Data Evaluation Committee

2.23.2022

**Present**: Matt, Michele, Kathy, Cynthia, Owen, Paige

**Sharing Settings issue and opening up data sharing**

-Michele met with Eric Gammons and Keleigh yesterday and he clarified some things and gave some additional suggestions:

-Whether or not someone shares data to enter into HMIS should not be a question, definitely not one determined by the release of information. The release should only specify permission to share data with others, not collect it.

-Eric wants to meet with Bitfocus to get a better sense of the software capabilities. Trying to put together meeting that Eric is able to join with us and Bitfocus

-Eric has also suggested that we reach out to some of the providers who we think will have the most reservations and have one on one meetings before bringing it to the larger group, Eric also offered to be part of those meetings.

-If it would be helpful or of interest, we could invite Eric to speak to the Data Eval Committee about best practices regarding client data privacy.

Kathy- there are situations where we can get much more information needed to help someone by not asking for lots of info, sometimes not demanding someone shares funder requested information actually helps us get more useful information of other kinds.

Owen- we have some programs not funded by HUD, DIAL/SELF’s release needs to factor in all of our different funding sources. Have approached that they won’t enter someone into data system if they refuse to sign or don’t want to be but comes with a more limited scope of services provided. Not whether or not you’re entered in the system but how you’re entered. People mostly understand that and agree to share.

Like some of Eric’s guidance, a lot of things are aligning with HUD’s guidance. It would be a bad idea to wholeheartedly follow HUD guidance without paying attention to other funders. Maybe a broader release sounds best to have release that gives permission to share with all CoC agencies but only have agencies sharing that really need it to minimize the exposure without having to change the release every time.

Matt- we have always described the HMIS release as releasing information to the funding sources and there’s another release that they sign for bridging communications with other agencies. Would be nice to have more specific releases to allow sharing for certain clients with specific or group of specific agencies.

Owen- it's good for us to think about how the HMIS release might interact with other releases agencies are using. Data will be visible to staff at other agencies but would still need another release to discuss with another agency. Some very personal questions and data that needs to be considered and keep in mind when wording a more general release.

Matt- talk to other agency staff about stuff pertinent to case management, only what’s relevant

Owen- could train everyone to manually select private as the default and can undo that when agreements are in made, the other agencies can then see those clients and enrollments (unless they’re marked as private)

Matt- in Coordinated Entry, the best case scenario is we have agreement, everybody is filling out the intake and assessments, I can see that level of things but to go into a deeper level, traditionally have shared data through a phone call or faxing over a letter, it’s not giving them rights to go through our paper files. There’s the option of sharing demographics and keeping the additional information locked if it isn’t needed or pertinent. Does that give us any wiggle room can we set different permissions for each set of data?

Michele- right now, the ability to make a client or enrollment/note/etc Public once it’s already been marked Private is restricted to agency administrators and managers and it can be a little messy to change to public, sometimes data needs to be re-entered. We could always think about opening up the ability to make private data public to more staff but other than making the specific clients or enrollments or files private and then making clients pubic after they sign an agreement, I don’t think there’s a way to do client level releases.

**2022 Point in Time Count!**

It’s today! February 23rd! Goes on for a week with a provider level survey, some street outreach is also happening tonight. Need to submit the report by (April something?) (Michele checked the reporting site after this meeting and it still says “TBD” for a due date but that last year the report wasn’t due until May 15th. Expecting mid to late April this year as I think the May date was a COVID extension but it could be May again. Either way we hope to finish compiling by the end of April at the latest.)

**LSA**

The LSA is the ‘Longitudinal Systems Analysis” report HUD requires annually. This report was due on February 15th by midnight PST and our CoC did not submit in time. The CoC also did not submit the LSA by the deadline in 2021 and it will continue to be a goal for the next year. The process to submit the LSA involves considerable time waiting for HUD liaisons to respond to your submissions and either accept them or ask for additional follow up information. This process, combined with errors in HUD's online reporting system and the need to focus on the HMIS migration during the bulk of the reporting period led to us uploading our final dataset on the 15th and hearing back from our HUD liaison on the afternoon of the 23rd that our comments were all acceptable at that point. We did submit a report with no errors but there were considerable warnings, many of which were caused by missing exit destinations and some missing migrated data from the transition. Emphasizing the importance of capturing exit destinations, fixing missing migrated data, and beginning the LSA report sooner will be priorities this year. Our HMIS TA provider, Eric, did mention that many other CoCs also were not able to submit on time and the LSA is technically not required, but completing it on time does give us additional points during the annual CoC funding process so we want to be completing it and completing it on time.

During a future meeting we can analyze the results of the LSA using Stella P: [Stella - HUD Exchange](https://www.hudexchange.info/homelessness-assistance/stella/#stella-p-basic-resources)

**System Performance Measures**

We need to submit this report by Monday, Feb 28th in the evening. Involves looking at performance measures across our entire system. How long people experience homelessness for (lengths of stay in ES and TH), how many people return to homelessness after entering housing, how many people exit to permanent housing, etc.

Can optionally re-submit previous year’s numbers, we have a new HMIS now and need to decide if we want to re-submit for last year or just continue with new data.

Results are used in the CoC’s renewal application and influences how well the CoC as a whole scores.

In 2021 we resubmitted FY2019 and submitted new data for FY2020. We are currently deciding if we want to resubmit for FY2020 and are submitting new data for FY2021.

We spent the majority of the rest of the meeting looking at the results of the performance measures we submitted compared to re-run performance measures.

Looks like we scored a little less well on the data we just re-ran with the new Clarity system but that it would be good to submit them as our 2020 data because it shows greater improvement as we go forward.

Cynthia- We can always account for some changes due to the change in data systems. This will be a better comparison moving forward to compare to a report run with the same system

Owen- more meaningful assessments of what is and isn’t working. Feels like a useful way to go. Rather have it be accurate with the work everyone puts in to enter and collect the data. Will be easier to make sense

Cynthia- do the programs change or agencies expand or reduce services? Do we know any possible reason for the change in numbers?

Michele- the way the two systems we used to generate the report work is a little different, one was running from everyone in the HMIS eligible and the other from a list of programs I chose, this could be part of the discrepancies.

-I have since this meeting determined that there is missing data from the migration process still, the report has helped to find some of these cases and I entered the information in Clarity that was available in the old HMIS still before running the performance measures a last time and submitting the results. I will be working on continuing to find and fix missing migrated data and during a future meeting we can discuss the results of this past year’s system Performance Measures which were just submitted (attached) to see if there are areas we can improve.

**Next Meeting**

March 23rd, 3 – 4:30pm