%		34%	14%			
Civic Engagement and Community Involvement Goal 2	10.45%	46.21%	28.64%	10.30%	2.27%	2.12%	660
	69	305	189	68	15	14	
	57%		29%	13%			
Civic Engagement and Community Involvement Goal 3	5.91%	35.45%	35.45%	10.76%	8.18%	4.24%	660
	39	234	234	71	54	28	
	41%		35%	19%			

Table 5: Reactions to Community-Level National Performance Indicators (Weighted)

How well do the indicators in each domain allow you to capture the impact of the work you do to ensure communities where people with low-incomes live are healthy and offer economic opportunity?

Community Level Work	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Total Reporting
Employment	11.13%	39.94%	23.02%	14.79%	7.93%	3.20%	656
	73	262	151	97	52	21	
	51%		23%	23%			
Education and Cognitive Development	10.06%	34.91%	32.47%	14.33%	4.12%	4.12%	656
	66	229	213	94	27	27	
	45%		32%	18%			
Infrastructure and Asset Building	8.84%	32.32%	31.10%	15.09%	7.62%	5.03%	656
	58	212	204	99	50	33	
	41%		31%	23%			
Housing	11.43%	38.72%	25.91%	19.51%	1.83%	2.59%	656
	75	254	170	128	12	17	
	51%		26%	21%			
Health and Social/Behavioral Development	10.67%	33.08%	30.34%	16.16%	3.81%	5.95%	656
	70	217	199	106	25	39	
	44%		30%	20%			
Civic Engagement and Community Involvement	10.67%	34.76%	34.15%	16.01%	3.51%	0.91%	656
	70	228	224	105	23	6	
	45%		34%	20%			

Individual and Family: Weighted Quantitative Analyses

Table 1 and Table 2 showcase the breakdown of respondents by type of organization represented and the role the respondent plays within their organization by the percent of respondents and the number of respondents. A weighted total of 609 respondents from across all organizations collectively represent 49 states.

Table 1: Respondents by organization type

Survey 3: Individual and Family			
Organizations responding to survey	Survey Responses	National total of organization's	Response Rate
CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	559	1,027	54.43%
State CSBG Lead Agency	27	56	48.21%
State Association	21	47	44.68%
Others* (NCRT, Vendors, etc)	2		
Total Responses	609		

*Received letters (instead of survey responses) from National Partners, State Associations, CAAs, etc

Table 2: Respondents by role played in the organization

Survey 3: Individual and Family		
What role do you play in your organization?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
State Administrator	6.14%	18
Executive Director – CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	18.77%	55
Planning Director - CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	11.26%	33
Data manager or data systems staff - CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	7.17%	21
Program Director or Senior Staff- CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	30.38%	89
Executive Director – State Association	1.71%	5
Program Director – State Association	2.73%	8
Other (please specify)	21.84%	64
<i>answered question</i>		293*
<i>skipped question</i>		12

*does not include weighted responses, as such this only reflects the respondents responsible for entering the data into the survey

Table 3: Reactions to Characteristics Reports (Weighted)

How well does each report allow you to describe the population your agency works with?

Individual and Family	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
The Baseline Characteristics Report	12.05%	52.67%	17.21%	9.64%	7.06%	1.38%	581
	70	306	100	56	41	8	
	65%		17%	17%			
The All Characteristics Report	13.25%	60.59%	16.01%	8.78%	0.52%	0.86%	581
	77	352	93	51	3	5	
	74%		16%	9%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Table 4: Reactions to Individual and Family Level Services List (Weighted)

How well does the list of services in each domain or section allow you to describe all the work you do to ensure individuals and families with low-incomes are stable and achieve economic security?

Individual and Family	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
Employment	22.36%	45.07%	18.49%	4.05%	6.69%	3.35%	568
	127	256	105	23	38	19	
	67%		18%	11%			
Education and Cognitive Development	22.71%	44.19%	23.06%	7.22%	1.06%	1.76%	568
	129	251	131	41	6	10	
	67%		23%	8%			
Infrastructure and Asset Building	23.24%	46.83%	19.89%	7.39%	0.88%	1.76%	568
	132	266	113	42	5	10	
	70%		20%	8%			
Housing	24.47%	50.00%	16.20%	2.11%	5.81%	1.41%	568
	139	284	92	12	33	8	
	74%		16%	8%			
Health and Social/Behavioral Development	21.48%	45.07%	18.13%	11.09%	1.41%	2.82%	568
	122	256	103	63	8	16	
	67%		18%	13%			
Support Services	22.36%	46.48%	19.01%	10.21%	0.88%	1.06%	568
	127	264	108	58	5	6	
	69%		19%	11%			
Civic Engagement and Community Involvement	12.85%	43.49%	30.11%	4.23%	7.75%	1.58%	568
	73	247	171	24	44	9	
	56%		30%	12%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Table 5: Services List: Data Capacity

Are you able to report the unduplicated number of people who receive services in the following domains?

	Yes	No	N/A	Total
Services in the Employment domain	281	188	104	573
	49%	33%	18%	
Services in the Education and Cognitive Development domain	274	194	105	573
	48%	34%	18%	
Services in the Infrastructure and Asset Building domain	281	191	101	573
	49%	33%	18%	
Services in the Housing domain	295	181	97	573
	51%	32%	17%	
Services in the Health and Social/Behavioral Development domain	239	225	109	573
	42%	39%	19%	
Services in the Support Services domain	259	215	99	573
	45%	38%	17%	
Services in the Civic Engagement and Community Involvement domain	256	214	103	573
	45%	37%	18%	

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Table 6: Reactions to Individual and Family Level National Performance Indicators (Weighted)

How well do the indicators in each domain allow you to capture the impact of the work you do to ensure individuals and families with low-incomes are stable and achieve economic security?

