**Needs Assessment and Evaluation Committee**

**Tuesday, September 28, 2021**

**9:00 – 11:00 a.m.**

**Microsoft Teams Meeting**

**Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Committee Members Present** | |
| Alissa Fountain (co-chair) | John Vener, MD |
| Lesa Nelson (co-chair) |  |
| **Guests** |  |
| Jonathan Hanft | Calvin Hillary Hylton |
| **Hennepin County (Part A) Representative:** | **DHS (Part B) Representative:** |
| Aaron Peterson | Dennis London |
| **MDH (Prevention) Representative:** | **MDH (Surveillance) Representative:** |
| McKinzie Woelfel | Allison LaPointe |
| **MCHACP Staff:** |  |
| Carissa Weisdorf (minutes) |  |

**Quorum? Yes**

1. **Welcome and introductions**

* Lesa Nelson called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and introductions were made.

1. **Review and approval of past meeting minutes and proposed agenda**

* The July 28, 2021 minutes were approved.
* There were no objections to the proposed agenda.

1. **Review results of Assessment of Administrative Mechanism**

* Carissa Weisdorf presented ***FY 2020 Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism (AAM) results***.
* Carissa Weisdorf reminded the committee that this is a requirement for members to complete and 95% (21 of 22) of council members completed it.
* All council members indicated 5 out of 6 of the objectives were met, with one respondent indicating “somewhat disagree” to objective two. Unfortunately, a comment was not included so it is not possible to interpret what the Part A recipient can do to improve.
* McKinzie Woelfel asked if new members were connected with more seasoned members to complete the AAM. This has been a recommendation from this committee in the past. Carissa Weisdorf said members were encouraged to reach out to their mentors for help completing it.
* Jonathan Hanft attended the meeting to hear feedback from the committee on the results and to offer a response from the Part A grant recipient. He thanked everyone for completing the AAM, and noted there is a lot of information, and some of it is technical. He also said this is the only time the council has responsibility in the administration of funds and the purpose of the AAM is to ensure the recipient is getting grant funds out into the community to serve the people it is intended to serve.
* Carissa Weisdorf stated the next steps in this process. The results will be communicated in the Part A grant application. She will also present the results to the council at their next meeting and post them to the council website.

1. **Debrief Assessment of Administrative Mechanism process**

* McKinzie Woelfel said she doesn’t understand why some respondents indicated “somewhat agree” for objectives where the data shows it was clearly met; objective one, for example. She feels this could be from not understanding the objective, measurement, or responses and she recommends that if we continue to meet virtually then we could meet in small groups so people can discuss it.
* Carissa Weisdorf shared with the committee that a new member asked to include a “neutral” response option but this committee historically has been opposed to including a neutral response option. The new member felt that they didn’t want to answer the objectives since they were not part of the council in the year that this is measuring. Carissa Weisdorf asked if we can do more so people better understand the information and feel comfortable responding.
  + McKinzie Woelfel emphasized using small groups to fill it out so the information can be discussed and people can ask questions. She felt it was really helpful to her as a new member to complete it with a small group.
* Carissa Weisdorf highlighted the comment in objective three that states, “I find the provider numbers in some service areas to be below sufficient.” She wondered if there were particular service areas this person felt were below sufficient and asked if there could be more education around this. She felt when looking at the funding amounts some are so small so it may be difficult to split up funding among several providers. She said this type of education and conversation used to occur in the service area presentations.
  + Jonathan Hanft agreed that some of the funding amounts are small and some service areas cost more to provide the service because they require staffing. For example, medical case management tends to cost more than other services because it required staff. Another factor is how many agencies respond to a request for proposal (RFP). He also highlighted that this only shows Part A funded providers so agencies funded by other funding sources like Part B and rebate are not shown here.
  + Jonathan Hanft also thinks it would be helpful to have additional information about why this person felt there were not enough providers. He thinks it would be great to know if there are ideas of who else might be able to provide a service.

1. **Agenda for next meeting:**

* Review monitoring plan data and prepare report on the status of the monitoring plan. The November meeting can also be used for the report.

1. **Announcements** 
   * None
2. **Adjourn**

* Lesa Nelson adjourned the meeting at 9:30 a.m.

**Meeting Summary**

* The committee reviewed the results of the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism.
* The committee debriefed the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism process and made recommendations for improvements.

**Documents distributed before the meeting:**

* Proposed meeting agenda
* July 26 meeting minutes
* FY 2020 Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism (AAM) results
* FY 2021 Work plan

**cw**