



Sacramento  
Employment and  
Training  
Agency

**GOVERNING BOARD**

**DON NOTTOLI**  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Sacramento

**ALLEN WARREN**  
Councilmember  
City of Sacramento

**JAY SCHENIRER**  
Councilmember  
City of Sacramento

**SOPHIA SCHERMAN**  
Public Representative

**PATRICK KENNEDY**  
Board of Supervisors  
County of Sacramento

**KATHY KOSSICK**  
Executive Director

925 Del Paso Blvd., Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95815

Main Office  
(916) 263-3800

Head Start  
(916) 263-3804

Website: <http://www.seta.net>

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD**

**DATE:** Wednesday, November 18, 2015

**TIME:** 10:00 a.m.

**PLACE:** SETA Board Room  
925 Del Paso Blvd.  
Sacramento, CA 95815

While the Community Action Board welcomes and encourages participation in the Board meetings, it would be appreciated if you would limit your comments to five minutes so that everyone may be heard. Matters under the jurisdiction of the Community Action Board and not on the posted agenda may be addressed by the general public following completion of the regular agenda. The Community Action Board limits testimony on matters not on the agenda to five minutes per person and not more than fifteen minutes for a particular subject. Meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for Assistance Listening Devices or other considerations should be made through the Clerk's office at (916) 263-3827. This document and other Board meeting information may be accessed through the Internet by accessing the SETA home page: [www.seta.net](http://www.seta.net).

**AGENDA**

**PAGE NUMBER**

- I. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
- II. **Consent Item**
  - A. Approval of Minutes of the October 14, 2015 Meeting 1-5
- III. **Action Item**
  - A. Approval of Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Funding Recommendations for Program Year 2016 6-10
- IV. **Information Items**
  - A. Program Operator Monthly Report through September 2015 11-13
  - B. Community Services Block Grant Fiscal Monitoring Reports 14-18
    - ✓ Greater Sacramento Urban League
    - ✓ Volunteers of America

***“Preparing People for Success: in School, in Work, in Life”***

**V. Reports to the Board**

19

- A. Chair
- B. Executive Director
- C. Program Manager
- D. Members of the Board
- E. Public

**V. Adjournment**

**DISTRIBUTION DATE: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2015**

ITEM II – CONSENT

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 14, 2015 MEETING

BACKGROUND:

Attached are the minutes of the October 14, 2015 meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Review, make any necessary corrections and approve the minutes.

STAFF PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION BOARD

### Minutes/Synopsis

(The minutes reflect the actual progression of the meeting.)

SETA Sequoia Room  
925 Del Paso Blvd.  
Sacramento, CA 95815

Wednesday, October 14, 2015  
10:00 a.m.

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call:** Ms. Nelson called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Members Present:

Denise Nelson, Head Start Policy Council  
Cole Forstedt, United Way  
Rivkah Sass, Sacramento Public Library Authority  
Debra Morrow, Sacramento County Department of Health and Human Services  
Donald Migge, California Community Credit Union  
LaShelle Dozier, Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency  
Sam Starks, SMUD  
Anthony Garcia, Child Action

Members Absent:

John Healey, California Emergency Food Link  
Calvin Sheppard, Head Start Policy Council  
Blake Young, Sacramento Food Bank & Family Services

**II. Consent Item**

A. Approval of Minutes of the August 12, 2015 Meeting

There were no questions or corrections to the minutes.

Moved/Migge, second/Sass to approve the minutes.

Voice Vote: Unanimous approval.

**III. Action Items – None.**

**IV. Information Items**

A. Monthly Report for August 2015: Ms. Davis-Jaffe stated that staff is awaiting information from operators to complete the report.

C. 2015 Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) Program Operator Monitoring Reports

The monitoring reports provide an annual review of the programs. The majority of the service providers seem to be doing well and moving forward. La Familia had three cases with eligibility issues; waiting to finalize the data to ensure the participant were eligible.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe stated that Robert's Family Development Center had quite a few findings regarding eligibility, grievance process, agency reporting, and what they need to correct them. They have submitted a corrective action plan. Staff will accept the plan and a monitor go to follow up to ensure that the findings are being dealt with.

Mr. Migge stated that last year they were having issues and submitted a corrective action plan. How long do we want for them to take care of business. Ms. Davis-Jaffe replied that this program did not submit a proposal for the next year but staff needs to make sure this year is followed through to ensure the funds are properly expended.

