

## HMIS lead agency evaluation 2019

The Policy & Prioritization Workgroup of the Minnesota statewide HMIS Governing Board is charged with overseeing an annual evaluation of performance by the HMIS lead agency / state system administrator, Institute for Community Alliances (ICA). The evaluation is comprised of three parts:

**Performance matrix (appendix 1):** This measures ICA completion of 12 key function areas from the annual work-plan. Ten were deemed fully completed and the remaining two were partially completed. This is on par with ten complete and two partially complete in 2018. The two partially completed areas were:

- Governance is aware of the status of deliverables listed in the HMIS Work Plan.
- Requests for one-time reports and custom report templates are satisfied.

**User satisfaction survey (appendix 2):** The survey's 165 respondents gave ICA an average score of 3.93 out of a possible 5 against the 20 performance rating questions.<sup>1</sup> Questions about ICA personnel received a slightly higher rating than other areas (average of 4.27). These ratings compare favorably to the 2018 ratings of 3.78 and 3.96 respectively (from 185 responses).<sup>2</sup>

**Data quality measure (appendix 3):** The average CoC data quality measure for June 2018 to May 2019 is 97.77% based on Entry/Exits for Continuum Projects active during the period the report was run, on par with 97.79% in 2018. All 10 CoCs were classified as receiving an A grade, on par with 2018.

**Conclusion:** On the basis of the above measures and also the full data across the three appendices, the Policy & Prioritization Workgroup concludes that ICA's performance meets the required standard for HMIS lead agency / state system administrator and recommends that they should therefore continue in this capacity.

---

<sup>1</sup> The total number of questions about ICA's performance in 2018 was 23, not 26 (as was listed in last year's report). Three questions – "ICA has encouraged my agency to use the HMIS/SP system"; "[System] Response time is always adequate for my/my org needs"; and "The decision to hire ICA has led to noticeable improvements" – were removed by the P&P Committee in 2019 because they were deemed not relevant to ICA's performance or because the group got feedback that they did not make sense to respondents.

<sup>2</sup> The 2018 HMIS Lead Agency Evaluation also incorrectly listed the 2018 average rating for ICA as 3.76 and the 2017 average staff rating as 3.78. Those numbers should have been reversed.

## Appendix 1 – HMIS Lead Agency Output Evaluation Matrix

- This matrix is intended to:
  - Evaluate performance above and beyond threshold/compliance requirements, which are not enumerated here
  - Evaluate performance according to a manageable list of the top priorities of HMIS Governance & stakeholders
  - Supplement the HMIS Work Plan by highlighting key performance measures therein for ease of evaluation
- The performance of the HMIS Lead should be evaluated according to what can be controlled by the HMIS Lead

Category	Priority	Measures for Success	Workplan tasks	Criteria (Yes/No/Partial)	ICA Assessment	ICA Narrative
<b>Management &amp; Compliance</b>	Governance is aware of the status of deliverables listed in the HMIS Work Plan.	Does the HMIS Lead provide a monthly report of issues, delays, challenges, solutions, recommendations, etc., related to the HMIS Work Plan?	16-17, 19	Y/N/P	P	This task has morphed over time as the work plan, system-level priorities, and project management process have evolved. ICA brings projects to P&P for ranking as needed but has stopped providing monthly reports to P&P as the reports were not being consistently reviewed or discussed. ICA asked for P&P's feedback on this and we agreed to shift these reports to quarterly.
	Governance is able to exercise oversight of HMIS Budget using accurate, up-to-date information	Does the HMIS Lead provide a monthly report of financial and resource expenditures, in the format agreed upon with Governance?	22	Y/N/P	Y	ICA has provided budget on a monthly basis and has worked extensively with the Chairs of the Governing Board and Finance Committee to refine the document template. The Finance Committee recently agreed to move to quarterly reports.
	Bed coverage is improved.	Does the HMIS Lead collaborate with CoCs and State Partners to encourage homeless services agencies/programs not currently entering data into HMIS to utilize the system?	24	Y/N/P	Y	Bed coverage improved by 3 percentage points between the 2018 and 2019 Housing Inventory Charts. Bed coverage has improved by about 11.4 percentage points since the 2017 HIC.
	Reports are submitted/provided in a timely fashion	Has the HMIS Lead fixed or re-created inaccurate reports	25-26	Y/N/P	Y	ICA has done significant work to improve the reliability and validity of reports, developing and implementing

