# Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Consumer Guide: A Review of Available HMIS Solutions

## January 29, 2003

Center for Social Policy
John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs
University of Massachusetts, Boston
Boston, MA 02125

Commissioned under a subcontract with
Aspen Systems Corporation, Rockville, MD 20850

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Contract, C-OPC-21201; Task Order 4

# Acknowledgments

This guide was prepared by the Center for Social Policy (CSP), McCormack Institute of Public Affairs; University of Massachusetts Boston through a subcontract with Aspen Systems Corporation (Aspen). Aspen's contract (C-OPC-21201, Task Order 4) is with the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Office of Community Planning and Development. The guide's authors are: Roger Blake, Kamran Favakeh, Donna Haig Friedman, Oscar Gutierrez, Michelle Hayes, Marc Lind, Jason McGorty, Sarah Nichols, Jennifer Raymond, Brian Sokol, Brooke Spellman, Anurag Sureka, and Jason Wilson. Lead contributors were Michelle Hayes, Marc Lind, Brian Sokol, and Brooke Spellman.

CSP has extensive experience in implementing HMIS software in the City of Boston and the State of Massachusetts, in addition to experience in HMIS software technology, management and training. CSP prepared a previous review of HMIS software under subcontract to Aspen. Aspen is providing an array of technical assistance on HMIS implementation in its current contract with HUD.

Michael Roanhouse, Government Technical Monitor, and Marty Horwath, Government Technical Representative, provide contract and project oversight. Cynthia Hernan, Aspen's Project Director, provides project direction, guidance and editing.

Many others contributed to this guide by providing feedback throughout its development, including Cheryl Anne Forster, Aspen; Alisa West Cahill and Ed McGee, Community Council of Central Oklahoma; J. Stephen Cleghorn and Ann Oliva, The Community Partnership for the Prevention of Homelessness; Ernesto Cruz Feliciano, consultant; Loren Hoffmann and Julie Hovden, State of Wisconsin's Division of Housing and Intergovernmental Relations; Stacy Jones and Jim Schmidt, Chattanooga Homeless Coalition, Inc.; Jeffrey Kerrigan, Training and Development Associates; Kimberly McCollim, Barbara Ritter and June Shapiro, City of Spokane, Washington; Kay Melancon, consultant; Elena Rush, Spartanburg County, South Carolina; and Matt White, consultant.

In addition, the guide's authors acknowledge the contributions of the HMIS solution providers, and directors and staff of service provider agencies. Solution providers devoted considerable resources to the project by providing access to each solution, meeting with review team members, and responding to surveys and questions. Directors and staff of dozens of agencies around the country took the time to meet with the review team members and discuss their experiences with each solution.

# Table of Contents

**Introduction** ..... **1**

What is a Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)? ..... 1

Congressional Direction ..... 1

HUD's Plan of Action ..... 2

Overview of the Consumer Guide ..... 2

HMIS Solution Review Methodology ..... 3

How the Information Should Be Used ..... 4

**Chapter One: HMIS Technology Elements and Architecture Options** ..... **6**

Key Technology Concepts and Terms ..... 6

Network Architecture Implementation Options ..... 8

Security Configurations ..... 11

**Chapter Two: Evaluation Framework** ..... **13**

Functional Activities ..... 13

System Characteristics ..... 17

**Chapter Three: Solution Reviews** ..... **21**

Background ..... 21

AWARDS by Foothold Technology ..... 25

CHIRP by Colorado Department of Human Services ..... 34

ClientTrack by Data Systems International ..... 42

C-STAR by S.V.D.P. Management, Inc. ..... 52

MAACLink by Mid America Assistance Coalition (MAAC) ..... 60

MetSYS by MetSYS Inc. ..... 69

PATHWAYS COMPASS by Pathways Community Network ..... 78

ROSIE by Municipal Information Systems, Inc ..... 86

ServicePoint by Bowman Internet Systems LLC ..... 95

Social Services System by Simplicity Computer Solutions, Inc. ..... 103

Washington Homeless MIS by State of Washington, Office of Community Development ..... 111

**Chapter Four: Comparative Analysis ..... 118**

Result Scores Summary ..... 119

Functional Activity Scores ..... 120

Evaluation Criteria Summary ..... 135

System Evaluation Results ..... 145

**Chapter Five: Overview of Other HMIS Solutions ..... 166**

CAPTAIN by Cap Systems, Inc. ..... 167

Client Track by Shah Software, Inc. ..... 167

DataStart by James Frazier Associates, Inc. ..... 168

FACTORS and HelpWorks by Peter Martin Associates ..... 168

H.E.A.R.T. by Software Applications Services, Inc. ..... 169

Homeless Prevention Network Client Intake by Homeless Prevention Network EPICS Team ..... 169