Mr. Starks suggested that staff go out to advise the service providers. We need to make sure some of the groups that do not have the sophistication that others have are able to engage the targets we serve. This is not the only group that does not have the strength/knowledge to run a program. We need to make it a part of preparing the agencies to ensure they succeed. He would like to see what plans staff have come up to assist groups to be successful. Mr. Kim stated that staff works closely with service providers during the corrective action process.

The reason that Robert's Family Development Center did not submit a proposal is that they did not meet the pre-qualification requirements; it was not due to the issues they are having. The pre-qualification requirements have more to do with fiscal and unresolved audit issues. The fiscal staff does reach out to provide technical assistance to the Robert's Family Development Center staff.

Ms. Sass referred to some findings on the Hmong Women's Heritage Center and inquired how often this program is reviewed. Ms. Davis-Jaffe replied that the fiscal monitoring reports are done throughout the year. Mr. Kim stated that there are two different reports: program monitoring reports and fiscal monitoring reports. Program and fiscal monitors do come together to discuss issues with service providers and to communicate findings. The other time monitors come together is during funding recommendations.

Ms. Dozier inquired at what interval staff go around to ensure the corrective action plan is done? This program has already been allocated \$13,000 and the corrective action list is quite lengthy. How does staff handle things if the corrective action plan is not met? Ms. Davis-Jaffe stated that staff will meet

with them in mid-November and as long as they follow the plan, they should be in good shape.

B. Update on Community Services Block Grant Organizational Standards

There are 58 CSBG organizational standards that need to be met. The standards are mandated by the State of California. One requirement is a mission statement that needs to be developed. This can be done by a committee to develop a mission statement with approval by the whole board. Ms. Nelson asked all board members to think about a mission statement and come forward with options. Mr. Starks suggested that sometimes a smaller group thinks better. He suggests having a committee of two to three people get together and bring suggestions to the board for consideration. He offered to serve on the committee.

Ms. Nelson suggested board members e-mail their ideas to the clerk within the next two weeks. The ideas and the board overview will be sent to all board members.

Mr. Starks stated that there is a high degree of African American youth experiencing recidivism. He was recently approached by an organization that would not qualify due to their lack of sophistication. He expressed concern of a lack of an organization to assist in this issue.

Mr. Bonanno stated that the issue of working with African American youth is innovative but there may not be an organization that is ready to tackle the issue. It is important to look at the long term approach of an organization and make sure a program is prepared for submitting a proposal. SETA has a very good track record of submitting proposals for additional funding.

D. Community Services Block Grant Fiscal Monitoring Reports

No additional report.

V. **Reports to the Board**

A. Chair: No report.

B. Executive Director: No report.

C. Program Manager: Ms. Davis-Jaffe stated that the binders provided to Board members have the cover sheet, proposal summary, and budget for each proposal received. The reading team has been provided copies of full proposals.

Ms. Davis-Jaffe updated the board on the Childhood Poverty Reduction Program grant; the first person was recently placed in full-time unsubsidized employment.

This program is in collaboration with the Hillsdale and Franklin job center staff working with Head Start parents.

C. Members of the Board: No comments.

D. Public: No comments.

VI. **Adjournment**: The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 a.m.

## ITEM III - A- ACTION

### APPROVAL OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT (CSBG) FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM YEAR 2016

#### BACKGROUND:

On September 4, 2015, SETA released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the CSBG program for program year 2016. The RFP solicited services under Safety-Net, Youth and Senior Support and Family Self-Sufficiency categories as identified in the 2016-2017 CSBG Community Action Plan. The amount of funding available for program services was estimated to be \$800,000, of which 40% was allocated to Safety-Net or short term emergency services, 40% allocated to case-managed Family Self-Sufficiency services, and 20% allocated to Youth and Senior Support Services. The deadline for receipt of proposals was October 8, 2015. Twenty-nine (29) proposals were received by the 4:30 p.m. deadline, requesting a total of \$1,736,103. All Twenty-nine (29) proposals were evaluated.

#### Evaluation Process:

All proposals received through this solicitation went through a review process to provide funding recommendations to the Community Action Board. Staff recommendations were developed through the deliberation of a team of ten (10) readers representing SETA's Workforce Development Department, and Contracts and Fiscal units, in addition to one member of the Community Action Board. The readers evaluated, scored and ranked each proposal using standardized evaluation and scoring criteria that were identified in the RFP. Proposals were ranked into four categories:

**Rank 1:** Proposals responses exceeded all the RFP criteria; the proposer has experience in the proposed activity, has leveraged funding and collaborative partners, and has demonstrated that a clear need for the service exists.

