Survey Monkey Responses

Overview
This document is intended to provide a concise summary of results from the Fall 2012 survey regarding Chicago CoC Structure and Governance. **Please note**: Because this was a voluntary survey, these results are not statistically reliable and may not accurately represent the opinions of the entire CoC.

1. **Which constituencies are not adequately represented in the CoC? (49 responses total)**

Unrepresented or Under-Represented Constituency	# of Cites
Law Enforcement	21
Developers	18
Businesses	17
Universities	17
Hospitals	15
School Districts	14
Faith Based Organizations	12
Public Housing Authorities (e.g., CHA)	10
Government	5
Veteran Service Providers	4
Youth Provider Agencies	3
Advocates	2
DV Providers	2
Mental Health Providers	2
Homeless/Formerly Homeless	1

2. **Examples of constituencies or specific organizations that should be represented or better represented in the CoC (37 responses total)**

• Agencies that don't receive HUD funds	• Chicago Agencies: Dept. of Public Health, Dept. of Economic Development, School Dept.	• Correction Facilities
• Diverse Government Representation, including those not serving homeless	• Faith-based shelters: Olive Branch & Pacific Garden Mission	• GLBTQ organizations
• Halfway Houses	• Health Care: clinics, community health centers, FQHCs, managed care/coordinated care entities, hospitals, psychiatric facilities.	• "Homeless Families receive scant attention and resources"
• Landlords	• Low income/Section 8 rental housing providers/CHA voucher programs	• HUD
• Politicians	• Private developers who get tax credits or other HUD funds who are supposed to follow the city	• State agencies: Dept. of Corrections, Housing Development Authority,

	ordinance of housing set-asides	Dept. of Human Services, Dept. of Children and Family Services.
• Substance Treatment	• Surrounding Cities and counties that have voucher programs	• Together4Health
• Universities	• VA and Veteran organizations	• Homeless Youth

3. Which constituencies or organizations should be represented on the board? (44 responses total)

Unrepresented or Under-Represented Constituency	# of Cites
Consumers	28
Providers	27
Government	20
Business	6
Civic and Community Leaders and Organizations	3
Faith Based Organizations	2
Private and Charitable Funders/Foundations	2
Child welfare representative; Developers	1 each

4. How should constituencies/individuals be selected for a seat on the board? (43 responses total)

Method	# of Cites
CoC Vote	16
Constituency selects own representatives	10
Other methods	6
Constituency nominates; CoC votes	4
Combination of appointment and election	3

5. How long a term should board members serve? (46 responses total)

Term Length	# of Cites
2 years	18
2+ years	10
3 years	6
1 year	5
1 year or 2 years	5
4 years	3

6. Should board membership be subject to term limits? What should be the limit? (47 responses total)

Term Limit	# of Cites
Yes, 2 terms	10
2 year limit	9
No	7
Yes, no further elaboration	3
4 year limit	3
Yes, 2 consecutive terms, then must sit out one term before returning	2
2-3 year limit	2
3 year limit	2
Other	8

7. How should the chair of the board be selected? How long should a chair serve in that role? (46 responses total)

How Should the Board be Elected	# of Cites
Elected by the Board	20
Elected by Continuum of Care members	13
Rotates in from Executive Committee	2

Term of a Chairperson	# of Cites
Two years	18
One year	16
3-4 years	2

8. Should there be a co-chair? If yes, what should be their role and how should they be chosen? (45 responses total)

Should there be a co-chair?	# of Cites
Yes	36
No	5
Not sure	4

Role of the Co-Chair	# of Cites
Back up the chairperson	17
Planning and agenda setting	3
Observe and be rotated in the following term	1
Provide checks and balances to the work	1
Share responsibilities with chair	1

9. Should decisions of the board require a simple majority, or some kind of super majority? (40 responses)

Simple Majority vs. Super Majority	# of Cites
Simple majority in routine decisions; super majority in certain cases (e.g., major policy decisions, changes in governing structure, changes to by-laws, articles of incorporation, governing policies, de-funding an agency or eliminating services, allocating of funds, election or removal of chair/co-chair/board member, rejection of a project for funding…)	19
Simple majority always	15
Super majority always	4

