

Needs Assessment and Evaluation Committee
Tuesday April 23, 2024
9 – 11:00 a.m.
Microsoft Teams Meeting
Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present:	
Alejandro Aguilera (co-chair)	Joe Amrhein
Moua Xiong	Cynthia Elmore
Dongwook Kim	Carol Labine
Lesa Nelson	John Vener
Joe Amrhein	
Committee Members Absent:	
Derek Martin	
Guests:	
Cody Raasch, Hennepin County	Emily Reimer, DHS
Hennepin County (Part A) Representative:	DHS (Part B) Representative:
Eriika Etshokin	Dennis London
MDH (Prevention) Representative:	MDH (Surveillance) Representative:
McKinzie Woelfel	Hannah Giles
MCHACP Staff:	
Audra Gaikowski, Council Coordinator	Jeremy Stadelman, Admin Specialist (minutes)

Quorum? Yes

- I. **Welcome and introductions:** Alejandro Aguilera called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Introductions were made.

- II. **Review and approval of March 26, 2024 meeting minutes. Review and approve proposed agenda.**
 - The March 26 minutes were approved with edits made during the meeting.
 - The proposed agenda was reviewed and approved with the noted addition below.
 - Addition: review recommended questions for the 2025 Needs Assessment from the Criminal Justice Involved Ad Hoc Committee.

- III. **Determine stratified sample sizes**
Cody Raasch & Emily Reimer, Data Analysts

- Cody reviewed the ***Proposal for NA2025 Sample Sizes.***
 - There are three proposed sample sizes:
 - 815 sample size at \$30 incentive per person.
 - 685 sample size at \$35 incentive per person.
 - 1,370 sample size at \$30. Cody noted that this is not feasible due to budget constraints.
 - Alejandro asked how many interns will be hired. Audra noted that in 2020, there were 3. Alejandro wondered if reducing the number will free up more money for incentives. Eriika noted that the county is looking at hiring 2 interns and hourly rates have gone up. Eriika emphasized that two interns will be needed and explained that the position requires a lot of work and is a heavy lift.
 - Alejandro suggested that if more funds become available, they should be put towards getting more responses.
 - Dennis urged the committee to think about what will be missed with a smaller sample size.
 - Emily noted that any sample less than 10 will likely need to be suppressed. A larger sample size would help avoid this.
 - The data analysts follow the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) on these guidelines. Hannah noted that what is suppressed is also dependent on how large the population is. Typically, less than 5 or 10 responses are suppressed so that data cannot be made identifiable.
 - Alejandro asked why more white men than Black men would be interviewed. Cody clarified that prevalence rates were used to determine the sample sizes. There are more white men living with HIV in MN than Black men. However, sub-sample numbers will be updated with 2023 data.
 - It was noted that Black African-born and Black African American have very distinctive needs and it's best to keep the samples separate to make sure we are gathering data specific to those communities.
 - Alejandro noted that Hispanic is an ethnicity; there can be Black and white identifying Hispanic individuals. LatinX would be a preferable term.
 - Members wondered what is included with the category "other men of color MSM." Emily responded that this would likely include Asian/Pacific Islander and multi-racial individuals. These populations are often grouped together because they are small subgroups that could be identifiable. The committee could

consider having a goal to reach a larger sample for some of these groups so that the data would not have to be suppressed.