**Rank 2:** Proposal responses met all the RFP criteria and meet a community need identified in the Community Action Plan.

**Rank 3:** Proposal responded adequately to the RFP criteria and meets a community need identified in the Community Action Plan. Proposal is eligible for funding as resources permit.

**Rank 4:** Proposal responses do not meet the RFP criteria and were not recommended for funding.

The top ranked proposals achieved their scores based on the following criteria:



## ITEM III-A – ACTION (continued)

Page 2

- The proposing agency had a history of successfully operating the proposed program or a similar program, had sufficient leveraged funding, and demonstrated the establishment of collaborative partnerships.
- The proposing agency adhered to the service priorities set forth in SETA's 2016-2017 Community Action Plan.
- The proposing agency succeeded in achieving planned, contracted goals, or, if not previously funded by CSBG, the agency demonstrated a potential for success.
- The proposing agency demonstrated a need exists for the service.
- If applying for the Family Self-Sufficiency category, the proposing agency had a clear description of a case-management system and had a connection with the system of Sacramento Works America's Job Centers.

Staff also considered that all identified high-risk and underserved neighborhoods would have access to services and ensured that all identified target groups would be served. Due to limited availability of CSBG funding, only twenty-two proposals are recommended for funding.

Two new agencies, Lao Family Community Development and Saint John's Program for Real Change (both ranked #2), are recommended for funding.

Daren Maeda, Director of Linkage to Education, provides services designed to redirect the lives of high-risk youth who are being released from juvenile institutions, and emancipated foster youth, to prepare and place them into local colleges. Staff recommends that his position be continued as a SETA Consultant for an additional year for \$30,000.

Attached are the resulting proposal rankings and staff funding recommendations.

Proposal summaries and funding rationale will be submitted under separate cover. The SETA Governing Board will consider CAB funding recommendations at its December 3, 2015 meeting.

### RECOMMENDATION:

1. Approve staff funding recommendations for the Program Year 2016 Community Services Block Grant.
2. Approve the continued funding of Daren Maeda as a SETA Consultant for an additional year in the amount of \$30,000.

STAFF PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

**2016 COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT  
STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>Safety-Net Services</b>									
Prop #	Rank	Agency	Target Group	Target Area *	Current Funding	Funding Request	Cost per/ # Served	Staff Recomm.	Page #
1	3	South County Services	Low Income Families	South Sacramento County and River Delta Area	\$65,000 + \$22,491 carryover + \$119,314 DHA 1-Stop Share of Cost	\$186,114	\$115 1,615 Households	\$27,700	5
2	2	Voluntary Legal Services of Northern CA	Persons w/ Criminal Convictions or Suspended Driver's Licenses	Sacramento County	\$28,000	\$28,750	\$75 384 Individuals	\$28,000	5
3	2	Legal Services of Northern CA	Seniors	Sacramento County	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$28 725 Households	\$20,000	6
5	2	Francis House of Sacramento	Homeless Families	Sacramento County	\$70,400	\$89,271	\$429 208 Households	\$70,400	7
6	2	The Salvation Army	Low Income Families	Sacramento County	\$60,500	\$95,000	\$199 478 Households	\$60,500	7
7	2	Lao Family Community Development	Low Income Families	N. Sacramento, Florin, North Highlands, Arden Arcade, Carmichael, Citrus Heights	\$0	\$67,350	\$127 530 Households	\$20,000	8
9	2	Next Move	Homeless Families	Arden Arcade, Carmichael, Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Galt, Florin, Rancho Cordova	\$10,200	\$42,295	\$223 230 Households	\$15,200	8
13	2	River City Food Bank	Low Income Families	Sacramento County	\$20,500	\$30,000	\$0.94 32,000 Households	\$20,500	10
22	2	Folsom Cordova Community Partnership	Low Income Families	Rancho Cordova and Parts of Folsom	\$24,000	\$56,110	\$62 899 Households	\$24,000	14
24	4	Elk Grove Food Bank Services	Low Income Families	Elk Grove and Zip Codes 95624, 95757, 95758, 95829, 95288, 95759	\$20,000	\$49,790	\$60 825 Households	\$0	15
25	2	My Sister's House	Domestic Violence Survivors	Central and South Sacramento, Elk Grove	\$34,000	\$49,024	\$860 57 Households	\$26,100	15
26	2	Volunteers of America	Homeless and Low Income Veterans	Sacramento County	\$7,519.02	\$26,950	\$99 272 Households	\$7,600	15
28	3	WIND Youth Services	Homeless Youth 12-24	Sacramento County	\$20,381	\$63,827	\$64 1,000 Households	\$0	16
<b>TOTAL SAFETY-NET RECOMMENDED:</b>								<b>\$320,000</b>	

