



## PIMIT Workgroup Meeting Minutes December 11, 2008

---

### *Items Relevant to Other Workgroups*

None

### *Attendees*

*Heather Wiegand, Co-Chair*  
*Teresa Duhl*  
*Denise Dunn*  
*Cecil McNally*  
*Mikki Myszak*  
*Andrea Kuhn*

*Stacey Varela*  
*Dean Feldpaush*  
*Rich Burgis*  
*Craig Holderbaum*  
*Nancy McCrohan, PPA*  
*Scott Southard, PPA*

### *Discussion Items*

#### **Introductions**

- Barb was on the road, and was unable to attend. Heather and Nancy M. facilitated the meeting in her absence.
  - Heather's role as the co-chair is to take assignments from Barb, facilitate in her absence, and encourage participants.
- The importance of communications was discussed as well. It will be key to knowing what the other teams are doing, and to avoid possible overlapping of assignments. This is part of Heather's role. This is also being attended to by Nancy as facilitator, and by Barb as she is part of DRT.

#### **Adding Team Members**

- There are several nominees for additions to the team. Of the people nominated, two are from regions 1 (UP), and two from and 6 (SW Michigan).
  - While it is good to have representation from each region, there is a concern about making the group too large.
- The group voted and was unanimously in favor of adding the team members.
- We are still missing region 4.
  - Heather will get in touch with some of her contacts in the region to see if they would be interested in joining.

#### **Action Plan**

- Nancy M. reviewed the written comments from the team, and invited discussion on each section of the action plan, starting at the bottom and moving to the top.
  - The goal was to "wrap up" the Action Plan, even though, Nancy M. pointed out, it is a living paper and will always be adapting.
  - This will need to be presented to DRT in January.

*Action Item #7, Support integration of planning data: REMOVED item #7 after discussion, but some information MOVED to #3*

- Not definitively in our scope, but it needs attention. It was suggested that this is covered elsewhere. It was decided that Barb, Nancy, and Heather will keep an eye on it.
  - The language was discussed. Maybe start with “Advocate” sentence?
  - In other words, drop the first sentence beginning with “Identify.”
- Can any other group do better on this point? Should we expect to have some overlap on this point?
- The group’s conversation changed on this item. Could this item be integrated into another item?
  - It was decided to move part of this item into *Action Item #3*.

*Action Item #6, Identify data to support assessment of systems or community operations and support systems of care: REMOVED after discussion, information MOVED to #2*

- Several people recommended we drop 6.
  - It was noted by some in the team that 6 is quite an undertaking.
- What type of system would be needed? Could HMIS cover this? The team was uncertain.
  - Some of the systems will need to be more involved than just HMIS.
  - HMIS will do what it can in regards to communicating with communities.
- Craig noted that not everyone knows what this item means, and we shouldn’t discuss it fully until we are all on the same page.
  - Mikki wondered if this was more specifically related to how we report our work out to the communities.
- Should this item be moved to #2? The decision was made to move it.

*Action Item #5*

- This item overall might be one of the best results of the team, even though not a lot of work will be needed.
  - Miki defined this item as being focused on tools.
  - Would this need more than a simple list?
  - How would this information be shared?
    - ◆ Barb is currently working on a project related to outcomes.
- For HMIS users, outcome reports are available on the Web site; this is available right now.
- The question came up about how item 2 is different from the work in Item 5.
  - Item 2 feels like it is more about advocacy; 5 lists actual tools.
- The team decided to keep this item, but agreed to try to keep on focus with the outcomes for the work.

*Action Item 4*

- This is defined as research (external and internal).
- Andrea noted how they are trying to find a university to partner with to look at different variables, etc. It would help to see what is out there already.
  - She also noted that this has a “seek and support” aspect to the work.
  - As the conversation grew around the seeking aspect, it was noted in doing our research we can’t get bogged down by the “forest vs. trees” aspect of it.

- ◆ We added “review relevant research studies” instead of literature review

#### *Action Item 3*

- The team agreed to advocate for common approaches. This point needs to be added to the item.
- The consensus from the team is that this point is fine, no need to change.

#### *Action Item 2*

- NM reviewed each of the comments in the Action Plan.
- This action should include recommending priorities
- Rich and Barb and their attendance at the CEPI meeting was mentioned. Could this be another data source?
- Is point 2b, like 1b?
  - Add to 1b.
    - ◆ So 2b is eliminated.
    - ◆ The rest of 2 will be kept.

#### *Action Item 1*

- Mikki defined this point as the fact finding part of our mission.
- The requirement of new access and use rules will be added to 1b.
- Should the old number 4 be added here?
  - However, should it be “identify” as compared to “develop?” Some agreed to the change.
  - Are we planning to personally implement each of these actions?
  - NM called that a good question. We are focused on action, but that doesn’t mean we are necessarily doing it. We would be advocating for the change. Is it better to say we are developing recommendations?
- Could this be turned into a presentation of some sort?
- We need to identify the priorities. What do we ask the different regions to concentrate on first?
- Barb has already been talking to the Web site people about what is appropriate data to include at the state level.
- We also need to consider things from the CoC perspective. We need to vet whether the report will make sense for them.
  - Will the CoCs have the power to veto what is put up on the Web?
- Adding to item: “Will recommend priorities for the collecting and sharing data.”
  - Action item 1 is about finding the data, and item 2 is about sharing data

**Action Plan Review**  
***PIMIT Meeting Review***

Action Item	Important Notes
1	Kept item. Clarified 1b (Access and use rules). Changed to “identify” instead of “develop” data. Added: “Will recommend priorities for the collecting and sharing of data.”
2	Kept item. Included #6 here. Deleted “identify rules” because it is redundant with statement in #1.
3	Kept item. Included “advocate” sentence from #7. Added statement about working towards common approaches.
4	Kept item. Some clarification added
5	No change
6	Deleted, moved to #2.
7	Deleted as item. Moved “advocate” part of statement to #3.

**Outcomes/DRT Preparations**

- NM noted that as we get closer to the DRT meeting in January, for the team to be in touch (via e-mail) regarding the outcomes and the completion of this draft of the Action Plan.
- From here on out, we should just be able to do status updates on the plan.

**HMIS Presentation** *(Presented by Sally and Heather)*

- Because of time and attendance, a short presentation was given on HMIS.
- Using Go-To Meeting, the presenters walked the remaining members through the database.
  - Some of the keys to the databases’ strength are in defining the rules for the data, having a clear idea of what the data would provide, and understanding who the target users of the data would be.
  - With the database they can create almost a complete service record for an individual; as well as creating the tools for tracking that individual through the system.
  - The system functions include follow-up reminders.
  - It ranks clients from 1 to 5 (crisis to self-sufficient).
- It was noted that data elements required by HUD are reflected in this system.

***Tasks Completed***

- Action Plan was reviewed, and nearly finished.
- A short presentation was given on HMIS.

***Tasks Assigned***

- Nancy will e-mail out a request for any feedback on the outcomes and timeline of the Action Plan. Any comments or suggestions on it will need to be e-mailed to her prior to the DRT meeting in January.
- Barb will invite nominated people to the team. Heather will look for people from Region 4 to nominate.
- We will review additional HMIS reports at the next meeting and Stacey will report on a retrospective cost study

### ***Next Meeting***

- Thursday, January 8, 2 PM. This meeting will take place at Public Policy Associates, 119 Pere Marquette, Lansing 48912, and will also be available at Go-To Meeting. Log in, and telephone number, are shown on the agenda for the next meeting