

Governance and Structure Steering Committee
Major Charter Feedback Themes and Decisions on Changes
June, 2014

The Governance and Structure Steering Committee held two in-person feedback sessions, offered a SurveyMonkey option for feedback, and had representatives receive feedback at a Service Providers Commission meeting, Lived Experience Commission meeting and Planning Council meeting. The Steering Committee compiled feedback into major themes and determined if and how changes would be addressed in the Charter. This document highlights major themes and how they were addressed.

Membership

Issue: Will dues requirement prohibit agencies or individuals from joining the CoC?

Decision: Clarified language in the charter (Article 2, Section 2) that the intent is to have a nominal fee/due to join the CoC and that waivers would be considered for agencies or individuals that are not able to pay. Clarified the statement in the charter that persons with lived experience are not required to pay dues by adding that statement in the membership dues section as well by repeating the statement in Article 2, Section 2.

Issue: Lack of clarity around how CoC will use dues revenue.

Decision: Added language in Article 2, Section 2 that gives examples of how the CoC will use dues (i.e. committee staffing support, meeting materials, and CoC website).

Service Providers Commission/Lived Experience Commission

Issue: Importance of Lived Experience Commission and Service Providers Commission is not apparent in the draft.

Decision: Added Article 9: Commissions to the charter with statements that specifically reference the continued importance of commissions and their authorized constituency groups in the CoC. The charter now also references commission bylaws and role of communication to and from the commissions by board and committee members.

Issue: What is the mechanism for bringing issues to the governing body?

Decision: This should be clearer with the inclusion of commissions and constituency groups in the charter in Article 9. The GSSC feels that with this addition, it is clear that the process for bringing

issues to governing body is through constituency group, commission and committee participation and/or working with reps on those bodies to bring issues to the governing body.

Issue: The reference to the Collaborative Applicant supporting the Lived Experience Commission does not demonstrate strong enough commitment.

Decision: Added language to this statement in Article 10, Section 1 that indicates that the support will be provided by the Chicago Alliance directly or through a contracted entity. Support includes but is not limited to technical assistance, leadership development, supporting individuals in leadership positions and generally ensuring meaningful participation by people with lived experience in the CoC.

Committee Purpose and Structure

Issue: Lack of clarity around what some committees will do – i.e. Finance Committee and Plan 2.0 committees. Concerns about whether we have too many committees proposed and whether 12-person minimum is too high given the number of committees. Systems Integration looks like it is missing.

Decision: Clarified Finance Committee purpose to focus on income generated by membership dues (Article 7, Section 3). For Plan 2.0 committees, the Steering Committee decided to keep the Plan Advisory Committee and reduce the number of Plan 2.0 committees. The only committees that will remain are existing committees: Advocacy, Chicago Task Force on Homeless Youth, Plan 2.0 Employment Task Force and Coordinated Access Steering Committee.

The charter also now reads that the governing body will delegate the evaluation of the type of committees needed to implement Plan 2.0 to the Plan Advisory Committee in the first year of the charter. This structure will likely be modified at times to adapt to annual priorities. These changes can be found in Article 7, Section 5.

Issue: How many committees can one person serve on?

Decision: There will not be an imposed limit in the first year of the charter; however, committee membership will be evaluated as part of the annual charter review process and issues that arise will be addressed through that process.

Issue: The committee composition does not explicitly state designated slots for persons with lived experience.

Decision: The GSSC noticed that the proposed slate for committees is missing from the charter entirely, so added a statement in the Committee Membership section (Article 7, Section 2) that indicates that

committees will be comprised of the same stakeholder groups represented on the board, including persons with lived experience of homelessness.

Conflict of Interest

Issue: Conflict of interest policy does not address circumstances when agencies may not be directly receiving funding in question, but benefit as a subcontractor or funds being passed through to them.

Decision: The GSSC decided to leave the policy as written. The abstention from decision-making section states that Members who become aware that the CoC is about to enter into any business transaction **directly or indirectly** must disclose that.

Alternates

Issue: The idea of persons with lived experience having unlimited alternates while other stakeholders have a limit was raised as confusing and potentially unfair.