**2016 COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT  
STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>Family Self-Sufficiency Services</b>									
<b>Prop #</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>Target Area</b>	<b>Current Funding</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Cost per/ # Served</b>	<b>Staff Recomm.</b>	<b>Page #</b>
4	2	Saint John's Program for Real Change	Single Homeless Women w/ Children 0-5	Sacramento County but Targeting Florin	\$0	\$96,653	\$483 200 Households	\$70,000	6
10	3	Next Move	Homeless	Sacramento County	\$58,000	\$60,143	\$261 230 Households	\$60,000	9
11	3	Sacramento Self-Help Housing	Low Income and Homeless Families	North Highlands and Florin	\$20,000	\$49,764	\$311 160 Households	\$20,000	9
12	4	Center for Employment Training	Low Income Families	South Sacramento County, Florin, Lemon Hill	\$0	\$56,037	\$934 60 Households	\$0	10
18	3	La Familia Counseling Center	In-School, Gang and Pre-gang Youth	South Sacramento, Lemon Hill, Parkway, Florin, Galt	\$0	\$100,000	\$1,333 75 Households	\$0	12
21	2	Folsom Cordova Community Partnership	Single Parents w/ Children 0-5	Rancho Cordova and Portions of Folsom	\$0	\$75,229	\$2,508 30 Households	\$60,000	13
23	2	Waking the Village	Homeless Pregnant and Parenting Youth w/ Children	Sacramento County	\$42,500	\$50,000	\$3,125 16 Households	\$50,000	14
27	3	WIND	Homeless Youth 12-24	Sacramento County	\$0	\$75,989	\$1,520 50 Youth	\$60,000	16
<b>TOTAL FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY RECOMMENDED:</b>								<b>\$320,000</b>	

**2016 COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT  
STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

<b>Youth and Senior Support</b>									
<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Target Group</b>	<b>Target Area</b>	<b>Current Funding</b>	<b>Funding Request</b>	<b>Cost per/ # Served</b>	<b>Staff Recomm.</b>	<b>Page #</b>
8	2	Next Move	Seniors	Sacramento County but Targeting Lemon Hill, Florin, Rancho Cordova	\$0	\$28,859	\$1,312 22 Seniors	\$25,000	8
14	3	Visions Unlimited	Seniors	South Sacramento County	\$50,000	\$58,468	\$688 85 Seniors	\$35,000	10
15	3	Elk Grove Unified School District	Pregnant and Parenting Teens and their Children	City of Sacramento, Elk Grove, Florin, Valley Hi	\$0	\$30,888	\$309 100 Families	\$0	11
16	3	Hmong Women's Heritage Association	Seniors	Sacramento County	\$23,800	\$28,000	\$467 60 Seniors	\$0	11
17	2	Department of Health and Human Services	Seniors	Sacramento County	\$27,500	\$27,500	\$1,100 25 Seniors	\$16,500	11
19	2	La Familia Counseling Center	In-School, Gang and Pre-gang Youth	South Sacramento, Lemon Hill, Parkway, Florin, Galt	\$55,000	\$100,000	\$1,333 75 Youth	\$55,000	12
20	2	Children's Receiving Home	Foster Youth	Sacramento County	\$28,500	\$41,552	\$1,385 30 Youth	\$28,500	13
29	4	Transitional Living and Community Support	Seniors/ Disabled SRO Residents	Downtown Sacramento	\$0	\$40,805	\$680 60 Seniors	\$0	17
<b>TOTAL YOUTH AND SENIOR SUPPORT RECOMMENDED:</b>								<b>\$160,000</b>	

<b>TOTAL FOR ALL CSBG CATEGORIES RECOMMENDED:</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>
---	------------------

ITEM IV-A - INFORMATION

PROGRAM OPERATOR MONTHLY REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 2015

BACKGROUND:

Attached for your information is the Monthly Report through September 2015.