	and accurately reflect data that is entered.	and subjected reports to thorough quality assurance measures, cross-checking with vendor-created reports as appropriate?				a thorough quality assurance process that includes internal testing and incorporates user feedback. A notable example of this process is the time ICA invested in gathering CoC input in the NOFA Scoring Tool Report and then testing the report.
	State funder reports, including the unduplicated state program reports, provide valid data on trends and outcomes that can inform funding decisions.	Has the HMIS Lead worked with State funders to re-envision report templates and then created those reports in HMIS?	23	Y/N/P	Y	The Core report, developed in conjunction with State partners, continues to be a key component of state reports. ICA has made updates to reports for HTA, HYA, LTH, and others, but more work is to be done to fully replace the suite of reports created by Wilder.
	Requests for one-time reports and custom report templates are satisfied.	Does the HMIS Lead respond to requests within 2 business days and fulfill requests as prioritized in conjunction with Governance?	23	Y/N/P	P	ICA fields and responds to custom report requests and one-time requests for data continuously on our Helpdesk. The report request form has been improved to ensure that reports meet stakeholder needs and requests are responded to within two weeks. Some notable one-time data requests that we have fulfilled include data for an LTH evaluation and data for LTHSSF for grantee monitoring purposes. Some notable custom reporting that we have done includes the Coordinated Entry Monitoring Report and the NOFA Scoring Tool Report.
<b>Communications &amp; Stakeholder Engagement</b>	HMIS end users and stakeholders are informed about changes that will affect the HMIS.	Does the HMIS Lead publish at least monthly communications via newsletter and hmismn.org, which include updates on initiatives and changes to funder requirements, policy,	4-7	Y/N/P	Y	ICA sends a newsletter every two weeks to 1,300+ users and stakeholders with the sort of information mentioned. ICA also highlights key updates via hmismn.org and the news feature within HMIS with news articles.

		and software that will impact the HMIS?				
	Stakeholder feedback is actively solicited and incorporated into the daily operations of the HMIS.	Does the HMIS Lead conduct quarterly stakeholder feedback meetings and/or surveys in collaboration with HMIS Governance and the CoCs to assure valuable stakeholder feedback is integrated into HMIS?	2, 4-5, 7	Y/N/P	Y	ICA gathers user feedback on a monthly basis through the Implementation Committee and HMIS user groups in several CoCs. Surveys are conducted as requested by P&P.
<b>Systems Modifications</b>	System functions that will improve efficiencies, workflow, data quality, performance, or outcomes are identified and implemented.	Has the HMIS Lead supported the implementation of CallPoint, Eligibility, FundManager, and XML Export functionality, according to the prioritization and timeline agreed upon with Governance?	40-41	Y/N/P	Y	ICA has been trained on and purchased all of modules/functionality mentioned. However, there is not a known interest on behalf of any CoC or State program in using CallPoint, Eligibility, or FundManager at this time. ICA would like to discuss whether this should remain a priority and whether we should be continuing to pay WellSky for this functionality.
	Coordinated entry is implemented within HMIS.	Has the HMIS Lead implemented and provided training on Coordinated Entry in HMIS – including the creation of customized assessments, reports, and priority lists for each CoC – according to the prioritization and timeline agreed upon with Governance?	38-39	Y/N/P	Y	All ten CoCs are using HMIS for Coordinated Entry. Assessments are customized by region and ICA has done extensive work to create and tweak priority list reports for individual CoCs. ICA is also heavily involved in Coordinated Entry meetings locally and statewide, including the statewide CES Workgroup and statewide CES Priority List Manager meetings. The CES Monitoring Report and accompanying dashboard allows communities to view key outcomes by different subgroups throughout the CES process.

