

Present: Brian Alexander, Matt Alexander, Debbie Bailey, Beth Bordeaux, Jennie Connor, Steve Crane, Heather Dillashaw, Darryl Kosciak, Tina Krause, Andrea Kurtz, Lora Moree, Denise Neunaber, Shana Overdorf, Cecelia Peers, Rebecca Pfeiffer, Jamie Rohe, Corey Root, Lloyd Schmeidler, Matt Schnars, Bob Taylor, Tim West

Present From HUD & HUD TA: Mike Leslie, Danielle Progen, Libby Stanley

Present From MCAH: Gerry Leslie and Sue Saul (joined for

CoCs Absent: Cumberland

Joining at 1 PM: Karen Deblasio (by phone), Eric Hufnagel (by phone), Barb Ritter (by phone), Gerry Leslie, Sue Saul

CoCs Absent: Fayetteville/Cumberland

Approval of Minutes:

Motion for approval – Debbie Bailey

2nd – Heather Dillashaw

Passed

Review of By-laws and Outstanding Questions (discussion facilitated by Mike):

Intro by Heather – we are shifting and this creates a significant change in relationship with NCCEH. Moving to this new model where CoCs are responsible means we need more clarity in our expectations of each other and of NCCEH. We have hit the reset button on the HMIS lead and now need to hit the reset button on how we work with each other.

What is the role of NCCEH in the governance of the NC HMIS? As our state's homeless coalition, they bring a wealth of knowledge and expertise to the table. What is the best way to avail the GC of these resources? How is this affected by state coalition running BoS CoC? Providing System Admin support to some CoCs? How does having the state coalition staff some CoCs change the relationships between the CoCs & NCCEH and how does it impact access to services from NCCEH for those CoCs not contracting with NCCEH?

Role of NCCEH in governance of NC HMIS

- Historically, CHIN was joint project of Housing Coalition and Homeless Coalition; Knowledge base = NCCEH and Overhead capacity = NCHC; Changed to contractor relationship for NCCEH providing knowledge and vision; growing disconnect between needs vs. reality led to RFP for new HMIS administrator; NCCEH had contracted role for providing support to CoCs for HMIS through 2014.
- Currently – NCCEH has no contracted role, BoS grant is paying for transition role to offer backbone support for GC (materials, minutes, using website to host materials, listserv, tracking meeting attendance and GC membership, managing action lists, making sure the pieces that need to come through are coming through). More recently, Mike & Danielle have taken on more Project Management role.
- Project management role will continue as a need, though will moved from transition to growth projects. HUD TA may continue but may not remain in the Project Management role.

Question: what should we ask MCAH to do vs what should we ask NCCEH to do?

- Grants – MCAH has been clear they did not want to manage grants
- Discussion points, no consensus
 - Need to define Backbone support: Administrative, Project Management,
 - Oversight - CoC is primarily responsible
 - Recommendation: all NC HMIS info and documents on nchmis.org
 - Recommendation: GC and MCAH talk about next steps
- Administrative support:
 - What: work with work groups and GC members to craft agenda, create agenda, distribute agenda and meeting materials, maintain GC contact list, maintain end user contact list, draft meeting minutes, host meeting materials on website
- Project management and oversight
 - What: coordinate among work groups, oversight of MCAH deliverables, develop timelines of project milestones, creating contracts as needed
- Motion – NCCEH continue with meeting minutes, attendance, hosting materials on NCCEH website and making materials available until completion of the by-laws [Kosciak, B Alexander – tabled and not voted upon]
- Mike: recommend a small group define what is needed and then make a recommendation about who can do this best for the group. Suggest look back to the bylaws and framework documents to define the work that needs to be done.
- Recommendation: ICF continues definitely until end of July 2015, continuing through September 2015 is doable with current parameters, possible to continue through early 2016 with a new contract; Can identify another group/body to take over at some future point and handover in a collaborative fashion
- Need to determine who will manage MCAH and provide oversight for deliverables then talk with MCAH

Mike: what does it mean for NCCEH to support some CoCs with LSA – what does it mean for those CoCs and what does it mean for other CoCs?

- NCCEH will be at the GC table because accountable to four CoCs, 81 counties. Will continue to support all CoC with knowledge base; working to ensure what we are all hearing matches up; ensuring we are getting what we need from MCAH; filling the gaps.
 - Existing gaps
 - Translation between what MCAH has to offer and how will work in NC, not all CoCs are starting at same level
 - Differences between what CoCs are getting, need to have some consistency and some ability for CoCs to customize
 - How HMIS fits into CoC collaborative application so scores go up
 - How to navigate MCAH website
 - MCAH communication gaps between Barb, Eric, Gerry and Sue
- Need to clarify if GC wants an implementation like what is in MI (each CoC is responded to individually and differently – ex. Sys Admin training opportunities) or do we want something different, more standardized?
- Recommendation: system admin workgroup with NC-specific info where people can talk to one another, forum or blog, NCCEH to host
- Recommend “dialogue group”
 - Leverage collective CoC knowledge

