

Summary

| Top Themes | | | |
|------------------------|--------|--------------|---------|
| | DSS | Stakeholders | Total |
| Data Reporting | 15 (5) | 33 (14) | 48 (19) |
| Data Sharing | 17 (8) | 21 (6) | 38 (14) |
| Data Quality | 14 (5) | 20 (5) | 34 (10) |
| Coordinated Assessment | 11 (2) | 23 (7) | 34 (9) |

| Top Requirements | | | | | |
|------------------|----------|--|--------|--------------|---------|
| Rank All | Rank DSS | Requirement | DSS | Stakeholders | Total |
| 1 | 2 | DATA REPORTING #1: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have immediate/quick/unlimited access to data | 17 (8) | 34 (16) | 51 (24) |
| 2 | 7 | DATA REPORTING #2: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have the unlimited ability to define and generate their own reports independent of (or with minimal) Wilder assistance. | 14 (5) | 29 (13) | 43 (18) |
| 5 | 1 | DATA SHARING #1: Standardizes and operationalizes state-wide rules to govern how participating HMIS organizations agree to share data | 20 (9) | 20 (5) | 40 (14) |
| -- | 3 | DATA SHARING #2: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 16 (7) | 17 (5) | 33 (12) |
| 8 | 5 | DATA SHARING #3: Protects client preferences and confidentiality | 13 (6) | 25 (7) | 38 (13) |
| 4 | 3 | DATA SHARING #4: Enables Agencies to access necessary and real-time data to intervene appropriately and prevent homelessness | 17 (7) | 24 (9) | 41 (16) |
| 7 | 7 | DATA QUALITY #5: Streamlines HMIS requirements of funders to create cleaner simpler data | 13 (5) | 26 (11) | 39 (16) |
| 3 | 5 | DATA QUALITY #9: Enhances usability for end users | 15 (6) | 27 (10) | 42 (16) |
| 10 | 7 | COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #3: Accommodates triage/assessment tools captures client/assessment information collected through CA | 14 (5) | 23 (9) | 37 (14) |
| 8 | 7 | COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #4: Ensures consistency among assessment data collected across state | 15 (5) | 23 (10) | 38 (15) |
| 12 | 7 | COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #6: Collects and reports consistent information needed to evaluation CA and system | 12 (5) | 24 (9) | 36 (14) |
| 10 | 7 | PROVIDES VALUE #2: Ensures that reforms are addressing concerns/needs of end users/agencies. | 12 (5) | 25 (10) | 37 (15) |
| 5 | - | PROVIDES VALUE #3: Does not add significant time/cost to providers. Capacity matches system use requirements | 12 (4) | 28 (11) | 40 (15) |

All Responses

| THEMES. | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| Data Reporting | 2 | 6% | 10 | 32% | 19 | 61% | 31 |
| Data Sharing | 6 | 19% | 10 | 32% | 14 | 45% | 30 |
| Data Quality | 6 | 19% | 14 | 45% | 10 | 32% | 30 |
| Data Integration | 20 | 65% | 8 | 26% | 2 | 6% | 30 |
| Coordinated Assessment | 5 | 16% | 16 | 52% | 9 | 29% | 30 |
| Create A Sense That HMIS Provides Value | 9 | 29% | 9 | 29% | 6 | 19% | 24 |