<b>Data Quality &amp; Integrity</b>	Data quality is improved.	Does the HMIS Lead produce quarterly data quality reports and education on data quality, as well as recommendations for improvement?	8-9, 12	Y/N/P	Y	ICA has recently (e.g., with System Performance Measures) sought to improve our data quality efforts by doing more direct outreach to agencies with the particular clients to address and how to do so. Quarterly data quality reports are currently on hold as ICA is undertaking a major overhaul of that process with feedback from CoCs, State homeless programs, and users.
<b>Training</b>	HMIS users are properly utilizing capabilities of HMIS beyond mandated reporting and data entry	Has the HMIS Lead implemented and provided new user, refresher and customized trainings according to the prioritization and timeline agreed upon with Governance?	43-45	Y/N/P	Y	ICA has made some relatively minor updates to the New User Training process. ICA has also ramped up in-person and webinar-based trainings for pilot projects and new initiatives. User Groups, which provide a good opportunity for in-person or virtual training and technical assistance, are being adopted in nearly all CoCs as of late 2019.

## Appendix 2 – HMIS User Survey Results

### Number of responses: 165

\*\*Percentages may not add up to 100% in some categories due to rounding

### Survey Respondent Information

1. What categories best describe your agency? (check all that apply)
2. What is your position at this agency?
3. How does HMIS relate to your position? (select all that apply)
4. Are you the only staff member at your agency that enters HMIS data?

**Yes:** 14%      **No:** 76%      **N/A – I do not enter HMIS data:** 10%

5. Which CoC(s) do you serve?

<b>Duluth/St. Louis County</b>	14
<b>Minneapolis/Hennepin County</b>	37
<b>Moorhead/West Central Minnesota</b>	9
<b>Northeast</b>	10
<b>Northwest</b>	9
<b>Rochester/Southeast Minnesota</b>	12
<b>St. Paul/Ramsey County</b>	22
<b>Suburban Metro</b>	8
<b>Southwest</b>	13
<b>St. Cloud/Central</b>	12
<b>Multiple CoCs</b>	19

6. Email address (optional) - Please let us know how to contact you by email if you are willing to have us follow up on your responses.      **81 provided an email address (49%)**

## General Statement of Service Provided by the Lead Agency, ICA

7. ICA has helped my agency by supporting and training on the utilization of enhanced/custom system functions.

**Average: 3.7**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
13%	3%	10%	23%	30%	21%

8. ICA has helped my agency improve the quality of our service.

**Average: 3.6**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
6%	4%	7%	28%	33%	21%

9. ICA has helped my agency gain efficiencies.

**Average: 3.6**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
9%	5%	8%	27%	30%	21%

10. ICA has helped my agency reduce duplication of data entry.

**Average: 3.5**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
12%	7%	13%	22%	26%	21%

11. HMIS benefits the work we do.

**Average: 3.9**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
2%	3%	9%	18%	30%	38%

12. Current HMIS reports are useful for tracking outcomes and trends for my clients.

**Average: 3.7**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
9%	1%	13%	22%	32%	22%

13. General comments on service provided by ICA (optional). **See comments**

14. I trust in ICA's ability to bring about continued improvements related to HMIS.

**Average: 4.1**

N/A	1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
3%	1%	4%	16%	36%	40%

15. Comments (optional). **See comments**

## HMIS User Experience

16. Do you have an HMIS username/login?

**Yes:** 155 (94%)

**No:** 10 (6%)

17. How long have you been an HMIS user?

Less than 1 year	1-3 years	3-5 years	5+ years
13%	33%	19%	35%

18. How often do you log into the HMIS system?

Daily/multiple times per week	Once per week/multiple times per month	Monthly or less often
59%	27%	14%

