

Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 7th 3:00pm-5:00pm

In attendance: Laura Kadwell, Cathy ten Broeke, Kathy Vitalis, Jim Anderson, Ben Van Hunnik, Mike Manhard, Mary Orr

On Phone: Carla Solem, Rebecca Bowers

1. Decision Making/Communications
 - a. Review survey results
 - b. Make determinations on how to proceed

Discussion	Actions Identified
<p>Overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for the proposed communication and decision making suggestions we made. • Who participated? About 80% of Visioning Session participants. 	
<p>Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Themes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Transparency ○ Buy-in ○ Input ○ More surveys ○ Include Providers/end users ○ Interactive ○ Check-ins valuable ○ Known point of contact ○ Utilizing existing meetings. Use that to get word out. • Newsletter—more high points, timeline. • End of meetings, summarize main points to share—written updates. Send broadly, end users and coordinators, etc. • Who is doing what, when, overview 	<p>IPT decisions on communication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will go forward with written summary as information is available (monthly, PRN). • IPT members can check in with their constituencies to see if check ins would be needed. • Share written summaries at existing meetings, invite feedback.
<p>Decision Making</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Themes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lack of trust (of the IPT, of the GG, etc.) ○ Don't get cumbersome ○ Involve all stakeholders ○ Don't let consensus lead to stagnation ○ Set a timeline • Sufficient support to move ahead. • Overwhelming sense is to get this done. Get timeline, make it happen. • Communication and inclusion is more important than who votes. Folks want to be informed and represented. • End user representation—suggestion to create end user group. • Do we need to add another Greater MN member? • Re-visioning session, named CoCs as responsible entities. Didn't take into account that other funders share the HMIS, leading to confusion among many participants. • We determined to change all significant voting to CoCs/State as we are trying to balance the feedback we heard (concerns about GG, concerns 	<p>IPT decisions regarding decision making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPT will add another Greater MN member (AG Lynch—Central CoC). • All major decisions related to HMIS 2.0 that take place prior to the formation of a new Governing Board (including GALA final recommendations) will be decided by those who fund system (CoCs and State funders). Support from both entities would be needed to pass. Prior to any major vote, communications and solicitation for comment will be made to stakeholders

<p>about IPT, concerns about CoCs/State). None are perfect. Thoughts behind this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Why not GG? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The GG has had extreme difficulty in making decisions. ▪ The GG is the subject of some of the HMIS reform efforts. ▪ The GG advises the administrative entity (Wilder), which may be the subject of some of the recommendations. ○ Why not IPT? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While IPT seeks to be representative of stakeholders, group formed by TA team, without broad input. ▪ It is clear from responses that if IPT plays primary role in decision making, some will feel disenfranchised. ○ Why State/CoCs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ultimately, these are the entities (legally) responsible for HMIS. ▪ All stakeholders (including end users) can be represented through these entities. ▪ Need agreement to pass, meaning any divisive issues (if there are any) will need to be worked out by these entities. 	<p>across the state. All votes will be up/down. Fine tuning will happen in communication/feedback process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mike/Ben will help to convene an end user group to share progress and gather input.
---	--

2. Data Structure & Sharing (DSS) Workgroup Update

Discussion	Actions Identified
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In first meeting, tried to define the “requirements” for HMIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What do we want/require out of the data system? ○ What do we hope to accomplish? ○ What are the final outcomes/improvements we are seeking with HMIS transformation? ● Followed up first meeting with survey to PRIORITIZE HMIS requirements ● Goal of second meeting was to identify “approaches” needed to create the HMIS requirements. This meeting got a bit derailed as we determined all other steps need to wait until determinations have been made regarding Data re-structure. ● Spent considerable amount of time hearing from Bowman and Barb Ritter. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High level, folks didn’t follow very well. ● Plan in place to get formal recommendations from Bowman/Barb by next meeting (4/16). ● Important to have Tony Polecsa at next meeting. Someone who knows what question 	

3. Governance and Lead Agency (GALA) Workgroup Update

Discussion	Actions Identified
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Handout provided (chart) ● Making a ton of progress. Group in agreement on most items. Formal recommendations regarding creation of Governing Board could be forthcoming sooner than thought. ● Governing Board composition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have determined that the GB should consist of 11 members ○ Developing a list of skills of Governing Board (still working on this) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Board term limits, etc. ○ Not looking to have full bylaws in place (GB role), but some guiding principles ○ Who chooses the GB members? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not talked about yet ● GALA group membership needing review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5 community ○ 3 state ○ 4 CoCs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hennepin ▪ Ramsey ▪ St Louis ▪ SW CoC ● Lead agency question starting to be addressed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Its existence has been determined to be a given. 	<p>IPT expressed consensus support for the GALA roster.</p>
--	---

4. Review Actions Identified

Discussion	Actions Identified
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Items to share <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meeting minutes ○ Communication/Decisions making process. ○ Workgroup membership. IPT solidified membership. Schedule/members/lead. ○ Re-structure proposal. Prioritize. ○ Governing Board—membership, existence of Lead Agency 	<p>Mike will do</p> <p>Laura will do</p>

5. Adjourn