10. In order to avoid conflicts of interest – or the appearance of such conflicts of interest – who on the board should make decisions about the inclusion of projects in the HUD application? (41 responses total)

Who should make funding decisions	# of Cites
Entities which do not stand to benefit from a funding decision	20
Other	10
Designated group	5
All members of the board	4
Based entirely on project ranking	2

11. **How often should the FULL CoC be convened? How often should the board of the CoC be convened? (40 responses total)**

Frequency of Convening Full CoC	# of Cites
Quarterly	5
Twice a year	3

Frequency of Convening Board	# of Cites
Every other month	4
Monthly	3
Other	2

Frequency without specifying Full CoC vs. Board	# of Cites
At least quarterly	7
Quarterly	6
Monthly	5
At least every other month	5
Twice a year	3
Other	3

12. **How should constituencies not represented on the CoC board convey their issues/concerns between meetings of the full CoC? (38 responses total)**

Mechanism of conveying concerns	# of Cites
Convey to designate Board member, or to the Board, or one of its subcommittees	13
Via a specifically designed mechanism (website portal, email address, create a group for otherwise unrepresented constituencies)	9
Convey to member representing their constituency	6
At open meetings of the Board/CoC	2
Convey to Chicago Alliance	2

13. **How should the CoC Board communicate its decisions to other stakeholders in the CoC? (38 responses total)**

Broad consensus:
- Minutes, announcements emailed to the listserv
- Minutes, announcements posted on the website
- Use of surveys
- Periodic town hall-type meetings
- Rely on constituency-based representatives to share information

14. **How should decisions about which projects to fund be made? Who should or should not participate in making those decisions? (37 responses total)**

How should funding decisions be made? By whom?	# of Cites
Other	14
By a designated committee or third party entity	10
Based on transparently applied performance criteria	8
Through an open, inclusive process	5

15. **How should decisions about setting project performance targets be made? Who should or should not participate in making those decisions. (35 responses total)**

Who Should Participate in Establishing Targets	# of Cites
All Stakeholders/Providers	13
External Experts	5

Other Examples Included: CoC-Funded Agencies; HMV Committee; Collaborative Applicant/UFA; Planning Council; Ad Hoc Committee

16. **Who should monitor the performance of projects funded with CoC funds? To what extent should information about project performance (and the results of project monitoring) be shared with CoC stakeholders?**

Who should monitor project performance?	# of Cites
UFA	6
Committee made up of select CoC members	5
Committee of Evaluation Experts	4
HUD	3
CoC Board	2
CoC Membership	2
Other	3

How much sharing of monitoring results/project performance?	# of Cites
Full sharing of performance data	11
Some performance data sharing, high level summary and project ranking shared, not project-specific monitoring results	8
No sharing of performance data	4

17. **What should the CoC do about under-performing or non-compliant projects? (37 responses total)**

What should be done about under-performing projects?	# of Cites
Provide TA, set performance objectives, monitor. If not successful, defund	28
Immediate defunding for programs showing a history of poor performance	4
Warn them/probation. If no improvements, reduce, reallocate or withdraw funding	4
Continue to support programs that provide critical services, reallocate a percentage of the funding to higher performing programs	1

18. **What entity in the Chicago CoC should be selected as the collaborative applicant to receive planning funds? (34 responses total)**

What entity should be selected as the collaborative applicant?	# of Cites
Chicago Alliance	24
No Opinion	4
Other (Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, Mayor's Office, the CoC)	4

19. **If there is more than one qualified and interested entity, how should the CoC's Collaborative Applicant be selected? Who should participate in the decision to select the Collaborative Applicant? (30 responses total)**

By what entity should a collaborative applicant be selected if there is more than one option?	# of Cites
Full CoC	7
CoC Board (Planning Council)	6
Planning Council Plus	6
Other	6
Don't know/No opinion	4
All HUD-funded agencies	1

