

## VT HMIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 17, 2020 1:30PM – 3:30PM

- Attendance:
  - Committee Members:
    - Ari Kisler, VCRHYP
    - Becca Lewis, NEKCA
    - Chris Brzovic, CCHA
    - Daniel Blankenship, VSHA
    - Elizabeth Melville, NCCS
    - Gwen Williams, UVH
    - James Doyle, UVH
    - Jessica Makela, HPC
    - Lee Trapeni, SSHP
    - Rebecca Gural, SSVF UVM
    - Rich Turner, The Veterans Place
    - Robert Ostermeyer, CVOEO Franklin Grand Isle
    - Will Towne, Spectrum
    - Elizabeth Kanard is unable to commit to the committee going forward. We will work with Chittenden folks to try and get another Chittenden CoC committee member. Suggestions: COTS, Howard Center, ANEW, Champlain Housing Trust, Todd from the City of Burlington – Collaborative Applicant
    - Meghan Morrow Raftery, ICA
    - Karina McNamara, ICA
    - Louise Masterson, ICA
  - Absent:
    - Karen Boyce, The Veterans Place
    - Chelsea Alsofrom, Pathways
    - Linda Amante, CVOEO Chittenden
    - Lily Sojourner, AHS OEO
- Data Entry Challenges
  - PATH data entry is very difficult and confusing. Entering and tracking referrals.
  - Rebecca at SSVF – Use HMIS as electronic files, statewide provider. File attachment section is used, but the documents are not always there/do not populate/duplicated. Not able to approve enrollments because of this. Lots of extra time and work. Service transaction notes duplicate also – causes reporting issues

- HMIS and Visibility
  - Global sharing would include the whole state (both CoC's) But, we could do baby steps – and do BoS separate from Chittenden
  - Ari and Elizabeth are for whole state global sharing
  - Global sharing would be amazing – not having to sign a bunch of documents for sharing
  - Beneficial to statewide partners. We would see less duplications in HMIS. Hard to track historical work or chronic homelessness if a client has multiple IDs because they are different sharing agreements.
  - What would we need to do to move forwards? What are the pros/cons? What is the push-back?
    - Confidentiality / privacy – this may be a misunderstanding about who has access to the data. You only look at a client if you are serving that client. Just like the Food Stamp system and like your medical records.
    - Local CoC's are fearful of having to prioritize by statewide – but we can still prioritize resources by region!
    - Data Entry and workload over all would be smoother as clients move throughout the state
    - **Benefit:** Seeing the whole client file – help provee chronic homelessness, avoid having to re-ask client same thing over again, client centered to give the option of other housing opportunities when sharing with outside of the local CoC. Help prevent duplicate files and duplication of services.
    - Some local CoC concerns: hard to explain to clients why information would be shared state-wide.
    - **Suggestion:** Do a client survey like Maine did, about client visibility
    - Advisory Committee's role: opening up the conversation to the local and HUD recognized CoC's. Recommendations can be made to the CoC's.
    - Client choice still would exist
    - Global sharing gives the client more ownership in their data and what they want to share
      - Currently, we have made the choice for clients, and it is not our choice to make by restricting the ability to share.
    - Is it possible for global sharing to happen slowly? Can certain local CoC's join together to make larger CoC's?
      - Yes. This would also be a sharing group and sharing agreements would need to signed still.
- Demo Rubric
  - This is the rubric that committee members would fill out when looking at / attending demos
  - Reviewed additional questions to ask Vendors

**UPDATE:** Jesse (ICA Reporting) is finishing up the document to send to vendor. Adam (ICA Director) will be sending the email, hopefully next week to Vendors and then they have 45 days to respond.

- Next Meeting
  - October 15<sup>th</sup> 1:30 – 3:30 pm
  - November 19<sup>th</sup> 1:30 -3:30 pm