**Maine HMIS Data Committee**

**Meeting Summary**

**August 18, 2020**

Attendance:

April Reed, Mary Wade, Kat Freeman, Tony Giarratano, Rachel Boyce, Meaghan Void, Awa Conteh, Mike Shaughnessy, Elaine Grade, Kate Easter

Previous minutes were approved as is.

Mike S updated everyone on what’s happening with CE.

The previous deadline to begin CE data collection of April 1st was extended to October 1st due to COVID. Despite the extension, the CoC board voted to draft/request a waiver so we would not be obligated to meet the October 1st deadline. Challenges regarding how to successfully engage the unsheltered population into CE are still being explored (211, CAP agencies, LAA’s etc.). The basis of requesting the waiver is largely based around this gap of ensuring the unsheltered population is equitably incorporated into CE.

TA assistance with CE was approved by the board and requested. The committee had an introductory meeting with TA as well as a couple of breakout sessions. As there is no guarantee a waiver will be approved, we will continue moving forward with CE implementation plans/refining data entry workflows with guidance from TA as we await the outcome of the waiver request.

Mary, Mike and April also had a very successful focus group meeting with a group of shelter providers. The data entry workflow the HMIS team has developed for CE was presented and the group discussed how shelters are currently handing diversion and prevention efforts. The group expressed interest in continuing to collaborate with the HMIS Team and all agreed a CE Entry EDA, sperate from the shelter EDA’s was greatly preferred.

Mary added that the next focus group meeting is next week. Shelter providers are currently testing the workflow and hopefully will be providing feedback at the next meeting.

Kat posed the question: If the feedback we are getting from shelters is that they feel comfortable and the data entry workflow seems doable, what is preventing us from being able to meet the October 1st deadline?

Mike reiterated the concern, which has been expressed numerous times, regarding how to equitably incorporate unsheltered populations into CE has yet to be ironed out. The group agreed it would still be beneficial to implement CE in a phased capacity and that idea should be presented to the CE committee for consideration.

Mike S exited the meeting.

Awa and Mary filled in the group regarding a data quality issues that was recently identified:

Since the data standard changes, there are clients who now have “missing data elements” (specifically TH projects). Mary checked with WellSky/ServicePoint who confirmed it’s a programming error which HUD is aware of and it will not negatively affect the APR.

Mary started a discussion regarding the Data Table in our current Data Quality Plan and if we should try to better align/realign with HUD’s data strategy.

* Awa stated there was a lot of work that went into developing the original Data Table/Data Quality Plan and felt we should leave as is.
* Kat suggested looking at “Destination at Exit” data to look at clients who show up in the system someplace else and then exit them to that shelter from the original location to increase the % of known “destination at exit”.
* Tony noted sometimes you just don’t know where people go/end up and there is nothing to do in those situations to improve it

Awa wondered if maybe it was time for Service Point training around data (why certain data points are collected, how they are used etc.) She also pointed out that data sharing has been great but there are data quality issues being carried over from one shelter/project to another.

The group discussed if/when is it okay to correct someone else’s data?

* Mary pointed out we would need to test how reports would pull data if it was changed by someone other than who initially inputted in.
* Rachel and Tony both voiced concerns that touching other people’s data and/or someone else touching “your” data is worrisome.
* The group felt it was something that needed to be discussed and a formalized process/guideline would be helpful.
* Being notified by someone else who identifies a data quality issue so YOU can fix it yourself may be a potential solution and happy medium.

Kat made a motion requesting MH to develop a report that would identify discrepancies between known entries/exits. Awa seconded the motion.

The group discussed a training for HMIS users and decided smaller, mixed groups (different providers/programs/areas) would be ideal. It may be easier for people to reach out to one another regarding dating quality issues for correction if there was a better level of rapport established between providers in general.

Mary announced the HMIS Team is already going holding an Agency Admin training in October. We will also be sending out a message soon regarding Qlik which will be replacing ART. The HMIS Team has started the process of identifying, prioritizing and re-creating reports. Another user group/training might not be something we can focus on right away.

The group discussed improving data quality should be a collaborative effort. Kat made a motion that the data committee request MH, utilizing the DQP, identify other data elements which we are significantly not meeting our mark on - and, in conjunction, identify any of those elements that also directly impact our system performance measures. Rachel seconded.

Mary opened a discussion regarding HUD’s timeline for data entry. The group discussed the challenges with trying to meet them. Kat suggested before deciding anything, we could examine where we currently are with data entry timeliness. Kat made a motion for MH to look at CAPERs and APRs for current data entry timeliness. Tony seconded the motion.

Rachel expressed concern regarding HMIS workload if the team had time to work on all three motions?

Mary explained the HMIS Team should be able to determine where we sit currently with data entry timeliness and report back to the committee at the next meeting. Pushing forward with CE and working on preparing for the launch of Qlik sense, the HMIS Team won’t be able address the other two motions as quickly.

Awa proposed CE should be a standing agenda item. Everyone agreed. Awa also proposed selecting a third co-chair for the data committee. Mary is going to email the Data Committee asking for nominations which can be sent to Awa, Josh and Mary.

Next agenda:

Data quality timeframe

CE updates