Decision: The GSSC decided to leave policy as is and explain that the charter defaults to creating opportunities for involvement and supported leadership development for persons with lived experience. The inclusion of multiple alternates reflects that commitment. This addition is reflected in Article 5, Section 2.

Advocacy

Issue: Role of advocacy seems to be missing from the charter. There was also a lot of discussion about the changing role of the Chicago Alliance and who will spearhead these efforts.

Decision: Add language about policy advocacy to the CoC Responsibilities section. The stakeholder feedback reflected the importance of two types of advocacy in the CoC: political advocacy and administrative advocacy. Therefore, advocacy is addressed in the charter in two ways: 1) The GSSC decided that by including language about the commissions and constituency groups and explanation about how these groups can organize to raise administrative advocacy issues within the CoC channels, ultimately the governing body can respond to or sign-off on advocacy initiatives that come to the governing body for action. (Article 9) 2) The Advocacy Committee will also remain and be charged with coordinating, partnering and/or leading on efforts to influence policy and resource allocation that affects the continuum (Article 7, Section 5).

UFA

Issue: Interest in understanding what changes will happen when we have a UFA.

Decision: The GSSC determined that there is not enough information or direction from HUD beyond what is included in the CoC Interim Rule to predict what the UFA will mean in Chicago. If Chicago were approved for a UFA, the inclusion of UFA requirements and any changes to roles and responsibilities would be added to the charter as an amendment. However, the Charter now includes language that stipulates that when a UFA is approved in Chicago, the UFA would enter into a MOU with the Board (which will outline roles and responsibilities) and the UFA will be evaluated by the Board three years from the date of the MOU unless otherwise specified by HUD or an amendment to the charter (Article 10, Section 2)

Issue: Confusion over the fact that a decision has been made by the Planning Council to select the Chicago Alliance as the UFA applicant. The Charter does not change that.

Decision: Added language to the UFA section (Article 10, Section 2) that references the previous Planning Council decision to select the Chicago Alliance as the UFA applicant and the date that decision was made.

Legal Status of the CoC

Issues: Uncertainty about the legal status of an unincorporated membership organization and how MOUs would operationally be established with the Chicago Alliance.

Decision: Board executive committee would be responsible for reviewing and developing MOUs with designated entities, with the Chair signing on behalf of the Board. This will also be an implementation issue.

Recordkeeping of Voting

Issue: To promote transparency, committee and board member votes should be recorded in meeting minutes.

Decision: The charter already states that the CoC will follow Robert's Rules of Order. The GSSC decided to add language to Article 5, Section 1 and Article 7, Section 8 that states that if a board or committee member call for Division of the House, votes can be recorded in the minutes and the Board or Committee chair would be responsible for ensuring the accurate documentation of those votes.

Bloc Voting

Issue: The charter does not specifically prohibit stakeholder groups from requiring bloc voting by its representatives on the Board or committees and there were concerns about ability to change one's mind about a vote or repercussions for not voting as designated by one's constituency.

Decision: The charter does not directly govern the commissions and constituency groups and states that they have their own bylaws, policies and procedures though does call for them to be reviewed and updated in the first year of the charter. Bloc voting could be addressed in those reviews. However, the Charter does state in Article 3, Section 6 that the only grounds for removal from the Board or committee are violations of attendance policy, gross misconduct and/or conflict of interest policies. Technically, a Board member may not be removed from his/her position for a vote but the constituency can decide whether to nominate that person again when their term is up based on voting history.

Other issues addressed through clarification edits

- Removed organizational chart
- Importance of leadership development/orientations and bringing new members in. Added language to Committee Leadership section (Article 7, Section 6) reflecting chair responsibilities for ensuring meaningful participation in committees by all constituencies, including supporting persons with lived experience with attendance, meeting prep and chair/co-chair opportunities.
- Noted that the Governing Board is the new Planning Council not the Board of CAEH (Article 3, Section 1)
- Noted that a process will be created by the membership committee to orient new members to the CoC (Article 2, Sections 1 and 4)