**Balance of State HMIS Assessment Survey**

**PROVIDERS SERVING BALANCE OF STATE**

* 62 Surveys received (53 serving Balance of State CoC only; 9 serving both Balance of State CoC and Chittenden CoC)
* Respondents served a variety of roles at their respective agencies with the highest percentage being Case Managers/Client Services (45%)
* Agencies provided a range of housing and services with highest being Transitional Housing (72%) and Supportive Services (60%). Respondents could select multiple types of services/housing.
* 68% of the respondents said they only entered required program data into ServicePoint
* There was a wide range of length of time that respondents had used ServicePoint
* 61% of the respondents reported that their agency used multiple client management systems. 47% of the respondents reported that they used ServicePoint as their primary data collection system.
	+ The most common reasons listed for using multiple systems was the need for specific reports (57%) and the need to capture more data than available in ServicePoint (55%)
* Respondents were moderately confident in the ability of their staff to meet HMIS requirements in ServicePoint (average 2.84 out of 5) and the quality and accuracy of data entered by staff at their agency (average 2.92 out of 5). However, the confidence in the quality and accuracy of data entered by other agencies and in the quality and accuracy of data reported out of ServicePoint were slightly lower (2.56 out of 5 and 2.65 out of 5 respectively).
* The types of reporting or analysis for which respondents most frequently used ServicePoint were generation of required reports for funders (2.37 out of 4), measuring outcomes of clients served by a project (2.52 out of 4), and understanding the quality of data entered into ServicePoint (2.60 out of 4).
* In general, respondents were fairly satisfied with the HMIS support provided. They were most satisfied with the Help Desk’s response to questions (3.71 out of 5) and least satisfied with Training on how to run required reports (2.86 out of 5)
* Respondents generally felt that the staff at Data Remedies was accessible and responsive (3.53 out of 5) and knowledgeable (3.98 out of 5). In addition, they felt that concerns or issues were addressed relatively quickly and thoroughly (3.49 and 3.57 out of 5 respectively)
* Respondents felt that HMIS requirements or policies were explained moderately well (2.96 out of 5) and that the HMIS support documents explained how to use the system moderately well (2.85 out of 5)
* 23% of respondents felt that more people at their agency needed access to ServicePoint. Respondents generally felt that the software itself was accessible when necessary (4.06 out of 5) and that they had the technology needed to use the system (4.10 out of 5)
* 85% of respondents said that they did not know how decisions were made about the HMIS System and 61% said that they were not familiar with the Continuum of Care’s HMIS Policies and Procedures
* The three features that the most respondents reported they would most like to see made to the system were data sharing between agencies (73%), enhanced reporting (59%) and increased training (41%). Import/Export of data and ability to add custom fields were selected by a high number of respondents (39% and 36% respectively).

|  |
| --- |
| **Average Ratings of Importance**1 (Not at all) – 5 (Very) |
| Easy Data Entry | 4.81 |
| One on One TA | 4.38 |
| Identify Data Quality Issues | 4.31 |
| Submit Reports Electronically | 4.06 |
| Agency Level Reporting | 3.65 |
| View Real-Time Data | 3.6 |
| Program Level Reporting | 3.6 |
| Custom Reporting | 3.52 |
| Enter Non HUD Data | 3.46 |
| Bed Availability | 3.43 |
| Share Data Across Agencies | 3.36 |
| Case Management | 3.3 |
| Community Level Reporting | 3.2 |
| Client Assessment | 3.17 |
| Exporting Data | 3.1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Ratings of Effectiveness** **Core Functions**1 (Not at all) – 5 (Very) |  | **Average Ratings of Effectiveness** **Desired Functions**1 (Not at all) – 5 (Very) |
| Identify Data Quality Issues | 3.77 |  | Matches Intake Form | 3.11 |
| Easy Data Entry | 3.67 |  | Submit Reports Electronically | 3.07 |
| Update Files | 3.48 |  | Enhance Ability to Serve Clients | 2.79 |
| Family Composition  | 3.3 |  | Agency Level Reporting | 2.77 |
| Run APR | 2.59 |  | Bed Availability | 2.78 |
| Program Level Reporting | 2.89 |  | Enter Non HUD Data | 2.61 |
| Manage Duplicate Records | 2.93\* |  | Non HUD Reporting | 2.48 |
| Client Assessment | 2.78 |  | Community Level Reporting | 2.49 |
| Case Management | 2.66 |  | Custom Reporting | 2.44 |
|  |  |  | Sharing Data across Agencies | 2.37 |
|  |  |  | Manage Joint Agencies | 2.29 |
|  |  |  | Exporting Data | 2.26 |
|  |  |  | Finding Available Resources | 2.02 |
|  |  |  | Share Data with Other Software | 1.98 |
|  |  |  | Making Referrals | 1.86 |
| AVERAGE OF AVERAGES ON CORE FUNCTIONS | 3.12 |  | AVERAGE OF AVERAGES ON DESIRED FUNCTIONS | 2.49 |

\* Management of Duplicate Records is also completed on the System Administration side of the system.

 This chart compares the average rating of effectiveness to the average rating of importance for each function. The list is sorted by magnitude of difference with the top row having the biggest discrepancy between the importance of a function for users and the effectiveness of the function in the current system.