- How can GC members work together/coordinate to make MCAH's workflow more efficient to decrease asks/bandwidth needed on their end?
- NCCCEH will lead and work with Sue to facilitate these meetings
- Use project management calls to continue this work, morph into implementation workgroup

Clarity about how BoS grant is used going forward:

- BoS funds used for non-BoS costs in NC HMIS
 - NCCCEH, the BoS Collaborative applicant and the BoS representatives on the Governance Committee make decisions about how the BoS HMIS grant is used
 - Has been used as contingency rather than subsidy
 - CoCs not able to pay into system, cash flow issues, transition costs
 - Other places to find these kinds of funds? BoS may or may not be willing to play this role solely or at all; Historically BoS has had a high percentage of CoC funds invested in HMIS
 - What is the philosophy behind who pays for NC HMIS funding gaps?
 - Currently – CoCs make local decisions on how to use CoC and ESG funds to operate homeless service programs, HMIS, etc.
 - Can State ESG funds can be used?
 - Can use GC to determine how/who pays CoCs' fair share
 - Are we a joint/collective table worrying about statewide needs?
 - What are the types of things that one CoC can do to benefit others?
 - Other states using BoS funds – works differently in different places, no model that translates easily to NC
 - Other federal partners can contribute

Old model – BoS paid a large portion of the bill and then agencies paid a fee.

New model – dividing cost by CoCs.

Next question – is every CoC on their own, leading each CoC to work on their own capacity building with any extra funds or are we in this together so that we develop capacity across the board and we determine what is most needed across the state and then work together to find the resources for those things.

Karen Deblasio, HUD HQ:

- Check in from HUD HQ on how implementation is going
 - HUD HQ is getting frequent updates from Mike and does not have concerns
 - NC is making good progress
 - This is the time to make sure everyone is satisfied with what NC HMIS structure will look like
 - Create new policies and procedures
 - Maintain transparency
 - A lot of work, many moving parts, setting precedents
 - Doing all of this in advance of having final HMIS rule
- Fine for HUD for separate organization to serve as grant recipient for CoC
 - Ie. NCCCEH holding grants for BoS, Wake, Durham, Orange
- Things to think about
 - Role of GC, Role of MCAH
 - What will happen if CoC, program sets up programs, etc. incorrectly
 - Affects statewide implementation, statewide data quality
 - Sustainability of funding

- What if one CoC goes away?
 - CoCs remain responsible for HMIS
- HUD can offer continued TA from ICF beyond original July 2015 deadline
- FY2015 CoC grant application considerations
 - CoCs can reallocate to HMIS in next CoC grant application
 - HMIS Lead is MCAH
 - OK for HUD for CoCs to pick a different organization (other than MCAH/HMIS Lead) to serve as HMIS grant recipient
- HUD monitors grant recipients and holds grant recipients responsible for how HMIS HUD grant funds are expended
 - HUD working out monitoring now to factor in the fact that CoCs are ultimately accountable for HMIS
 - Partially through questions on CoC application
 - Want CoCs to be actively engaged with data
- May have made sense years ago for BoS grants to pay for HMIS – shifting now
 - CoCs now seeing value, finding funding streams
 - BoS CoCs wanting to step down subsidizing HMIS implementations
 - No regulatory guidance/prohibitions, HUD does not expect BoS subsidies for HMIS
 - Recommendation: make sure funding decisions are sustainable and transparent

Privacy Documents Final:

- Barb created document that lists each document still in process and the steps required to move them through approval status
 - Privacy script
 - Intended to come with ROI, customizable for each agency, created as a handout that agencies will print and hand to consumer
 - Motion to approve script with edits from Beth Bordeaux and Andrea Kurtz [Motion: Dillashaw, Second: B Alexander, Passed]
 - Participation agreement
 - Liability language concerns
 - Possible to replace Section VII (1) Hold Harmless Clause
 - Heather and Andrea will explore NC hold harmless clauses and choose a different one to use (more reciprocal)
 - Publishing consent re: reporting
 - Section V – leave sections (1) and (2) and remove section (3)
 - Definition of publishing needs to be clarified = Making data relative to system available to public
 - GC will approve final version via email; Beth, Barb and Andrea will make edits and re-circulate for a final vote by GC by email; Tim will W-S attorney comments to Beth and Andrea for incorporation
 - Privacy Notice NC HMIS
 - Do need GC approval for this
 - All other docs complete and posted on website
 - Administrative QSOBAA/Data Use Agreement
 - Sharing Agreement/QSOBAA
 - Users Agreement