| REQUIREMENTS. 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? | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| DATA REPORTING #1: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have immediate/quick/unlimited access to data | 2 | 6% | 3 | 10% | 24 | 77% | 29 |
| DATA REPORTING #2: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have the unlimited ability to define and generate their own reports independent of (or with minimal) Wilder assistance. | 5 | 16% | 7 | 23% | 18 | 58% | 30 |
| DATA SHARING #1: Standardizes and operationalizes state-wide rules to govern how participating HMIS organizations agree to share data | 3 | 10% | 12 | 39% | 14 | 45% | 29 |
| DATA SHARING #2: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 7 | 23% | 9 | 29% | 12 | 39% | 28 |
| DATA SHARING #3: Protects client preferences and confidentiality | 5 | 16% | 12 | 39% | 13 | 42% | 30 |
| DATA SHARING #4: Enables Agencies to access necessary and real-time data to intervene appropriately and prevent homelessness | 4 | 13% | 9 | 29% | 16 | 52% | 29 |
| DATA QUALITY #1: Minimizes incidence of duplicate records and data inconsistencies | 11 | 35% | 11 | 35% | 9 | 29% | 31 |
| DATA QUALITY #2: Minimizes frequency of "anonymous" records entered into the database | 20 | 65% | 8 | 26% | 1 | 3% | 29 |
| DATA QUALITY #3: Establishes "real time" data entry in the field as the preferred protocol | 12 | 39% | 10 | 32% | 7 | 23% | 29 |
| DATA QUALITY #4: Minimizes the incidence of second and third-hand data entry | 18 | 58% | 8 | 26% | 4 | 13% | 30 |
| DATA QUALITY #5: Streamlines HMIS requirements of funders to create cleaner simpler data | 8 | 26% | 7 | 23% | 16 | 52% | 31 |
| DATA QUALITY #6: Ensures that movement of shared clients from one jurisdiction to another does not compromise integrity of jurisdictional reports | 7 | 23% | 16 | 52% | 7 | 23% | 30 |
| DATA QUALITY #7: Provides complete data (incomplete records)—Establishes targets | 9 | 29% | 13 | 42% | 7 | 23% | 29 |
| DATA QUALITY #8: Accommodates full participation (bed coverage)—Establishes targets | 7 | 23% | 13 | 42% | 9 | 29% | 29 |
| DATA QUALITY #9: Enhances usability for end users | 5 | 16% | 10 | 32% | 16 | 52% | 31 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #1: Enhances the ability to link HMIS client data with other state data systems (source of truth for all systems). | 14 | 45% | 10 | 32% | 5 | 16% | 29 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #2: Accommodates timely data uploads from service providers. | 9 | 29% | 14 | 45% | 7 | 23% | 30 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #3: Accommodates data bridge with North Dakota | 25 | 81% | 2 | 6% | 0 | 0% | 27 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #1: Provides real time information on the availability of beds and units | 8 | 26% | 10 | 32% | 11 | 35% | 29 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|----|
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #2: Establishes mechanisms for reserving units for triaged clients | 16 | 52% | 9 | 29% | 4 | 13% | 29 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #3: Accommodates triage/assessment tools captures client/assessment information collected through CA | 7 | 23% | 7 | 23% | 15 | 48% | 29 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #4: Ensures consistency among assessment data collected across state | 5 | 16% | 10 | 32% | 14 | 45% | 29 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #5: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 8 | 26% | 13 | 42% | 8 | 26% | 29 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #6: Collects and reports consistent information needed to evaluation CA and system | 7 | 23% | 8 | 26% | 14 | 45% | 29 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #1: Ensures all providers have common understanding of HMIS/Bowman capabilities. | 15 | 48% | 6 | 19% | 9 | 29% | 30 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #2: Ensures that reforms are addressing concerns/needs of end users/agencies. | 7 | 23% | 7 | 23% | 15 | 48% | 29 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #3: Does not add significant time/cost to providers. Capacity matches system use requirements | 6 | 19% | 10 | 32% | 15 | 48% | 31 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #4: Accommodates local requirements of HMIS | 10 | 32% | 11 | 35% | 7 | 23% | 28 |

DSS Workgroup Responses

| 2. THEMES. | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| Data Reporting | 1 | 9% | 5 | 45% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| Data Sharing | 2 | 18% | 1 | 9% | 8 | 73% | 11 |
| Data Quality | 2 | 18% | 4 | 36% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| Data Integration | 9 | 82% | 2 | 18% | 0 | 0% | 11 |
| Coordinated Assessment | 2 | 18% | 7 | 64% | 2 | 18% | 11 |
| Create A Sense That HMIS Provides Value | 6 | 55% | 3 | 27% | 2 | 18% | 11 |
| Comments | | | | | | | |
| If we get data sharing and data quality addressed first, I think the other issues (e.g. reporting) will be easier to address. | | | | | | | |
| Since I did not send the survey around to our CoC members before asking for their input, I aggregated answers from several members. Didn't want to go back and ask them to do it again online once we were given the green light to share the survey monkey email. | | | | | | | |
| Data sharing and data integration need to be very clearly defined. | | | | | | | |
| I selected "Data Quality" thinking about the "closed system data" that exists in the system that we want to open. If we don't have an open system containing good data, the other efforts won't work. | | | | | | | |

