

# Meeting Minutes

## CSP All Agencies Administrators Meeting

March 7, 2017 9:00 am – 11:00 am

Location: CSB Conference Room

Attendees: Chelsea Macciomei, Access Ohio; Dreysha Hunt, Betsy McGraw, VOAGO; Christina Phalen, Paula Jenkins, YWCA; Leah Tuttamore, SEMH; Taylor Keating, Maryhaven; April Harvey, CAIHS; Courtney Elrod, Andrea Ropp, Equitas; Branden Woodward, CHN; Brittani Perdue, Nicholas Brenner, Beth Fetzer-Rice, TSA; Eman Albash, GCH; Amanda Glauer, Huck House; Leena Scott, HOCO; Marsha Zimmerman, NCR; Tiffany McCoy, HFF; Rich Agnello, VA; Lianna Barbu, Catherine Kendall, Jeremiah Bakerstull, Becky Hamilton, Thaddeus Billman, Community Shelter Board.

### A) Welcome and Flow of the Day

- 1) **Agenda** – Lianna walked through the day's agenda. The group did introductions.

### B) CSB Update

#### 1) ServicePoint Upgrade & CSP Reporting Tool Timelines –

##### a) QlikSense

- < Bowman committed that QlikSense is slated to be released near the end of March 2017 and before April 11th.
- < Bowman will be in Columbus the last two days of May to train continuum care administrators. At the end of training we will know if we can replicate current reports.

##### b) ServicePoint 6

- < Will probably be available this summer.
- < Feedback from administrators who have viewed SP6 was mixed. Sarah felt it is user friendly with an easy workflow. Another admin felt it is very different with a lot of back tracking. It was stated that there is a lot more clicking through items which adds more time. There is a concern that SP6 will not be able to give us what we need.
- < Report writer reports will be going away; nothing comparable will be offered.
- < CSB will wait before upgrading to allow all the bugs to be fixed first.

#### 2) **Spiceworks review** – No concerns or open cases are noted in Spiceworks.

- #### 3) **AccessOhio**- Created a Spiceworks case to request the Vulnerability Assessment be created within CSP. The vulnerability form is a mandatory form for everyone. There would only be a change in how you access the form, not who is completing it. Administrators gave pros and cons to using an electronic version. Some feel this electronic version would be helpful in transitioning clients to different programs. In contrast, some programs may not have the technology available for the electronic version to be created in real-time. At the same time, Access does not have the capability to scan and upload all assessments completed by the navigators. Tablets were suggested as an alternative method, but that comes at a cost. The idea of taking a photo of the form was also brought up, but Catherine questioned the security of this solution. There was agreement by all participants that the electronic CSP assessment should be developed in CSP and used exclusively as the vulnerability assessment, system wide. The CSB team will begin developing the electronic assessment. Once completed, it will be available through the project entry/exit record.

**4) Destination at Exit/Missing Data-** The following Destination response categories were discussed: Other, No exit interview completed, Data not collected, Client doesn't know, Client refused. The category of "Other" is being inconsistently used. AccessOhio said the "Other" category is sometimes used if the client is a veteran and they hand-off service provision to a veteran project while the client is still in shelter. Maryhaven added that they use the "Other" category if a client is going to the hospital. The group discussed that the "Other" category should be rarely used when existing destination categories do not cover the exit destination. "Data not collected" should be used if an exit interview was conducted but that particular question was not asked. This is another option that should be rarely used. "Client Refused" and "Client doesn't know" are self-explanatory. "No exit interview completed" should be used if the client disappears and the case manager or other agency staff are not able to make an educated guess/decision on where the client went. For permanent exit destination backup documentation is needed. If household exited to family, we would like to see documentation of that exit, a letter from the family member, name on utility bill, name on lease, etc.

**5) Veteran Permanent Housing Assessment-** this assessment tracks data fields completed by partners who house veterans, such as Outreach and Access. There are several data elements that only the VA knows, the VA (Carl Landry) should be contacted for those data fields.

**6) HUD Webinar-**

- < Lianna reviewed the new HUD is quality assurance reports we will have to complete. These will be completed at system level but can be used at a program level or multiple programs at a time.
- < They are very similar to what we are tracking in our QA reports currently.
- < Bowman has to create in ART and QlikSense all the QA reports and they should be available April 1<sup>st</sup>. These reports will be a very useful part of the transition to QlikSense. We will use current QA reports in ART as long as they are available. We will transition to Qlik when there is no other option. In the meantime programs will be able to use both reports for the QA process. Only the ART QA is required though.

**7) Data Elements-** HandsOn requested something to aide them with tracking the need for services for hearing impaired and Non-English speakers.

**C) CSP Administrators Updates**

**1) Catherine's transition-**

- < The data and evaluation team at CSB is currently interviewing candidates. Lianna, Jeremiah, and Thaddeus are learning CSP before Catherine's departure March 31<sup>st</sup>. There will not be additional training before the end of March. QA will continue, however. The importance of Agency Admins participating in trainings so specifics are covered for their particular program was re-emphasized.
- < Thank you, Catherine, for all your dedication and hard work over last 15 years!!! We will miss you!

**2) Next CSP Administrator Meeting is 06/27/2017, from 9-11 a.m.**

Meeting adjourned.

