

# MEETING MINUTES

10 – 11:30 am, September 28, 2015

*In Attendance:* Eric Grumdahl, Abby Guilford, Jen Romero, Matthew Ayres, Cathy ten Broeke, Joel Salzer, Mikkel Beckman, Ji-Young Choi, Teresa Howard, Mike Manhard, Zachary Hylton, Joel Salzer

*On Phone:* Justin Vorbach, AG Huot, Michele Reid, Carla Solem, Matt White, Mary Ulland Evans, Laura DeRosier

1. Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Review

2. Update from August trainings/meetings

Discussion	Actions Identified
<p><u>8/28 meetings</u></p> <p>Full week of meetings. By and large they went well.                      8/28 meetings with DV and Tribes went very poorly                      Cathy met with leaders after the meeting.                      Shared understanding of importance of partnership.                      Formal email has been sent out. Meeting with Matt White has since been set up (10/30). Location not yet finalized (likely Mille Lacs).                      Cathy, Matt will be part of the meeting. Possibly Ji-Young and Mike.                      Looking forward to getting back on track with each other (moving forward in formal way).                      CoC coordinators may be invited to attend, at this point they are determining the rest of their agenda.                      Minutes were taken from the morning meetings that include many tasks that need to be taken on state-wide and local level. Workgroup will make an effort to move these items forward and bring decisions needed by IDG to the group.</p>	
<p><u>Communication strategies</u></p> <p>Three different CE presentations occurred at MCH conference.                      Found that there is wildly varying levels of understanding of CE plans.                      Even though we have tried to include consistent messaging at meetings and on websites, we are missing a large number of stakeholders.                      How do we improve communication with all stakeholders?                      We should have something in place for property managers in addition to service providers. How can we use MN Housing asset management staff to assist with supporting this communication?</p>	

3. Review revised project schedule

Discussion	Actions Identified
<p>Matt walked through his document (CE Implementation activities)                      After 10/1, activities will be more focused on local/specific implementation issues.                      Document is template for conversations.                      Q—would the property manager group fall into the subpopulation engagement? It could, beyond property managers, could also include PATH/outreach, etc.                      By November 1<sup>st</sup>, we should have a greater action plan that ensures CE sticks on local level.</p>	<p>Workgroup will take Matt’s outline and build out as much as possible for next IDG meeting.</p>

<p>There may be some gray areas regarding where decisions need to be made (local vs state-wide).</p> <p>Q—who is charged to do this? The workgroup has already been charged to be in the weeds. The workgroup should create a task plan that comes back to IDG for adoption in November.</p> <p>Q—Should HMIS have a representative on the workgroup? Open meetings. Welcome to be there. May make sense to give Wilder a heads up regarding when we will be hitting HMIS items.</p> <p>While we may need to wait for governance clarity until NOFA is done, seems urgent to get greater clarity here. There should be a transition, but not clear when this should occur. And what takes IDG’s place?</p> <p>Will need strong communication plan.</p> <p>Decisions about policy/procedures (currently) vs decisions about CE in HMIS (ATF). Need clear linkage, but HMIS governance is already set. May need regular updates on CE at HMIS ATF meetings. HMIS DSS group is also making decisions. Process is muddy regarding who is making decisions.</p> <p>Matt’s role as consultant will be ongoing. Initial HUD TA grant has been 2/3 expended. HUD does implement some restrictions during NOFA process. Because we knew this might inhibit Matt’s work, MN Housing has established a smaller contract that will allow for continued work.</p>	
--	--

4. Updates on the CE implementation status/progress

Discussion	Actions Identified
<p>Following discussion at August meeting, conducted a survey of all coordinators with follow up meeting for identifying CoC needs.</p> <p>Many CoCs have completed key steps. Nearly all will have most in place by January. Written documentation in place to be ready for CE implementation in HMIS.</p> <p>Interest in increasing LSA role in HMIS live site.</p> <p>Frustration that limitations in HMIS are slowing things down locally.</p> <p>Interest in bringing expertise outside of MN to help in HMIS implementation</p> <p>Question bank needs to be one of the first steps.</p> <p>In August, there was a suggestion to have a temporary work around while we wait for Wilder capacity. Strong opposition from CoCs to doing this. Just commit work to making progress in HMIS.</p> <p>Lisa/Colleen had identified a list of questions/tasks that CoCs need to complete before being ready to move forward. Most CoCs feel they have already answered/completed these items.</p> <p>Q—Have CoC decisions been documented and have they been shared?</p> <p>Without being documented, it will be unclear for what alignment/steps need to take place. Where will alignment truly be needed? Until we have the variations and know what they are; it will be difficult to identify if there are areas where we do need alignment (in order to create as system implementation that makes sense)</p> <p>The outcome we are aiming for is clarity among all parties for clarity regarding next steps.</p> <p>Who is the WE who needs to review and validate these items?</p> <p>Why is there a need to collect and compare all assessments? The intent of</p>	<p>Carla will work with CoCs to provide written documentation on CoC CE decisions</p>

<p>creating a collection of CE systems that make sense across the state.                  Need to understand the differences among CoCs. Vetting analysis can help to identify what is important and what is not with alignment process. Once vetting process is complete (including Wilder), bring to ATF for formal support/ MN Housing approval.                  Sub-assessments need to be basic, centered around eligibility for specific programs.                  Need to make sure the checklist (what decisions/questions need to be addressed for CE implementation in HMIS) is correct and sufficient.                  CoC coordinators are frustrated with process. Urgency.</p>	
---	--

5. Discuss CES build out in HMIS

Discussion	Actions Identified
<p>Wilder has an operation calendar that is beyond their current capacity. With that knowledge Matt is proposing hiring an outside consultant to get some of the CES work developed within HMIS. Would like to bring in someone who has implemented CES in other communities.                  This consultant would provide work on two levels: 1) create a template and work plan for Wilder that needs to happen in the system. 2) Support to do live work in HMIS to develop work within the system- build assessments etc. Hennepin County is willing to pay and contract with a consultant to assist in providing this capacity. This consultant along with other Hennepin staff would work alongside Wilder within HMIS to get this work done.                  The goal with this proposal is to prioritize CES build out and speed up the implementation of CES within HMIS.                  The proposal could be split in two. Matt Theide could start work live in HMIS to assist with building assessments etc. The build out of a work plan could be put on hold as evaluation is done about what the best way is to get that done.                  Cathy is going to convene a group to review Hennepin’s proposal and see if tweaks need to be made before it is presented to the ATF.</p>	<p>Matthew and Mikkel will come to the ATF meeting in October to share the proposal requesting an action from that group for what should be done with resources.</p>

6. Future IDG discussion items

- CES Participation Agreements (CoC– State) – October
- CES Project Performance Outcome Targets – October
- CES Shared Governance Strategy – November

Discussion	Actions Identified
<p>IDG should meet after HMIS ATF meeting to continuously discuss the CES &amp; HMIS options.</p>	<p>Ji will work to find another date in October that will work for IDG to meet.</p>