| 3. REQUIREMENTS. 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? | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| DATA REPORTING #1: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have immediate/quick/unlimited access to data | 1 | 9% | 1 | 9% | 8 | 73% | 10 |
| DATA REPORTING #2: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have the unlimited ability to define and generate their own reports independent of (or with minimal) Wilder assistance. | 2 | 18% | 4 | 36% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| DATA SHARING #1: Standardizes and operationalizes state-wide rules to govern how participating HMIS organizations agree to share data | 0 | 0% | 2 | 18% | 9 | 82% | 11 |
| DATA SHARING #2: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC's as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 2 | 18% | 2 | 18% | 7 | 64% | 11 |
| DATA SHARING #3: Protects client preferences and confidentiality | 3 | 27% | 1 | 9% | 6 | 55% | 10 |
| DATA SHARING #4: Enables Agencies to access necessary and real-time data to intervene appropriately and prevent homelessness | 1 | 9% | 3 | 27% | 7 | 64% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #1: Minimizes incidence of duplicate records and data inconsistencies | 3 | 27% | 3 | 27% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #2: Minimizes frequency of "anonymous" records entered into the database | 6 | 55% | 4 | 36% | 1 | 9% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #3: Establishes "real time" data entry in the field as the preferred protocol | 5 | 45% | 5 | 45% | 1 | 9% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #4: Minimizes the incidence of second and third-hand data entry | 7 | 64% | 4 | 36% | 0 | 0% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #5: Streamlines HMIS requirements of funders to create cleaner simpler data | 3 | 27% | 3 | 27% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #6: Ensures that movement of shared clients from one jurisdiction to another does not compromise integrity of jurisdictional reports | 3 | 27% | 6 | 55% | 2 | 18% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #7: Provides complete data (incomplete records)—Establishes targets | 4 | 36% | 5 | 45% | 2 | 18% | 11 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|----|
| DATA QUALITY #8: Accommodates full participation (bed coverage)—Establishes targets | 2 | 18% | 5 | 45% | 4 | 36% | 11 |
| DATA QUALITY #9: Enhances usability for end users | 2 | 18% | 3 | 27% | 6 | 55% | 11 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #1: Enhances the ability to link HMIS client data with other state data systems (source of truth for all systems). | 6 | 55% | 5 | 45% | 0 | 0% | 11 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #2: Accommodates timely data uploads from service providers. | 2 | 18% | 5 | 45% | 4 | 36% | 11 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #3: Accommodates data bridge with North Dakota | 8 | 73% | 1 | 9% | 0 | 0% | 9 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #1: Provides real time information on the availability of beds and units | 2 | 18% | 5 | 45% | 4 | 36% | 11 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #2: Establishes mechanisms for reserving units for triaged clients | 7 | 64% | 4 | 36% | 0 | 0% | 11 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #3: Accommodates triage/assessment tools captures client/assessment information collected through CA | 2 | 18% | 4 | 36% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #4: Ensures consistency among assessment data collected across state | 1 | 9% | 5 | 45% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #5: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC's as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 3 | 27% | 7 | 64% | 1 | 9% | 11 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #6: Collects and reports consistent information needed to evaluation CA and system | 4 | 36% | 2 | 18% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #1: Ensures all providers have common understanding of HMIS/Bowman capabilities. | 6 | 55% | 3 | 27% | 2 | 18% | 11 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #2: Ensures that reforms are addressing concerns/needs of end users/agencies. | 4 | 36% | 2 | 18% | 5 | 45% | 11 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #3: Does not add significant time/cost to providers. Capacity matches system use requirements | 3 | 27% | 4 | 36% | 4 | 36% | 11 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #4: Accommodates local requirements of HMIS | 6 | 55% | 1 | 9% | 2 | 18% | 9 |

Comments

I think the top priority is to create an open and simplified (streamlined requirements) system that does not have duplicate records and has full bed coverage. If we don't do that, we'll continue to chase our tail and not achieve the other priorities and system goals.

