

**Chicago CoC Charter Amendment Submissions
February 4, 2016**

All Amendment Submissions were received by January 31, 2016. A total of **8** submissions were received via SurveyGizmo and one via CoC email. Three submissions submitted via SurveyGizmo did not have any Feedback attachment to review. The following documents are submissions that contained Charter Amendment Feedback.

Charter Amendment Recommendations

Article 3: Continuum of Care Governance Structure

(§3.3) Board Composition states that, "The Collaborative Applicant will not have dedicated seats on the Board."

Rationale: As the Collaborative Applicant is a key stakeholder and one of the major leaders in the Continuum of Care, it seems odd that they would not have a seat on the CoC Board, given that all other stakeholders are provided the opportunity to participate, I am unable to determine a rationale for excluding the Collaborative Applicant and what benefit this would produce. Indeed, other CoCs across the country have included a dedicated CA seat on their CoC Board or governing body, recognizing that the unique perspective of this entity is one that should not be excluded. The exclusion of CA so pointedly in the Charter reflects a sense of opposition and not collaboration, as intended by the very concept of Continuum of Care.

Article 7: Committees and Ad hoc Working Groups

(§7.1) The Charter states that "Ad hoc working groups may be formed and given specific responsibilities as needed by the Board."

(§7.2) "The Board will determine ad hoc committee or working group membership."

Rationale: While some standing committees have consistent work from year to year, other committees experience a changing set of tasks, which may present opportunity for unforeseen workgroups to be needed in a timely manner. For example, the Evaluation Subcommittee this previous year decided to break out into smaller workgroups to tackle various sections in order to make the work more manageable and expedient. Another example would be the work of Coordinated Access Steering Committee, which has recently formed several working groups. The Youth Taskforce has several working groups, as well. Based on the language in the Charter, it would appear that these workgroups would need to be created or "approved" by the Board. If this is not the case, it may be prudent to clarify the language to provide more detail on ad hoc working groups and their formation.

(§7.2) "Committee slates will include slots for all stakeholder groups represented on the Board, using the same ratio of representation as the Board Slate."

Rationale: In implementing the Charter, it has become very apparent that the makeup of the Board and committee slates is overly restrictive and unnecessarily prescribed to all groups, without the ability to consider special needs or circumstances. Most committees have experienced hardship in filling the slates as outlined, for a variety of reasons:

- The number of members does not seem to be challenging at 12 minimum, but having a minimum of 12 meeting the specific stakeholder groups needed, has been the issue particularly in getting Private Funders, State Agency, Public Agency, and Key Stakeholder representation. Additionally, some committees require *more* than 12 members to complete their work, but then must fill these spots in the same ratio, presenting quite a challenge. Defining what it means to be an "At-large" versus a "Key Stakeholder" or other various slots has also presented challenges.

Article 3: CoC Governance Structure

Section 3: Board Composition

The composition of the Board indicates various numbers of key stakeholders in our community, yet there is a specific sentence that indicates that the Collaborative Applicant will not have dedicated seats on the Board. I believe that it would be absolutely beneficial to have the Collaborative Applicant on the Board to have a direct vote in the various conversations around CoC work and progress. This person would also have a voice at the table to give updates and input to the current state, as well as participate in conversations on improvement as that role to the Chicago community. Like any other person, this representative could always not vote if there was a direct conflict of interest.

Article 5: Nominations and Approval of Board of Directors State

Section 4: Officers

Currently, All Chicago is managing the responsibilities outlined for the Secretary of the Executive Committee. This speaks to a larger issue of needing an oversight body of the Board of Directors that ensures that responsibilities and duties outlined in the Charter are being completed by the appropriate parties. This also includes that there is assistance provided and an action plan created when some of these expectations are falling short in an effort to keep our system moving forward.

Article 7: Committees and Ad Hoc Working Groups

Section 1: Formation

This section currently states that Ad Hoc working groups will be formed by the Board of Directors. I would argue that this would be a direct response based on need per individual committees rather than the Board. The committees have a better understanding of how the work needs to be divided to get the best results and should be forming these groups on an "as needed" basis.

Section 10: Open Meetings

It currently states that that "attendance at committee meetings of the Chicago CoC will be open to any interested person to observe." This should be changed to include "committees, commissions, and constituency groups" in order to promote transparency and encourage membership.

Article 8: Advisory Boards

The Central Referral System Managing Entity Advisory Board is outlined to be included in the Charter. Since CRS is being phased-out in 2016-2017, this should not be a stand-alone group and potentially be absorbed into the Coordinated Access Steering Committee.

Article 14: General Provisions

Section 4: Orientation of Board, Committee, and CoC Members

It states that the "The Board Executive Committee and Committee Chairs are responsible for ensuring new members are orientated to their specific work, promoting meaningful participation and supporting new leaders." I am suggesting that there be a timeline added to when these orientations need to occur to hold groups accountable and give ample preparation of materials, invitation list, and general logistics.