Individual and Family	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
Employment	12.04%	32.81%	35.60%	9.60%	3.32%	6.63%	573
	69	188	204	55	19	38	
		44.85%	35.60%	12.91%			
Education and Cognitive Development	11.69%	32.98%	38.39%	9.25%	1.40%	6.28%	573
	67	189	220	53	8	36	
		44.68%	38.39%	10.65%			
Infrastructure and Asset Building	10.82%	37.17%	34.90%	9.42%	1.40%	6.28%	573
	62	213	200	54	8	36	
		47.99%	34.90%	10.82%			
Housing	14.83%	37.17%	34.03%	6.98%	1.22%	5.76%	573
	85	213	195	40	7	33	
		52.01%	34.03%	8.20%			
Health and Social/Behavioral Development	10.82%	32.81%	35.43%	11.34%	2.79%	6.81%	573
	62	188	203	65	16	39	
		43.63%	35.43%	14.14%			
Civic Engagement and Community Involvement	9.77%	23.39%	44.68%	12.22%	3.84%	6.11%	573
	56	134	256	70	22	35	
		33.16%	44.68%	16.06%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Table 7: Reactions to the Stability Indicator Options (Weighted)

How well does each option for the indicators in the Individual and Family Stability domain allow you to capture the impact of the work you do to ensure the impact of the work you do to ensure individuals and families with low incomes are stable and achieve economic security?

Individual and Family	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
Option 1	10.50%	29.89%	20.28%	12.99%	24.38%	1.96%	562
	59	168	114	73	137	11	
		40.39%	20.28%	37.37%			
Option 2	4.45%	24.02%	18.51%	24.38%	25.98%	2.67%	562
	25	135	104	137	146	15	
		28.47%	18.51%	50.36%			
Option 3	12.81%	16.55%	26.51%	13.35%	27.94%	2.85%	562
	72	93	149	75	157	16	
		29.36%	26.51%	41.28%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Fiscal and Agency Capacity: Weighted Quantitative Analyses

Table 1 and Table 2 showcase the breakdown of respondents by type of organization represented and the role the respondent plays within their organization by the percent of respondents and the number of respondents. A weighted total of 553 respondents from across all organizations.

Table 1: Respondents by organization type

Survey 4 Fiscal and Agency Capacity			
Organizations responding to survey	Survey Responses	National total of organization's	Response Rate
CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	509	1,027	49.56%
State CSBG Lead Agency	26	56	46.43%
State Association	18	47	38.30%
Others* (NCRT, Vendors, etc)			
Total Responses	553		

*Received letters (instead of survey responses) from National Partners, State Associations, CAAs, etc

Table 2: Respondents by role played in the organization

Survey 4: CSBG Expenditures and Resources Administered by the CSBG Network		
What role do you play in your organization?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
State Administrator	6.1%	19
Executive Director – CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	18.5%	58
Planning Director - CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	12.8%	40
Data manager or data systems staff - CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	7.0%	22
Program Director or Senior Staff- CSBG Eligible Entity or Community Action Agency	31.9%	100
Executive Director – State Association	1.6%	5
Program Director – State Association	1.9%	6
Other (please specify)	20.1%	63
	<i>answered question</i>	313*
	<i>skipped question</i>	11

*does not include weighted responses, as such this only reflects the respondents responsible for entering the data into the survey

Table 3: Reactions to Domains for Reporting CSBG Expenditures (Weighted)

How well does each report allow you to describe the population your agency works with?:

Fiscal and Agency Capacity	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
How well do the domains for reporting expenditures in Table 1 allow you to describe your expenditures?	37.74%	39.85%	11.88%	7.47%	2.30%	0.77%	522
	197	208	62	39	12	4	
	77.59%		11.88%	9.77%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Table 4: Reactions to Details on Agency Capacity Expenditures (Weighted)

Fiscal and Agency Capacity	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
The list of credentials and certifications (#3) reflect staff qualifications that demonstrate agency capacity?	13.15%	55.71%	17.02%	7.93%	4.45%	1.74%	517
	68	288	88	41	23	9	
	68.86%		17.02%	12.38%			
Identification of hours (#2) demonstrate your support for board members, staff, and volunteers?	15.63%	50.00%	18.75%	9.38%	4.49%	1.76%	512
	80	256	96	48	23	9	
	65.63%		18.75%	13.87%			
List of activities (#1) identify your agency capacity building activities?	11.84%	46.80%	18.45%	12.04%	9.13%	1.75%	515
	61	241	95	62	47	9	
	58.64%		18.45%	21.17%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.

Table 5: Reactions to Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network (Weighted)

Fiscal and Agency Capacity	5 (Very Well)	4	3	2	1 (Not Well)	N/A	Count
How well do the categories for recording resources allow you to describe your resources?	31.31%	39.28%	16.70%	9.49%	1.33%	1.90%	527
	165	207	88	50	7	10	
	70.59%		16.70%	10.82%			

Note: Weighted data does not include “skipped” responses.