This was very hard, a good way to force clear thinking.

I propose to add DATA REPORTING #3: Entered/updated data is immediately available for reporting. (Also a question: Do other SrvPt implementations have the same delay as MN in accessing newly entered data for reports?)

I did not rate DATA INTEGRATION #3 (data bridge) and PROVIDES VALUE #4 (local req's of HMIS), as I don't know enough about these requirements to assess where I think they should fit.

I appreciate that this exercise really made me think through what the CRITERIA should be for what's most important, and will be interested to hear how others landed on this question. To me, the most important items are those that: 1) Help demonstrate that HMIS provides value worth investing in, and 2) Confirm and demonstrate we have a sound, effective STRUCTURE for getting data into and out of HMIS before adding functionality with the same data in/data out problems.

Data Q #9 and Provides value # 2, 3 are much the same.

MN Stakeholder Responses

| 1. Please indicate the region in which you serve/are located. Please check all that apply. | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|
| Answer Options | Response Percent | Response Count |
| Northwest CoC | 0.0% | 0 |
| Northeast CoC | 5.0% | 1 |
| St Louis CoC | 10.0% | 2 |
| Central CoC | 0.0% | 0 |
| West Central CoC | 0.0% | 0 |
| SMAC CoC | 35.0% | 7 |
| Ramsey CoC | 15.0% | 3 |
| Hennepin CoC | 25.0% | 5 |
| Southwest CoC | 25.0% | 5 |
| Southeast CoC | 5.0% | 1 |
| Entire State of MN | 20.0% | 4 |
| Answered Question | | 20 |
| Total Metro Respondents | 50% | 10 |
| Total Greater MN Respondents | 35% | 7 |
| Total Entire State Respondents | 20% | 4 |

| THEMES. | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| Data Reporting | 1 | 5% | 5 | 25% | 14 | 70% | 20 |
| Data Sharing | 4 | 20% | 9 | 45% | 6 | 30% | 19 |
| Data Quality | 4 | 20% | 10 | 50% | 5 | 25% | 19 |
| Data Integration | 11 | 55% | 6 | 30% | 2 | 10% | 19 |
| Coordinated Assessment | 3 | 15% | 9 | 45% | 7 | 35% | 19 |
| Create A Sense That HMIS Provides Value | 9 | 45% | 6 | 30% | 4 | 20% | 19 |
| Comments | | | | | | | |
| It seems like creating a sense that HMIS provides value is something that should be a part of all the tasks that are planned. | | | | | | | |
| Most important is not just to "create a sense that HMIS provides value," but to have HMIS provide value. | | | | | | | |
| I think that having quality data and the ability to use the data are the most important, because there needs to be a good reason for why we are collecting all the data. Coordinated Assessment and data sharing might be ways to get us there. | | | | | | | |