Date: January 29, 2015

TO: CoC Charter Implementation Committee

FR: Kathy Booton Wilson, Deborah's Place; Andrea Dakin, AIDS Foundation of Chicago;
Mindy Taylor, Cornerstone Community Outreach
Service Provider Members, System Performance and Evaluation Committee (SPEC)

RE: Chicago Continuum of Care, Topic Recommendations for Charter Amendments

Suggested topics and areas to be amended:

Article 7: Committees and Ad hoc Working Groups

Section 2: Membership

Recommended Topic: *Committee membership in regards to conducting official business*

Rationale: The current charter states that committees be comprised of a minimum of twelve (12) members. This has been interpreted by some, including staff of the Collaborative Applicant, to mean that no committee decisions can be made until there are 12 people listed on the committee.

In any organization, committees will have turnover and periods of time when there will be empty seats. The work of the committee does not stop as the committee looks to find new individuals to take those seats. Clarification through the charter regarding how many of the member slots must be occupied in order to conduct official committee business would permit committees to work on assigned tasks while simultaneously identifying additional members.

Article 7: Committees and Ad hoc Working Groups

Section 4: Committees for the Board and CoC

Recommended Topic: *Defining the parameters of SPEC responsibility and oversight in regards to the performance evaluation of CoC projects*

Rationale: The responsibilities of the SPEC committee as outlined in the charter include working collaboratively with the Collaborative Applicant and DFSS to "establish metrics and standards for measuring the performance of ESG- and CoC-funded projects" and "evaluating performance of those ... projects." If SPEC is responsible for the evaluation process in its entirety, then it needs to be specified that its authority is for the entirety of the process - from the initial conceptualization of how the process occurs to how the process is implemented (from start to finish including scoring and communication) by the Collaborative Applicant. Lack of clarity regarding where SPEC oversight begins and ends is creating tension between SPEC committee members and Collaborative Applicant staff regarding evaluation process implementation.

Article 10: Selection and Review of the Collaborative Applicant and HMIS Lead Agency

Section 1: Collaborative Applicant

Recommended Topic: *Role and responsibility of staff of Collaborative Applicant*

Rationale: If the staff of the Collaborative Applicant are to provide support for the committees, there must be clearer parameters as to their role and authority in providing that support. The role of

Collaborative Applicant staff in relation to the committee needs to be well-defined, including how committee members can hold Collaborative Applicant staff accountable for its assigned tasks and define the appropriate course of action if tasks are not completed.

Article 13: Appeals

Recommended Topic: *Scope of Appeals and Role of Collaborative Applicant*

Rationale: The charter indicates that the Appeals Committee scope will be limited to HUD funding related decisions (ranking priorities, reallocation, defunding) and HMIS sanctions. This has been interpreted by some, including various members of the Appeal Committee and staff of the Collaborative Applicant, to mean that evaluation score appeals for individual questions are not reviewed by the Appeals Committee. The appeals regarding the scoring of individual questions are reviewed internally by Collaborative Applicant staff members only – the same group of people who conducted the initial scoring. This is problematic as it decreases the transparency of the scoring process, allows for bias in the decision-making process, and lacks accountability.

There are two potential manners in which this can be addressed. The first is to define any appeal related to evaluation instrument scoring as having a potential impact on ranking, reallocation and defunding. This would then allow the Appeals Committee to review the scoring appeals of individual questions. The second manner is to define SPEC's responsibilities as such that they oversee the entirety of the evaluation process. SPEC would then be able to impact how initial scoring and the scoring of appeals are conducted by the Collaborative Applicant, including but not limited to requiring outside scorers/reviewers as part of the process. (See Article 7, Section 4 comments)

Suggestions for Amending the Chicago Continuum of Care Governance Charter

Topic/Area 1: Consolidation of Charge(s) of Membership and Nominating Committees

When the Membership Committee was reviewing its charge per the Charter, as part of determining its 2016 work plan, the committee found references to its responsibilities that were outside of and in addition to Article 7, Section 3. The Committee should not have to review the entire Charter every time it sets up its work plan. Consolidating/cross-referencing the multiple references to Membership and Nominating Committees' responsibilities will enable those committees, and the continuum as a whole, to more effectively fulfill its mission and goals.

Topic/Area 2: New Projects Selection

Not sure if/how this issue can be fixed with Charter revision. However, we need to examine where we've put the fulcrum point between the need for the New Projects Selection Committee to be unbiased and independent and the need for the committee to make informed decisions. Both the NPSC I participated in and the NPSC I observed had more questions than answers. Both NPSCs this past year felt they were not given enough information/context. NPSC may need to get involved with the process sooner, possibly in the development of applications and outreach for applicants. Committee work should never feel unsatisfying (hard yes).

Charter Amendment Suggestions

Submitted on behalf of the Concerned Providers Constituency Group

- 1) Create and include an established process for amending the charter;
- 2) Include a description of who/what constitutes a Private Funder & At Large Member
- 3) Increase the number of alternates for service providers from 1 to 3
- 4) Remove the restriction of CoC (HUD) funded agencies to participate in the discussion and be able to vote regarding ranking policies understanding that it could cause some undue influence, however, it is necessary that there is full discussion and that all view points are able to be heard. As the majority of the service providers receive CoC funding, finding appropriate members with relevant experience and knowledge that are not funded through the CoC is extremely challenging. Members should disclose their conflict before participating in the discussion.