IRis by SunCoast Custom Programming & Web Design ..... 170

OCERS by Corporation for Standard & Outcomes ..... 170

Tapestry, NextStep, and PathFinder by Vision Link, Inc. ..... 171

Vesta and SOPHIA by Caracole, Inc. ..... 171

**Glossary ..... 176**

**Appendix A: HMIS Evaluation Methodology ..... 180**

Solution Review Overview ..... 180

Initial HMIS Solution Provider Survey ..... 180

Selection of HMIS Solution Providers for an Indepth Review ..... 181

Indepth Review Process ..... 182

**Appendix B: Master List of Identified HMIS Solutions for Initial Survey ..... 188**

**Appendix C: Description of Corporation Types ..... 190**

**Bibliography ..... 191**

# List of Tables

Table 1: Solution Evaluation Process ..... 4
Table 2: User Interface Options ..... 8
Table 3: Database Location Options ..... 9
Table 4: Hosting Options ..... 10
Table 5: Description of Functional Activities ..... 22
Table 6: Description of System Characteristics ..... 24
Table 7: AWARDS Result Scores ..... 27
Table 8: CHIRP Result Scores ..... 36
Table 9: ClientTrack Result Scores ..... 44
Table 10: C-STAR Result Scores ..... 54
Table 11: MAACLink Result Scores ..... 62
Table 12: MetSYS Result Scores ..... 71
Table 13: PATHWAYS COMPASS Result Scores ..... 80
Table 14: ROSIE Result Scores ..... 88
Table 15: ServicePoint Result Scores ..... 97
Table 16: Social Services System Result Scores ..... 105
Table 17: Washington HMIS Result Scores ..... 113
Table 18: Result Scores Summary ..... 119
Table 19: Intake and Exit Scores ..... 120
Table 20: Intake and Exit Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 121
Table 21: Information and Referral Scores ..... 122
Table 22: Information and Referral Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 123
Table 23: Operations Scores ..... 124
Table 24: Operations Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 125

Table 25: Client Assessment Scores ..... 126
Table 26: Client Assessment Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 127
Table 27: Services and Outcomes Scores ..... 128
Table 28: Services and Outcomes Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 129
Table 29: Reporting Scores ..... 130
Table 30: Reporting Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 131
Table 31: APR Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 132
Table 32: Local System Administration Scores ..... 134
Table 33: Local System Administration Scores By Evaluation Criteria ..... 134
Table 34: Login Rules and Processes ..... 145
Table 35: Administrator and Caseworker Permissions ..... 146
Table 36: Solution-Level Security Capabilities ..... 147
Table 37: Training, Services, and Support ..... 151
Table 38: Technical Characteristics ..... 155
Table 39: Example Assumptions ..... 157
Table 40: Single Agency ..... 158
Table 41: Small Community or Equivalent Medium Agency ..... 160
Table 42: Medium Community or Equivalent Large Agency ..... 162
Table 43: Large Community ..... 164
Table 44: Solution-Level Security Cababilities ..... 172
Table 45: Data Elements ..... 173
Table 46: Training, Services, and Technical Support ..... 174
Table 47: Technical Characteristics ..... 175
Table 48: Indepth Review Selection Criteria ..... 181
Table 49: Evaluation Environment Technologies ..... 184

# List of Figures

Figure 1: Internet Based Security Model ..... 11
Figure 2: Sample Functional Activity Scores ..... 23
Figure 3: AWARDS Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 28
Figure 4: AWARDS Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 30
Figure 5: CHIRP Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 37
Figure 6: CHIRP Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 38
Figure 7: ClientTrack Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 45
Figure 8: ClientTrack Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 47
Figure 9: C-STAR Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 55
Figure 10: C-STAR Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 57
Figure 11: MAACLink Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 63
Figure 12: MAACLink Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 65
Figure 13: MetSYS Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 72
Figure 14: MetSYS Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 73
Figure 15: PATHWAYS COMPASS Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 81
Figure 16: PATHWAYS COMPASS Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 83
Figure 17: ROSIE Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 89
Figure 18: ROSIE Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 91
Figure 19: ServicePoint Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 98
Figure 20: ServicePoint Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 99
Figure 21: Social Services System Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 106
Figure 22: Social Services System Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 107
Figure 23: Washington HMIS Functional Activity Scores By Category ..... 114
Figure 24: Washington HMIS Average Ease of Use and Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 115
Figure 25: Intake and Exit Result Scores ..... 121

Figure 26: Information and Referral Result Scores ..... 123
Figure 27: Operations Result Scores ..... 125
Figure 28: Client Assessment Result Scores ..... 127
Figure 29: Services and Outcomes Result Scores ..... 129
Figure 30: Reporting Result Scores ..... 131
Figure 31: APR Result Scores ..... 133
Figure 32: Local System Administration Result Scores ..... 135
Figure 33: Presentation Scores ..... 136
Figure 34: Performance Scores ..... 137
Figure 35: Intuitiveness Scores ..... 138
Figure 36: Flow Scores ..... 139
Figure 37: Average Ease of Use Scores ..... 140
Figure 38: Data Entry Required Scores ..... 141
Figure 39: Data Elements Scores ..... 142
Figure 40: Features Scores ..... 143
Figure 41: Average Comprehensiveness Scores ..... 144
Figure 42: Newer Computers, High-Speed Internet Environment Scores ..... 152
Figure 43: Older Computers, High-Speed Internet Environment Scores ..... 153
Figure 44: Older Computers, Dial-up Internet Environment Scores ..... 154
Figure 45: Single Agency Up Front, Annual, and Five-Year Total Costs ..... 159
Figure 46: Small Community or Equivalent Medium Agency Up Front, Annual, and Five-Year Total Costs ..... 161
Figure 47 : Medium Community or Equivalent Large Agency Up Front, Annual, and Five-Year Total Costs ..... 163
Figure 48: Large Community Up Front, Annual, and Five-Year Total Costs ..... 165