19. Do you have System Administration (LSA, SA, Admin) privileges in HMIS?

**Yes:** 15%

**No:** 85%

20. Where do you struggle the most with HMIS? **See comments**

21. What has helped you better understand HMIS? **See comments**

22. What HMIS practices would you recommend for other users? **See comments**

23. How do you use HMIS data within your agency outside of funder requirements? **See comments**

24. Would you be interested in attending an End User Group for ongoing HMIS support?

**Yes:** 27%

**No:** 31%

**Maybe:** 42%

25. Keeping data up-to-date in the system is important.

**Average: 4.7**

1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
< 1%	1%	3%	14%	82%

26. When I have a question about the HMIS system, I know where to go to find an answer.

**Average: 4.2**

1 (Strongly Disagree)	2	3	4	5 (Strongly Agree)
1%	3%	11%	26%	60%

## Training

### Recent Training Experience with ICA

27. Have you participated in any training provided by ICA?

**Yes:** 132 (80%)      **No:** 33 (20%)

### In-person Training

28. Have you attended an in-person training session?

**Yes:** 69 (52%)      **No:** 63 (48%)

29. What training did you attend? **See comments**

30. In general, how would you rate the training content?

**Average: 4.2**

1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
0%	6%	12%	43%	39%

31. In general, how would you rate the length of the training?

**Average: 3.5**

1 (Too short)	2	3	4	5 (Too long)
1%	10%	41%	32%	16%

32. Please add anything you would like to say about the training. **See comments**

### Recorded Training

33. Have you watched a recorded training session?

**Yes:** 107 (81%)      **No:** 25 (19%)

34. What training did you attend? **See comments**

35. In general, how would you rate the training content?

**Average: 3.6**

1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
1%	6%	22%	44%	27%

36. In general, how would you rate the length of the training?

**Average: 3.6**

1 (Too short)	2	3	4	5 (Too long)
1%	4%	44%	34%	18%

37. How often do you reference recorded HMIS trainings?

**Average: 2.5**

1 (Never)	2	3	4	5 (Often)
11%	18%	38%	21%	11%

38. Please add anything you would like to say about the training. **See comments**

### General ICA Training Feedback

39. Please rate how applicable current training is to your/your agency's regular, day-to-day use of HMIS.

**Average: 3.6**

1 (Not at all)	2	3	4	5 (Indispensable)
3%	9%	29%	40%	19%

40. Do ICA's current HMIS training offerings meet your/your agency's needs?

**Average: 3.5**

1 (Not at all)	2	3	4	5 (To a great extent, yes)
2%	13%	33%	39%	14%

41. How can ICA improve training options to better meet your/your agency needs? **See comments**

42. General comments on training. **See comments**

### Internal Agency Training

43. Have you participated in any internal HMIS training at your agency?

**Yes: 61 (37%)**

**No: 104 (63%)**

44. What did the internal HMIS training consist of and how useful was it in your onboarding to HMIS? **See comments**

## User Aids

45. Do you use any “user aids” such as review sheets or “cheat sheets” to help you use HMIS? And/or do you use the online instructions available on the MNHMIS website?

**Yes:** 117 (71%)

**No:** 48 (29%)

46. Please tell us what you use and how helpful you find any user aids. **See comments**

47. Please rate the usefulness of the General HMIS Instructions.

**Average: 4.1**

I don't use them/N/A	1 (Useless)	2	3	4	5 (Really useful)
3%	1%	4%	16%	34%	42%

48. How often do you reference the General HMIS instructions?

**Average: 3.2**

1 (Never)	2	3	4	5 (Often)
8%	16%	37%	27%	13%

## Reporting

### ART Tool Evaluation

49. Do you use ART, the HMIS reporting tool, yourself or do you use reports generated through ART?

**Yes:** 115 (70%)

**No:** 50 (30%)

50. How many ART reports have you run/reviewed in the last 6 months?

None	1-3	4-6	7 or more
7%	27%	20%	47%

51. Please comment on the usefulness and effectiveness of the ART tools. **See comments.**

### “Non-ART” Reporting

52. Have you run or reviewed any “non-ART” reports in the last 6 months?

**Yes:** 72 (44%)

**No:** 93 (56%)

53. How many “non-ART” reports have you run/reviewed in the last 6 months?

1-3	4-6	6 or more
46%	21%	33%

54. What tools/approaches do you use to produce these reports? **See comments**

### General Reporting Evaluation

55. Please add any comments on current reporting capability in HMIS. **See comments**

## ICA News Alert/Newsletter

56. Have you seen the ICA News Alert/Newsletter online or in your email?

**Yes:** 146 (88%)

**No:** 19 (12%)

57. In general, how would you rate the ICA News Alert/Newsletter in terms of its length?

**Average: 3.3**

1 (Too Short)	2	3	4	5 (Too long)
0%	2%	75%	19%	4%

58. In general, how would you rate the ICA News Alert/Newsletter in terms of its content?

**Average: 3.8**

1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
0%	6%	37%	32%	25%

59. In general, how would you rate the ICA News Alert/Newsletter for ease of finding the information you need?

**Average: 3.7**

1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
2%	6%	33%	36%	23%

60. In general, how would you rate the ICA News Alert/Newsletter in terms of its relevance to your work?

**Average: 3.6**

1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
1%	10%	33%	34%	22%

61. Please add any comments you might have about the ICA News Alert/Newsletter. **See comments**

62. How would you prefer to receive information from ICA about HMIS? **See comments**

63. How do you currently get HMIS information/news? Please select all that apply.

ICA News Alert/Newsletter	133
MN HMIS website	76
MN HMIS Knowledge Base	10
Other HMIS users/staff at my agency	44
ICA Regional System Administrator/other ICA staff	48
Communications from my funder/program	29
Communications from my CoC	61
Other*	3