Staff will be available to answer questions.

STAFF PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe

Community Action Board  
Monthly Report Through September, 2015

DELEGATE AGENCIES	EXPENDITURES			Family Self-Sufficiency % of Households Served	Emergency Safety-Net Services Provided (A Percentage of Projected Third Quarter Goals)							
	PY2015 BUDGET	Reported	% of Budget Expended		Food	Housing Assistance	Shelter (Motel)	Utilities Assistance	Legal Assistance	Employ. Supports	Transportation	Clothing
Children's Receiving Home	\$ 28,500	\$ 21,375	75%	100%+								
Department of Health and Human Services	\$ 27,500	\$ 21,382	78%	100%+								
Elk Grove Food Bank Services	\$ 20,000	\$ 13,891	69%		100%+							
Folsom Cordova Community Partnership	\$ 24,000	\$ 20,933	87%		100%+	100%+	100%+	100%+		100%+	100%+	100%+
Francis House	\$ 70,400	\$ 46,748	66%		87%		88%				85%	
Greater Sacramento Urban League ***	\$ 24,200	\$ -	0%			0%		0%			0%	
Hmong Women's Heritage Association	\$ 23,800	\$ 20,043	84%	80%								
La Familia Counseling Center	\$ 55,000	\$ 40,675	74%	100%+								
Legal Services of Northern California	\$ 20,000	\$ 16,312	82%						100%+			
My Sister's House	\$ 34,000	\$ 17,460	51%			100%+		100%				
River City Food Bank	\$ 20,500	\$ -	0%		100%+							
Roberts Family Development Center	\$ 20,000	\$ 15,369	77%	59%								
Next Move Sacramento	\$ 68,200	\$ 52,201	77%	77%		100%+	100%+	100%+		100%+	0%	

Community Action Board  
Monthly Report Through September, 2015

DELEGATE AGENCIES	EXPENDITURES			Family Self-Sufficiency % of Households Served	Emergency Safety-Net Services Provided (A Percentage of Projected Third Quarter Goals)							
	PY2015 BUDGET	Reported	% of Budget Expended		Food	Housing Assistance	Shelter (Motel)	Utilities Assistance	Legal Assistance	Employ. Supports	Transportation	Clothing
Sacramento Self-Help Housing	\$ 20,000	\$ 16,470	82%	100%+								
South County Services	\$ 206,805	\$ 176,061	85%		91%	89%		89%			16%	
The Salvation Army	\$ 60,500	\$ 58,500	97%			100%+	100%+	100%+				
Travelers Aid Emergency Assistance Agency	\$ 70,000	\$ 55,582	79%		0%	51%	100%+	100%+				
Visions Unlimited	\$ 50,000	\$ 37,325	75%	100%+								
Voluntary Legal Services Program	\$ 28,000	\$ 19,969	71%					98%				
Volunteers of America	\$ 7,519	\$ 5,700	76%			100%+		88%				
Waking the Village	\$ 42,500	\$ 16,810	40%	100%+								
Wind Youth Services	\$ 20,381	\$ 15,282	75%		100%+						100%+	

\*\*\* On November 5, 2015, the SETA Governing Board granted the Greater Sacramento Urban League's request to terminate its CSBG contract with SETA, under which no services were provided.

ITEM IV-B – INFORMATION

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT FISCAL MONITORING REPORTS

BACKGROUND:

Attached for your information are the latest CSBG fiscal monitoring reports.

Staff will be available to answer questions.

STAFF PRESENTER: Julie Davis-Jaffe



**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Ms. Cassandra Jennings **DATE:** October 30, 2015  
**FROM:** Tammi L. Kerch, SETA Fiscal Monitor  
**RE:** On-Site Fiscal Monitoring of Greater Sacramento Urban League

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>	<u>CONTRACT PERIOD</u>	<u>PERIOD COVERED</u>
WIA	AD IT	\$ 15,000	7/1/14-6/30/15	3/1/15-6/30/15
WIA	US	\$ 61,000	7/1/14-6/30/15	9/1/14-6/30/15
WIA	DW 25%	\$ 120,000	7/1/14-6/30/15	9/1/14-6/30/15
CSBG	Safety Net	\$ 24,200	1/1/15-12/31/15	1/1/15-7/31/15 (closed)
CalWorks	TC/GED	\$ 54,900	7/1/14-6/30/15	9/1/14-6/30/15
CalWorks	ESE2/OJT	\$ 63,715	3/1/15-6/30/15	3/1/15-6/30/15