Date: January 20, 2016

TO: CoC Charter Implementation Committee

FR: Audrey Thomas, CEO, Deborah's Place

RE: Chicago Continuum of Care, Topic Recommendations for Charter Amendments

Suggested topics and areas to be amended:

Article 3: Continuum of Care Governance Structure
Section 3: Board Composition

Recommended Topic: *Reducing stakeholder groups.*

Rationale: Committees face two barriers to their work. 1) Seating a committee with all stakeholder groups (8 groups); and 2) Defining the definition of some of the stakeholder groups.

At a minimum, folding "At Large" members into the "Key Stakeholder" group would assist committees with finding community members to serve.

Article 7: Committees and Ad hoc Working Groups
Section 2: Membership

Recommended Topic: *Changing language from "members" to "seats"*

Rationale: The current charter states that committees be comprised of a minimum of twelve (12) members. This has been interpreted by some, including staff of the collaborative applicant, to mean that no committee decisions can be made until there are 12 people listed on the committee.

In any organization, committees will have turnover and periods of time when there will be empty seats. The work of the committee does not stop as the committee looks to find new individuals to take those seats.

It would be clearer if committees referred to seats – still representing the stakeholder representation ratio of the Governing Board.

There are committees who have a lot of work to do and should not be impeded by having to delay decision making while they fill a seat.

Article 10: Selection and Review of the Collaborative Applicant and HMIS Lead Agency
Section 1: Collaborative Applicant

Recommended Topic: *Role and responsibility of staff of Collaborative Applicant*

Rationale: If the staff of the Collaborative Applicant are to provide support for the committees, there must be clearer parameters as to their role and authority in providing that support. It must be clear that support does not mean making decisions or running the committee in lieu of committee chairs.

Elizabeth Perez

From: Becki Martello <brgunderman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 10:22 PM
To: COC Program
Subject: Charter Amendment Recommendation

Hello. I could not upload anything when I just tried on Surveygizmo because I don't have skills, just a phone.

Suggestion: I would like the consumer constituency or stakeholders to be re-thought, re-imagined, re-envisioned.

I would like the Charter to define the current LEC as an open forum where many diverse ideas are represented, not just "one consumer voice".

The rich tapestry of consumer voices and experiences should not be defined by a few consumers. A "one world order" is not beneficial to consumers.

ALL CONSUMERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THEIR THOUGHTS AND UNIQUE OPINIONS WITHOUT BEING TOLD THEY ARE NOT NEEDED OR BEING CRITICIZED FOR QUESTIONING LEC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE EDICTS, PROPOSALS OR COMMANDS. ONE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO EXPRESS THEMSELVES WITHOUT BEING MALIGNED OR FEARING RETRIBUTION; BECAUSE RETALIATION ALWAYS COMES. BULLYING HAS BECOME THE NEW NORM.

I DO NOT ACCEPT FORCED BLOCK VOTING. NOR DO I VOTE OR ACT IN MY OWN INTERESTS WHEN I SPEAK WHAT I BELIEVE AND WHAT IS IN MY HEART.

AS AN EQUAL HUMAN I RESENT BEING CRITICIZED AND HARASSED FOR USING MY OWN VOICE. IF I WERE ONLY IN THIS FOR MYSELF, I WOULD NOT INVOLVED IN THIS AT ALL.I SPEAK WITH OTHER CONSUMERS EVERY DAY. I BRING THEIR WANTS AND NEEDS AND VOICES TO MY WORK HERE. I WILL NOT BE TOLD WHAT TO SAY BY AN OLIGARCHY.

THE CONSUMER CHARTER IS NOT COMPLETE EVEN THOUGH IT WAS RATIFIED. WE HAVE NO VOTING POLICIES OR PROCEDURES AND COMPLETE CONTROL OF ALL CONSUMER VOICES IS GIVEN TO THE LEC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

AN ALTERNATIVE CONSUMER GROUP IS NEEDED TO FULLY REPRESENT ALL CONSUMERS. IF NOT,INCLUSIVITY, DIVERSITY, AND FREE EXCHANGES OF IDEAS DIED WITH THE NEW LEC. THAT IS NOT IN ALIGNMENT WITH WHAT HUD REQUIRES. WITHOUT NEW IDEAS AND UNQUENESS OUR SYSTEM WILL STAGNATE AND NOT EVOLVE. ONE IS EITHER IN THIS FOR THE POWER OR THE CHANGE.

THE LEC IS AKIN TO GEORGE ORWELL'S ANIMAL FARM. ALL ANIMALS ARE EQUAL BUT SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS.

LASTLY

THE IRONY OF CONSUMERS ON THE LEC BEHAVING HYPOCRITICALLY IS NOT LOST ON ME. FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO CLAIM TO ESPOUSE FREEDOM OF VOICES, THEY ARE CERTAINLY CONVINCED THAT THEIR VOICES ARE THE ONLY ONES THAT MATTER.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android