\* Sources noted under "Other" were Hennepin User Group, working with another agency, and webinars

## ICA Staff and Helpdesk

Please rate ICA staff you have encountered in terms of:

64. Technical knowledge of HMIS

**Average: 4.3**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
6%	1%	1%	12%	31%	49%

65. Helpfulness in answering questions regarding HMIS

**Average: 4.3**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
5%	0%	4%	13%	30%	48%

66. Knowledge of how agencies providing homeless services operate and how HMIS fits into their work

**Average: 4.2**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
10%	1%	4%	13%	36%	37%

67. Visibility in CoC/community

**Average: 4.0**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
12%	1%	4%	21%	27%	35%

68. Interpersonal skills

**Average: 4.4**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
7%	0%	1%	10%	35%	47%

69. Knowledge of reports/reporting options

**Average: 4.3**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
13%	1%	3%	12%	27%	44%

70. Accessibility by email

**Average: 4.4**

Don't know/N/A	1 (Poor)	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)
7%	1%	2%	8%	27%	56%

71. Please add any comments, especially as they might relate to your desire to have accessibility by phone. **See comments**

72. Would your agency be willing to pay more for phone service? **(153 replied)**

**Yes: 6 (4%)    No: 77 (50%)    Maybe: 70 (46%)**

73. What are some ICA staff strengths you have noticed? **See comments**

74. General comments about ICA staff. **See comments**

75. Please add any comments/explanations that would help us improve service. **See comments**

## Prioritization of HMIS Tasks and Projects/HMIS Annual Priorities

76. Do you want to provide input on the prioritization of HMIS tasks and projects/what the HMIS Annual Priorities should be? **43 chose to provide input**

77. If I had to choose three activities that ICA could do that would help me most, I'd say:

<b>Add new online training content</b>	9 (21%)
<b>Continue working on the implementation of coordinated entry in HMIS</b>	22 (51%)
<b>Create more FAQ documents</b>	10 (23%)
<b>Create more HMIS Reference Guides</b>	3 (7%)
<b>Create more transparency around project/report requests and prioritization</b>	5 (12%)
<b>Create new recorded HMIS training material</b>	6 (14%)
<b>Deliver more in-person training</b>	24 (56%)
<b>Expand local data access and training to Local System Administrators</b>	7 (16%)
<b>Improve Helpdesk response time</b>	1 (2%)
<b>Improve the general HMIS instruction material</b>	1 (2%)
<b>Offer new and expanded reports</b>	14 (33%)
<b>Overhaul the quarterly data quality process</b>	2 (5%)
<b>Re-do existing online training content</b>	7 (16%)
<b>Take more Helpdesk calls</b>	8 (19%)
<b>Other</b>	None

78. Please provide any other feedback you believe would be pertinent to the prioritization of HMIS tasks or projects.  
**See comments**

**Appendix 3 – HUD UDE data completeness 6/1/18 – 6/1/19**

Grade based on count for each element. This report only pulls Entry Exits for Continuum Projects active during the period the report was run.

CoC	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
MN-500 Hennepin	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>C</b>
	97.87%	97.62%	89.36%
MN-501 Ramsey	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>
	97.79%	98.53%	91.99%
MN-502 Southeast	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	98.43%	98.31%	97.07%
MN-503 SMAC	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>
	96.37%	95.95%	94.29%
MN-504 Northeast	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	96.66%	97.81%	98.96%
MN-505 Central	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	96.41%	98.08%	98.66%
MN-506 Northwest	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	98.67%	98.63%	97.97%
MN-508 West Central	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	98.01%	98.31%	98.91%
MN-509 St. Louis	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	95.22%	96.79%	97.96%
MN-511 Southwest	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>
	99.18%	99.18%	98.81%