| REQUIREMENTS. 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? | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| DATA REPORTING #1: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have immediate/quick/unlimited access to data | 1 | 5% | 2 | 10% | 16 | 80% | 19 |
| DATA REPORTING #2: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have the unlimited ability to define and generate their own reports independent of (or with minimal) Wilder assistance. | 3 | 15% | 3 | 15% | 13 | 65% | 19 |
| DATA SHARING #1: Standardizes and operationalizes state-wide rules to govern how participating HMIS organizations agree to share data | 3 | 15% | 10 | 50% | 5 | 25% | 18 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----|-----|----|-----|----|-----|----|
| DATA SHARING #2: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 5 | 25% | 7 | 35% | 5 | 25% | 17 |
| DATA SHARING #3: Protects client preferences and confidentiality | 2 | 10% | 11 | 55% | 7 | 35% | 20 |
| DATA SHARING #4: Enables Agencies to access necessary and real-time data to intervene appropriately and prevent homelessness | 3 | 15% | 6 | 30% | 9 | 45% | 18 |
| DATA QUALITY #1: Minimizes incidence of duplicate records and data inconsistencies | 8 | 40% | 8 | 40% | 4 | 20% | 20 |
| DATA QUALITY #2: Minimizes frequency of "anonymous" records entered into the database | 14 | 70% | 4 | 20% | 0 | 0% | 18 |
| DATA QUALITY #3: Establishes "real time" data entry in the field as the preferred protocol | 7 | 35% | 5 | 25% | 6 | 30% | 18 |
| DATA QUALITY #4: Minimizes the incidence of second and third-hand data entry | 11 | 55% | 4 | 20% | 4 | 20% | 19 |
| DATA QUALITY #5: Streamlines HMIS requirements of funders to create cleaner simpler data | 5 | 25% | 4 | 20% | 11 | 55% | 20 |
| DATA QUALITY #6: Ensures that movement of shared clients from one jurisdiction to another does not compromise integrity of jurisdictional reports | 4 | 20% | 10 | 50% | 5 | 25% | 19 |
| DATA QUALITY #7: Provides complete data (incomplete records)—Establishes targets | 5 | 25% | 8 | 40% | 5 | 25% | 18 |
| DATA QUALITY #8: Accommodates full participation (bed coverage)—Establishes targets | 5 | 25% | 8 | 40% | 5 | 25% | 18 |
| DATA QUALITY #9: Enhances usability for end users | 3 | 15% | 7 | 35% | 10 | 50% | 20 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #1: Enhances the ability to link HMIS client data with other state data systems (source of truth for all systems). | 8 | 40% | 5 | 25% | 5 | 25% | 18 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #2: Accommodates timely data uploads from service providers. | 7 | 35% | 9 | 45% | 3 | 15% | 19 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #3: Accommodates data bridge with North Dakota | 17 | 85% | 1 | 5% | 0 | 0% | 18 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #1: Provides real time information on the availability of beds and units | 6 | 30% | 5 | 25% | 7 | 35% | 18 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #2: Establishes mechanisms for reserving units for triaged clients | 9 | 45% | 5 | 25% | 4 | 20% | 18 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #3: Accommodates triage/assessment tools captures client/assessment information collected through CA | 5 | 25% | 3 | 15% | 10 | 50% | 18 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #4: Ensures consistency among assessment data collected across state | 4 | 20% | 5 | 25% | 9 | 45% | 18 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #5: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 5 | 25% | 6 | 30% | 7 | 35% | 18 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #6: Collects and reports consistent information needed to evaluation CA and system | 3 | 15% | 6 | 30% | 9 | 45% | 18 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #1: Ensures all providers have common understanding of HMIS/Bowman capabilities. | 9 | 45% | 3 | 15% | 7 | 35% | 19 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #2: Ensures that reforms are addressing concerns/needs of end users/agencies. | 3 | 15% | 5 | 25% | 10 | 50% | 18 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #3: Does not add significant time/cost to providers. Capacity matches system use requirements | 3 | 15% | 6 | 30% | 11 | 55% | 20 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------|------------|---|-----|----|
| PROVIDES VALUE #4: Accommodates local requirements of HMIS | 4 | 20% | 10 | 50% | 5 | 25% | 19 |
| Comments | | | | | | | |
| Thanks for not shying away from this challenge. | | | | | | | |
| I am most interested in a "good enough" HMIS system that allows us to be in full compliance with HUD requirements while limiting the amount of time, money, and energy that this will siphon away from providing top notch supportive services and housing. | | | | | | | |
| HMIS reform should also help to better serve the people who are actually experiencing homelessness. | | | | | | | |
| I think it's important for funders to have some level of access to HMIS data and reporting, but maybe it doesn't have to be unlimited. For some reason the word unlimited just makes me a little nervous. | | | | | | | |