20. **If the Chicago CoC does not become an incorporated entity, and therefore must designated an eligible applicant to serve as its Collaborative Applicant (in order to apply for funds on behalf of multiple applicants), how should the CoC and that Collaborative Applicant divide their respective responsibilities, and how should they divide the planning resources awarded to the Collaborative Applicant?**

> <u>Note</u>: **Eleven of the 26 respondents indicated "no opinion."**

Selected Comments:

- The Planning resources would need to be divided based on the work assigned to each entity.
- The Alliance should have as its responsibility as the UFA to fully staff the Board
- Specifically the HUD grant and evaluation should be one entity and the CoC the other. Had the CoC not merged with the Emergency Fund, I would have stated the CoC can have the separate entity within but now it appears to be a conflict of interest where the Emergency Fund can possible represent the entities that their board of directors work at or serve on.
- Collaborative applicant would: develop the application to HUD, evaluate outcomes, participate in consolidated plan, point-in-time count, data collection, monitoring costs. CA would receive majority of planning resources and specific activities of CoC would need to be assigned a cost to determine the dollars the entity would recive for planning purposes. CoC would: develop the CoC, determine geographic region of CoC, participate in consolidated plan,
- The collaborative applicant should be responsible for facilitating processes within the CoC, monitoring for program performance, and providing training and technical assistance to agencies within the CoC. Ultimate decision making power of how the CoC should operate should lay with the CoC and should be settled by a super majority vote. Depending on the time commitment of individuals on the planning council, the planning resources could go to both the CAEH and the planning council (or other designated executive board).
- Chicago's CoC is an incorporated entity - the Alliance to End Homelessness. This question ignore significant work undertaken: The Alliance is a merger of The Partnership to End Homelessness and The Chicago Continuum of Care. As mentioned before, The Alliance has already been put forward as the potential UFA, based on many continuum-wide conversations. If the Alliance is not to become the collaborative applicants, they will continue to be the convener of the most varied group of CoC stakeholders and the Collaborative Applicant would be, in my opinion, a grants administrator and performance monitor. That would mean the for funding purposes The Alliance should receive funds proportional to their work to convene stakeholders and facilitate CoC wide planning, where the Collaborative Applicant should receive funds for grants management and administration.
- I imagine it should be shared but DO NOT make CDFSS the collaborative agent! They are just not equipped to facilitate effective programs and funding.
- Find a fiscal agent to apply under and pay an administrative fee for the maintaining of the grant. The fiscal agent submits the paper work. Likely the fiscal agent is just that and would only be handling the grant and final submissions, but the CoC completing the work. Negotiate a fee for services of the fiscal agent - Likely not more than 10% of the administrative fee, unless they're completing some significant work required of the grant.
- The Collaborative Applicant will have the lion's share of the responsibility. Therefore it should get minimally 85% of

the available funds.   Collaborative Applicant: grant administration; application process; program monitoring; HMIS operation; Consumer and Service Provider Commission support; advocacy work.   CoC: system wide collaboration and facilitation; policy setting and approval if the applicant is doing most of the work they should receive most of the resources, but some should be allotted to the CoC to ensure that they can actually hold true to the decision making structures that they have established.

- They can delegate various collaborative agencies to apply for funds on behalf of the other multiple applicants. This could be done by a Network System (one applicant (mother collaborative applicant) will be designated to carry all the other collaborative applicants) This is done in an umbrella like fashion; the mother collaborative applicant will apply one and for all and divide respectfully to the others. Therefore non would be lost, and at the same time accountability will be right there.
- Responsibilities of the Collaborative Entity are to oversee the entire Collaborative by forming appropriate committees, facilitating the committees' responsibilities, communicating the committees' decisions to the entire Collaborative, and Advocating for the Collaborative with HUD. Planning resources should be given to each CoC applicant in the amount of 5% of their grant and the rest of it should go to the designated Collaborative Applicant.
- I feel like answering this question is a waste of time as no one is going to offer the idea that some other entity other than the CAEH should organize planning activities for the CoC