**Monitoring Purpose:** Initial  Follow-Up  Special  Final   
**Date of review:** August 17-20, 2015

AREAS EXAMINED	SATISFACTORY		COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
1 Accounting Systems/Records		X	X	
2 Internal Control	X			
3 Bank Reconciliation	X			
4 Disbursement Control	X			
5 Staff Payroll/Files	X			
6 Fringe Benefits	X			
7 Participant Payroll	N/A			
8 OJT Contracts/Files/Payment	N/A			
9 Indirect Cost Allocation	X			
10 Adherence to Contract/Budget	X			
11 In-Kind Contribution	N/A			
12 Equipment Records	N/A			

**Program Operator:** Greater Sacramento Urban League

**Findings and General Observations:**

The total costs as reported to SETA for WIA and CSBG programs have been reviewed and traced to the subgrantee's fiscal records. Although there are no disallowed costs, the following is a finding and concern that requires corrective action.

GSUL is not in compliance with federal regulations. The agency has expended more than \$500,000 in federal grant funds during the fiscal years reviewed and is therefore subject to the A-133 audit requirements. The last audit completed was for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. Although an audit has been conducted for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014, SETA is in possession of draft versions dated September 10, 2015. GSUL has not provided finalized audit reports for the fiscal years ending 2013 and 2014.

**Recommendations for Corrective Action:**

Immediately upon completion, submit to SETA an A-133 compliant audit for fiscal years ending June 30, 2013 and June 30, 2014.

cc: Kathy Kossick  
Governing Board

MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Mr. Leo McFarland **DATE:** October 30, 2015  
**FROM:** Tammi L. Kerch, SETA Fiscal Monitor  
**RE:** On-Site Fiscal Monitoring of Volunteers of America

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>	<u>CONTRACT PERIOD</u>	<u>PERIOD COVERED</u>
CSBG	SN	\$ 7,519	1/1/14-12/31/14	1/1/14-12/31/14

**Monitoring Purpose:** Initial  Follow-Up  Special  Final   
**Date of review:** March 2015 desk audit with follow-up

	<b>AREAS EXAMINED</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>		<b>COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
1	Accounting Systems/Records	X			
2	Internal Control	X			
3	Bank Reconciliation	X			
4	Disbursement Control	X			
5	Staff Payroll/Files	X			
6	Fringe Benefits	X			
7	Participant Payroll	N/A			
8	OJT Contracts/Files/Payment	N/A			
9	Indirect Cost Allocation	N/A			
10	Adherence to Contract/Budget	X			
11	In-Kind Contribution	N/A			
12	Equipment Records	N/A			

Memorandum  
Fiscal Monitoring Findings  
Page 2

**Program Operator:** Volunteers of America

**Findings and General Observations:**

The total costs as reported to SETA CSBG programs have been traced to the subgrantee's fiscal records. The recorded expenditures were verified and appear to be in order and there are no adjustments required.

**Recommendations for Corrective Action:**

There are no findings for corrective action in this fiscal monitoring visit.

cc: Kathy Kossick  
Governing Board

## ITEM V - REPORTS TO THE BOARD

### A. CHAIR'S REPORT

The Chair of the SETA Community Action Board on a regular basis receives numerous items of information concerning legislation, current programs and agency activities.

The important information from the material received and meetings attended will be shared with the entire Board and the method proposed by the Chair is to give a verbal report at each regular meeting. It will also allow time for the Board to provide input on items that may require future action.

### B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

This item is set aside to allow the Executive Director of the Community Action Program to report to the Board on any items of important information or to deal with special requests which need to be addressed but, because of time constraints, were not included in the formal SETA Community Action Board packet.

The Executive Director's Report also allows the opportunity for the Executive Director to apprise the Board of upcoming events, significant agency activities, or conferences.

### C. PROGRAM MANAGER

This item provides an opportunity for Ms. Julie Davis-Jaffe, the CSBG program manager, to provide an oral report on issues not included in the agenda packet.

### D. MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

This item provides the opportunity for SETA Community Action Board members to raise any items for consideration not covered under the formal agenda. It also provides the opportunity for Board members to request staff to research or follow up on specific requests or to ask that certain items be placed on the next agenda.

### E. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Participation of the general public at SETA Community Action Board meetings is encouraged. Members of the audience are asked to address their requests to the Chair, if they wish to speak.