- ROI & Sharing Plan
 - HUD Privacy Notice
 - Interim MOU NC HMIS
- Privacy training is available and in use
- How are communities migrating without documents? When is consent process changing? Unclear what needs to be done when. How to implement client-level changes when do not have documents? Signatures after implementation
 - MCAH talks about what's most important
 - Privacy notice
 - Privacy script
 - Participation agreement
 - Administrative QSOBAA
- Normal procedure for MCAH – have privacy training, sign users agreement, get other administrative documents in place afterwards; OK to start working with agencies, can implement over time
 - MCAH will write up workflow and write up expectations of how migration will go
 - All things to get signed and in what order
 - Client, agency staff, CoC-level
 - MCAH has implementation checklist ready now
 - What is the liability?
 - New system has increased client protections

Committee Reports and MCAH Update:

- Financial Work Group
 - Contract for transition services, due to MCAH by May 22
 - MCAH has received 2 signed contracts
 - Charlotte sent with feedback
 - Northwest waiting on a notary
 - MCAH Board needs contracts signed and billing to start ASAP
 - Also looking for billing documents from MCAH
 - Will be ready for the next meeting
 - Review documents timeline adopted at the last meeting
 - Licenses
 - It appears that volunteer licenses work the same as other licenses, no difference in functionality
 - CHIN bought licenses as they were needed
 - CoCs allocated a certain number, but NC implementation did not actually own that total number
 - Own 887 licenses that were in use in ServicePoint
 - Number allocated – own this license but no monthly charges
 - Used – assigned and paying hosting fees
 - Inactive – not reassigned, have violated something where cannot use this, still accruing charges
 - MCAH will assign to in ServicePoint to each CoC

- MCAH will contact GC members and System Admins to talk about timeline for this
 - MCAH will be in contact with users
 - Delete and recreate user accounts
 - MCAH will talk with CoC leads about what to do about agencies that cross CoC lines
 - MCAH will start May 18, finish in five weeks
 - MCAH will create report of all folks who have not logged in in 2 months to let CoCs know what licenses could be available
 - Different from 929 licenses on CHIN Spreadsheet + 99 volunteer license
 - When CoCs purchased “extra” licenses these are not currently allocated in ServicePoint, only in Excel CHIN spreadsheet
 - New contract with Bowman will have 902 licenses
 - Can increase number of licenses if increase amount we pay Bowman/MCAH
 - License costs going forward
 - \$295 for first year
 - \$120 every year thereafter
 - CoCs want more licenses
 - MCAH-Bowman contracts normally run July-June (this year 14 months, May 2015 – June 2016)
 - If a CoC purchases additional licenses, this affects annual bill for statewide implementation
 - Would be good to have a percentage of licenses available
 - Next steps
 - Fully understand landscape of current licenses by CoC
 - GC to decide how licenses are divided and how new licenses handled
 - Process for purchasing additional licenses
 - OK for CoCs to buy more licenses?
 - Yes
 - Pay through June 2016
 - Some agencies are sharing user names and passwords in Charlotte, need 40 additional licenses right away
 - CoCs pay same percentage of monthly bill based on HIC, total amount could increase
 - Barb confident that will be easy to pay for this in the long-term, just need to figure out short-term funding
- MCAH Update
 - SOW for Mass Merging of Clients: CHIN used to do a mass merging of client records annually
 - MCAH does not do this nor think it’s a good idea
 - Client record numbers can be deleted
 - Can adversely affect data quality
 - How do agencies resolve problems of duplicate records that have been created?
 - Call these in as individual requests to MCAH helpdesk

- Determine which record is correct one
 - How prevent duplicate records from being created?
 - End users should search and compare SSN and year of birth PRIOR TO entering new record
 - Motion to not complete mass merge of records, withdraw SOW [Motion: Schnars, Second: Bailey – passed]
 - Barb will check on whether this has been paid for already
- Migration rollout process
 - Key component – onsite training in computer lab or in a space with WiFi
 - MCAH then follows up with System Admins who work with Agency Admins
 - System admin continues to work with agencies to complete migration process which takes additional weeks
 - Each system admin needs to track percentage of agencies who have fully migrated
 - MCAH has custom report that tracks migration by agency
 - System Admins need to run these reports and audit this information
 - All Agency Admins need to complete Provider Page training before migration
 - System Admin meetings
 - Minutes for System Admin meetings sent by MCAH
 - System Admins need to send info to Agency Admins in their CoCs
 - MCAH could move to every 2 weeks meeting instead of monthly
 - NCCEH will work with Sue to convene dialogue group, an in person meeting and ongoing information sharing
- Workflows
 - Begin conversations with System Admins, funders and MCAH about what is needed locally
 - Assessments will tie to particular funding sources
 - Moved all questions for one funding source into one screen
 - Rolling this out as folks are migrated
- Communications Work Group
 - Working on logo – thanks to Tim for Winston-Salem helping on this
 - Will bring versions to GC for final vote
 - Working on communications protocols – draft for discussion/approval at next meeting

Next meeting: Phone meeting, Tues. May 26, 1:30 – 3:30 pm