- Dongwook wondered if for “other,” race could also be collected. Cody explained that the option on the survey wouldn’t be “other”, but respondents will self-identify their race. Some populations would only be grouped in “other” for data reporting purposes.
- Cody clarified that both the 685 and 815 are acceptable sample sizes for data analysis. Both are statistically significant. Emily and Eriika both recommended that the sample size be 815 because the council will get more meaningful data.
- Joe would be in favor of \$30 incentive, provided that the next needs assessment survey would offer a \$50 incentive.
 - Eriika noted that there are many unknowns about what the grant award amount will be in 5 years. This will be hard to make actionable. A suggestion would be to add the caveat that if there are additional funds, we could revisit that number.
- **MOTION:** Joe Amrhein moved that the sample size be 685, with \$35 incentive. There was no second. The motion failed to proceed.
- Audra suggested the following could be a motion, based upon the committee’s conversation. “I move to accept the proposed sample size of 815 respondents with a \$30 gift. If government recipients find an increase in the budget for the 2025 Needs Assessment, additional funding should go towards increasing the sample size of the assessment.”
 - 5 members indicated that they would be in favor of this action item.
 - Joe wondered about increasing the gift card amount if there is an increase in budget. Audra noted that it may not be ethical to change the incentive provided to respondents in the middle of the survey.
- **MOTION:** John Vener moved that the proposed sample size of 815 respondents with a \$30 gift card be approved. If government recipients find an increase in the budget for the 2025 Needs Assessment, additional funding should be prioritized towards increasing the sample size of the assessment. Lesa Nelson seconded.
- **DEBATE:** None.
- **VOTE:** With 4 ayes and 1 no, the motion carries.

IV. Review council & committee operations evaluation results

- Audra displayed and reviewed the **Scored Evaluation Results** and the **Council & Committee Operations Evaluation results**.
 - Overall results improved over the last survey.
 - Questions/comments:
 - Joe wondered if the survey is a legislative requirement. Audra noted that it is in the bylaws.
 - Joe wondered how the feedback is incorporated into council operations. Audra noted that the committee is able to provide recommendations to the Executive Committee about how the council is run. Based on previous surveys, the “get to know you” activity was added to council agenda. Alejandro also noted that changes to how materials were delivered was because of feedback from the survey.
 - Alejandro suggested that the Community Voices Committee is a good opportunity to meet people in person (see the [council's calendar](#) for more information).
 - Continue to encourage in-person attendance at the March council meeting.
 - Joe suggested that there should be an option for members to provide recommendations for improvement when they provide critical feedback.

V. Committee Co-Chair Election

- Audra noted that committees can have up to two co-chairs; another spot is available.
- Audra reviewed the committee’s **co-chair position description**.
- The floor was opened for nominations. There were no nominations.

VI. Unfinished Business / New Business

- Confirm presenter for Home & Community Based Health Services & Housing presentation May MCHACP meeting
 - Audra indicated that she would email Carol to ask if she can present. If not, Alejandro agreed to present.
- Joe reviewed questions from the **Criminal Justice Involved Ad Hoc Committee for the 2025 Needs Assessment survey**.
 - Change first question to “Were you offered HIV testing?” Then ask, did you receive HIV testing?
 - Clarify that questions 2-3 are asking about HIV medications.
 - Question 4 would be qualitative.

- Question 3 (what's intended with this question? Switched w/o consent or switched in consultation with doctor?)
- Question 5: include case management, insurance premium support
 - Emily noted that this question is asked for everyone, and wondered if there is a way to ask this question that doesn't add too many more questions for survey respondents.
- Joe will take the committee's feedback to the Criminal Justice Involved Ad Hoc Committee to consider.

VII. Set agenda for next meeting

- Review/approve objectives for the Assessment of the Administrative Mechanism
- Review results of the meeting format survey
- Review EIS, health education/risk reduction, and legal services data
- Determine social determinants of health questions for the 2025NA
- Review religious holiday calendar

VIII. Announcements

- None.

IX. Adjourn

- Alejandro Aguilera adjourned the meeting at 11:02am.

Meeting Summary

- The committee reviewed the proposal for NA2025 Sample Sizes and approved a motion to set the sample size goal at 815 respondents with a \$30 gift card incentive.
- The committee reviewed the council & committee operations evaluation results.
- The committee reviewed questions from the Criminal Justice Involved Ad Hoc Committee for the 2025 Needs Assessment survey.

Documents distributed before the meeting:

- Proposed Agenda
- Minutes from the March 26 meeting
- Home & Community Based Health Services and Housing Services April MCHACP Presentation
- Needs Assessment Committee Co-Chair Position Description
- Council and Committee Operations Evaluation Results – February 2024
- February 2024 Scored Evaluation Results
- FY 2024 NAE Workplan
- NA2025 – Sample size methods

Additional documents distributed during the meeting:

- Questions from the Criminal Justice Involved Ad Hoc Committee for the 2025 Needs Assessment survey

JS/ag