Greater MN Only

| THEMES. | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| Data Reporting | 0 | 0% | 2 | 29% | 5 | 71% | 7 |
| Data Sharing | 2 | 29% | 3 | 43% | 1 | 14% | 6 |
| Data Quality | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 3 | 43% | 7 |
| Data Integration | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| Coordinated Assessment | 1 | 14% | 5 | 71% | 0 | 0% | 6 |
| Create A Sense That HMIS Provides Value | 1 | 14% | 4 | 57% | 1 | 14% | 6 |

| REQUIREMENTS. 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? | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|----------------|
| Answer Options | 1--Important | | 2--Very Important | | 3--Most Important | | Response Count |
| DATA REPORTING #1: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have immediate/quick/unlimited access to data | 0 | 0% | 1 | 14% | 6 | 86% | 7 |
| DATA REPORTING #2: Ensures Funders, coordinators, and agency staff have the unlimited ability to define and generate their own reports independent of (or with minimal) Wilder assistance. | 1 | 14% | 0 | 0% | 6 | 86% | 7 |
| DATA SHARING #1: Standardizes and operationalizes state-wide rules to govern how participating HMIS organizations agree to share data | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| DATA SHARING #2: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 1 | 14% | 4 | 57% | 1 | 14% | 6 |
| DATA SHARING #3: Protects client preferences and confidentiality | 0 | 0% | 3 | 43% | 4 | 57% | 7 |
| DATA SHARING #4: Enables Agencies to access necessary and real-time data to intervene appropriately and prevent homelessness | 2 | 29% | 3 | 43% | 1 | 14% | 6 |
| DATA QUALITY #1: Minimizes incidence of duplicate records and data inconsistencies | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 3 | 43% | 7 |
| DATA QUALITY #2: Minimizes frequency of "anonymous" records entered into the database | 4 | 57% | 2 | 29% | 0 | 0% | 6 |
| DATA QUALITY #3: Establishes "real time" data entry in the field as the preferred protocol | 2 | 29% | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 6 |
| DATA QUALITY #4: Minimizes the incidence of second and third-hand data entry | 3 | 43% | 3 | 43% | 1 | 14% | 7 |
| DATA QUALITY #5: Streamlines HMIS requirements of funders to create cleaner simpler data | 0 | 0% | 2 | 29% | 5 | 71% | 7 |
| DATA QUALITY #6: Ensures that movement of shared clients from one jurisdiction to another does not compromise integrity of jurisdictional reports | 1 | 14% | 2 | 29% | 4 | 57% | 7 |
| DATA QUALITY #7: Provides complete data (incomplete records)—Establishes targets | 0 | 0% | 4 | 57% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| DATA QUALITY #8: Accommodates full participation (bed coverage)—Establishes targets | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| DATA QUALITY #9: Enhances usability for end users | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 3 | 43% | 7 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|------------|---|
| DATA INTEGRATION #1: Enhances the ability to link HMIS client data with other state data systems (source of truth for all systems). | 3 | 43% | 1 | 14% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #2: Accommodates timely data uploads from service providers. | 2 | 29% | 4 | 57% | 1 | 14% | 7 |
| DATA INTEGRATION #3: Accommodates data bridge with North Dakota | 6 | 86% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 6 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #1: Provides real time information on the availability of beds and units | 2 | 29% | 4 | 57% | 0 | 0% | 6 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #2: Establishes mechanisms for reserving units for triaged clients | 4 | 57% | 2 | 29% | 0 | 0% | 6 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #3: Accommodates triage/assessment tools captures client/assessment information collected through CA | 4 | 57% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #4: Ensures consistency among assessment data collected across state | 2 | 29% | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 6 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #5: Accommodates providers who deliver services within multiple CoC'S as well as clients who receive services within multiple CoC's | 3 | 43% | 2 | 29% | 1 | 14% | 6 |
| COORDINATED ASSESSMENT #6: Collects and reports consistent information needed to evaluation CA and system | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% | 2 | 29% | 6 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #1: Ensures all providers have common understanding of HMIS/Bowman capabilities. | 2 | 29% | 1 | 14% | 4 | 57% | 7 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #2: Ensures that reforms are addressing concerns/needs of end users/agencies. | 2 | 29% | 1 | 14% | 3 | 43% | 6 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #3: Does not add significant time/cost to providers. Capacity matches system use requirements | 2 | 29% | 1 | 14% | 4 | 57% | 7 |
| PROVIDES VALUE #4: Accommodates local requirements of HMIS | 1 | 14% | 2 | 29% | 4 | 57% | 7 |